is best adapted to serve. One of our most pressing needs today is to strengthen our common culture and sense of national unity and purpose. The only media that reach enough people or touch people intimately enough to achieve this are radio and television. Whether television lifts us to esthetic or intellectual heights or elevates our artistic standards is less important than whether it helps us achieve a common culture and sense of national unity and purpose.

It is more likely to do this by responding day after day to the wants and tastes of the million-strong masses than by straining for approval of scornful intellectuals. There need be no apology and should be no lament for a broadcasting industry which provides the mass of people with programs they watch and enjoy daily. Disdainful talk about television seeking "the lowest common denominator" misses the important point. Culture is not arithmetic, and the cultural denominator of popular programs may be the highest, not the lowest, that is truly common. The important point is television does achieve a *common* denominator in society.

If there were less programing it might be of better quality. But the character of life depends upon everyday experience more than upon great infrequent ceremonial occasions. Amiability at the breakfast table is more important to a happy marriage than design of the wedding gown.

As television lets us share daily a common reflection of society and helps us see a similar vision of our relationship to society, it builds a common culture to unite our country. This now appears to be its natural function and highest ideal. It is enough.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 19, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 88th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 22, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Teach me to do Thy will; for Thou art my God: Thy spirit is good; lead me into the land of uprightness.—Psalm 143: 10.

Almighty and eternal God, we thank Thee for the lovely evidences of spring, for the beauty which surrounds us, for the glory which shines above us, and for the love which from our birth over and around us lies. Lord of all, to Thee we raise this our prayer of grateful praise.

Let us not set out on any endeavor this day which is not in accord with Thy will for us, for our Nation, and for our world. Take us by the hand and lead us, illumine our minds and direct our thinking, strengthen our spirits and give us the courage of creative convictions that our thoughts, our words, and our actions may be worthy of Thy blessing.

Bless our President, our Speaker, these Representatives of our people, and all who work under the dome of this beloved Capitol. God bless us everyone and help us to continue to labor earnestly and enthusiastically for the welfare of our country and the well-being of mankind. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 11, 1968, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15398. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2155. An act to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the classification of Chinese gooseberries; and

H.R. 10477. An act to amend chapter 37 of title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the guarantee entitlement and reasonable value requirement for home loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the interest rate on loans subject to such chapter, and to authorize aid on account of structural defects in property purchased with assistance under such chapter.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 234. An act for the relief of James W. Adams and others;

S. 375. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 1664. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; and

S. 2912. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3293. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1969 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1968.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on April 10, 1968, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 1229, making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Respectfully yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SIGNING ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Wednesday, April 10, 1968, he did on April 11, 1968, sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House:

H.J. Res. 1229. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

POSTAL REFORM MEASURE INTRODUCED

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation like that previously introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. It is designed to end the politics involved in the appointment of postmasters and rural mail carriers. It would become effective on the day the new President is inaugurated next year, or January 20, 1969.

I have always objected to this political practice. It is just a throwback to the old, discredited spoils system and hinders the progress we are trying to make toward a true merit system in the public service.

The measure introduced would give experienced postal workers first crack at promotions to postmastership and rural carrier positions. Where employees are unavailable for such jobs, vacancies would be filled through competitive civil service examination.

Criminal penalties would be authorized for those using political influence to gain the Government jobs for political cronies.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind our colleagues that Republicans played a political hand in picking people for such postal plums in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration while the Democrats have done the same for the 8 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. It would be easier to quit this blatantly political business while we are even-steven. I hope the Congress will see fit to enact this needed measure this year.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

COMMUNICATION FROM THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Assistant Attorney General of the United States:

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are happy to advise you that the Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit on March 21, 1968 affirmed the Order of the District Court dismissing the action entitled *In The Matter of the Maryland Petition Committee, et al. v. Lyndon B. Johnson, Hubert H. Humphrey, John W. McCormack and the Acting Attorney General,* Civil No. 17326. Should there be any further proceedings we will so advise you.

Sincerely,

EDWIN L. WEISL, JR.,
Assistant Attorney General.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1968

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 16409) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to provide salary increases for teachers and school officers in the District of Columbia public schools, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16409

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1968".

SEC. 2. The District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Effective on October 1, 1967, the salary schedule contained in section 1 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501) is amended to read as follows:

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1	$28,000								
Superintendent.									
Class 2	24,000								
Deputy Superintendent.									
Class 3	18,480	$18,920	$19,360	$19,800	$20,240	$20,680	$21,120	$21,560	$22,000
Assistant superintendent.									
President, teachers college.									
Class 4	15,625	15,995	16,365	16,735	17,105	17,475	17,845	18,215	18,585
Director, curriculum.									
Dean, teachers college.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	14,120	14,470	14,820	15,170	15,520	15,870	16,220	16,570	16,920
Group B, master's degree	14,750	15,100	15,450	15,800	16,150	16,500	16,850	17,200	17,550
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,065	15,415	15,765	16,115	16,465	16,815	17,165	17,515	17,865
Group D, doctor's degree	15,380	15,730	16,080	16,430	16,780	17,130	17,480	17,830	18,180
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial adult equcation.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendedt.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	14,320	14,660	15,000	15,340	15,680	16,020	16,360	16,700	17,040
Principal, level IV	14,320	14,660	15,000	15,340	15,680	16,020	16,360	16,700	17,040
Principal, level III	14,010	14,350	14,690	15,030	15,370	15,710	16,050	16,390	16,730
Principal, level II	13,700	14,040	14,380	14,720	15,060	15,400	15,740	16,080	16,420
Principal, level I	13,390	13,730	14,070	14,410	15,750	15,090	15,430	15,770	16,110
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,635	14,975	15,315	15,655	15,995	16,335	16,675	17,015	17,355
Principal, level IV	14,635	14,975	15,315	15,655	15,995	16,335	16,675	17,015	17,355
Principal, level III	14,325	14,665	15,005	15,345	15,685	16,025	15,365	16,705	17,045
Principal, level II	14,015	14,355	14,695	15,035	15,375	15,715	16,055	16,395	16,735
Principal, level I	13,705	14,045	14,385	14,725	15,065	15,405	15,745	16,085	16,425
Group D, doctor's degree	14,950	15,290	15,630	15,970	16,310	16,650	16,990	17,330	17,670
Principal, level IV	14,950	15,290	15,630	15,970	16,310	16,650	16,990	17,330	17,670
Principal, level III	14,640	14,980	15,320	15,660	16,000	16,340	16,680	17,020	17,360
Principal, level II	14,330	14,670	15,010	15,350	15,690	16,030	16,370	16,710	17,050
Principal, level I	14,020	14,360	14,700	15,040	15,380	15,720	16,060	16,400	16,740
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil personnel services).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health (physical education, athletics, and safety).									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	13,020	13,330	13,640	13,950	14,260	14,570	14,880	15,190	15,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,335	13,645	13,955	14,265	14,575	14,885	15,195	15,505	15,815
Group D, doctor's degree	13,650	13,960	14,270	14,580	14,890	15,200	15,510	15,820	16,130
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	$12,520	$12,830	$13,140	$13,450	$13,760	$14,070	$14,380	$14,690	$15,000
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,835	13,145	13,455	13,765	14,075	14,385	14,695	15,005	15,315
Group D, doctor's degree	13,150	13,460	13,770	14,080	14,390	14,700	15,010	15,320	15,630
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	11,390	11,700	12,010	12,320	12,630	12,940	13,250	13,560	13,870
Group B, master's degree	12,020	12,330	12,640	12,950	13,260	13,570	13,880	14,190	14,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,335	12,645	12,955	13,265	13,575	13,885	14,195	14,505	14,815
Group D, doctor's degree	12,650	12,960	13,270	13,580	13,890	14,200	14,510	14,820	15,130
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	11,470	11,780	12,090	12,400	12,710	13,020	13,330	13,640	13,950
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,785	12,095	12,405	12,715	13,025	13,335	13,645	13,955	14,265
Group D, doctor's degree	12,100	12,410	12,720	13,030	13,340	13,650	13,900	14,270	14,580
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	10,950	11,260	11,570	11,880	12,190	12,500	12,810	13,120	13,340
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,265	11,575	11,885	12,195	12,505	12,815	13,125	13,435	13,745
Group D, doctor's degree	11,580	11,890	12,200	12,510	12,820	13,130	13,400	13,750	14,060
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	10,430	10,740	11,050	11,360	11,670	11,980	12,290	12,600	12,910
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,745	11,055	11,365	11,675	11,985	12,295	12,915	12,915	13,225
Group D, doctor's degree	11,060	11,370	11,680	11,990	12,300	12,610	12,920	13,320	13,540
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	9,360	9,740	10,120	10,500	10,880	11,260	11,640	12,020	12,400
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,675	10,055	10,435	10,815	11,195	11,575	11,955	12,335	12,715
Group D, doctor's degree	9,990	10,370	10,750	11,130	11,510	11,890	12,270	12,650	13,030
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									
Psychiatric social worker.									

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 14:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	$7,510	$7,830	$8,150	$8,470	$8,790	$9,110	$9,430	$9,750	$10,070	$10,390	$10,710	$11,030	$11,350		
Group B, master's degree	8,140	8,460	8,780	9,100	9,420	9,740	10,060	10,380	10,700	11,020	11,340	11,660	11,980		
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,455	8,775	9,095	9,415	9,735	10,055	10,375	10,695	11,015	11,335	11,655	11,975	12,295		
Group D, doctor's degree	8,770	9,090	9,410	9,730	10,050	10,370	10,690	11,010	11,330	11,650	11,970	12,290	12,610		
Coordinator of practical nursing.															
Census supervisor.															
Class 15:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,050	7,435	7,750	8,065	8,380	8,695	8,950	9,200	9,450	9,700	$10,200	$10,800
Group B, master's degree	7,030	7,230	7,430	7,680	8,065	8,380	8,695	9,010	9,325	9,580	9,830	10,080	10,330	10,830	11,430
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,345	7,545	7,745	7,995	8,380	8,695	9,010	9,325	9,640	9,895	10,145	10,395	10,645	11,145	11,745
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours of doctor's degree	7,660	7,860	8,060	8,310	8,695	9,010	9,325	9,640	9,955	10,210	10,460	10,710	10,960	11,4 60	12,06
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.															
Attendance officer.															
Child labor inspectors.															
Counselor, placement.															
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, teachers college.															
Research assistant.															
School social worker.															
Speech correctionist.															
Instructor, teachers college.															
Instructor, laboratory school.															
School psychologist."															

(2) Effective on July 1, 1968, such salary schedule is amended to read as follows:

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1	$28,000								
Superintendent.									
Class 2	24,000								
Deputy superintendent.									
Class 3	19,320	$19,780	$20,240	$20,700	$21,160	$21,620	$22,080	$22,540	$23,000
Assistant superintendent.									
President, teachers college.									
Class 4	16,400	16,800	17,200	17,600	18,000	18,400	18,800	19,200	19,600
Director, curriculum.									
Dean, teachers college.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degrree	$15,260	$15,640	$16,020	$16,400	$16,780	$17,160	$17,540	$17,920	$18,300
Group B, master's degree	15,960	16,340	16,720	17,100	17,480	17,860	18,240	18,260	19,000
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	16,310	16,690	17,070	17,450	17,830	18,210	18,590	18,970	19,350
Group D, doctor's degree	16,660	17,040	17,420	17,800	18,180	18,560	18,940	19,320	19,700
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial adult education.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	15,540	15,910	16,280	16,650	17,020	17,390	17,760	18,130	18,500
Principal, level IV	15,540	15,910	16,280	16,650	17,020	17,390	17,760	18,130	18,500
Principal, level III	15,040	15,410	15,780	16,150	16,520	16,890	17,260	17,630	18,000
Principal, level II	14,540	14,910	15,280	15,650	16,020	16,390	16,760	17,130	17,500
Principal, level I	14,040	14,410	14,780	15,150	15,520	15,890	16,260	16,630	17,000
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,890	16,260	16,630	17,000	17,370	17,740	18,110	18,480	18,850
Principal, level IV	15,890	16,260	16,630	17,000	17,370	17,740	18,110	18,480	18,850
Principal, level III	15,390	15,760	16,130	16,500	16,870	17,240	17,610	17,980	18,350
Principal, level II	14,890	15,260	15,630	16,000	16,370	16,740	17,110	17,408	17,850
Principal, level I	14,390	14,760	15,130	15,500	15,870	16,240	16,610	16,980	17,350
Group D, doctor's degree	16,240	16,610	16,980	17,350	17,720	18,090	18,460	18,830	19,200
Principal, level IV	16,240	16,610	16,980	17,350	17,720	18,090	18,460	18,830	19,200
Principal, level III	15,740	16,110	16,480	16,850	17,220	17,590	17,960	18,330	18,700
Principal, level II	15,240	15,610	15,980	16,350	16,720	17,090	17,460	17,830	18,200
Principal, level I	14,740	15,110	15,480	15,850	16,220	16,590	16,960	17,330	17,700
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil personnel services).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	14,070	14,405	14,740	15,075	15,410	15,745	16,080	16,415	16,750
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,420	14,755	15,090	15,425	15,760	16,095	16,430	16,765	17,100
Group D, doctor's degree	14,770	15,105	15,440	15,775	16,110	16,445	16,780	17,115	17,450
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics									
Director, school attendance									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	13,580	13,905	14,230	14,555	14,880	15,205	15,530	15,855	16,180
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,930	14,255	14,580	14,905	15,230	15,555	15,880	16,205	16,530
Group D, doctor's degree	14,280	14,605	14,930	15,255	15,580	15,905	16,230	16,555	16,880
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	12,380	12,695	13,010	13,325	13,640	13,955	14,270	14,585	14,900
Group B, master's degree	13,080	13,395	13,710	14,025	14,340	14,655	14,970	15,285	15,600
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,430	13,745	14,060	14,375	16,690	15,005	15,320	15,635	15,950
Group D, doctor's degree	13,780	14,095	14,410	14,725	15,040	15,335	15,670	15,985	16,300
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	12,600	12,900	13,200	13,500	13,800	14,100	14,400	14,700	15,000
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,950	13,250	13,550	13,850	14,150	14,450	14,750	15,050	15,350
Group D, doctor's degree	13,300	13,600	13,900	14,200	14,500	14,800	15,100	15,400	15,700
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	12,180	12,470	12,760	13,050	13,340	13,630	13,920	14,210	14,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,530	12,820	13,110	13,400	13,690	13,980	14,270	14,560	14,850
Group D, doctor's degree	12,880	13,170	13,460	13,750	14,040	14,330	14,620	14,910	15,200
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	11,680	11,970	12,260	12,550	12,840	13,130	13,420	13,710	14,000
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,030	12,320	12,610	12,900	13,190	13,480	13,770	14,060	14,350
Group D, doctor's degree	12,380	12,670	12,960	13,250	13,540	13,830	14,120	14,410	14,700
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	10,700	11,050	11,400	11,750	12,100	12,450	12,800	13,150	13,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,050	11,400	11,750	12,100	12,450	12,800	13,150	13,500	13,850
Group D, doctor's degree	11,400	11,750	12,100	12,450	12,800	13,150	13,500	13,850	14,200
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									
Psychiatric social worker.									

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 14:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	$8,160	$8,505	$8,850	$9,195	$9,540	$9,885	$10,230	$10,575	$10,920	$11,265	$11,610	$11,955	$12,300		
Group B, master's degree	8,860	9,205	9,550	9,895	10,240	10,585	10,930	11,275	11,620	11,965	12,310	12,655	13,000		
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,210	9,555	9,900	10,245	10,590	10,935	11,280	11,625	11,970	12,315	12,660	13,005	13,350		
Group D, doctor's degree	9,560	9,905	10,250	10,595	10,940	11,285	11,630	11,975	12,320	12,665	13,010	13,355	13,700		
Coordinator of practical nursing.															
Census supervisor.															
Class 15:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	7,000	7,280	7,560	7,840	8,120	8,400	8,750	9,100	9,450	9,800	10,150	10,500	10,850	$11,410	$12,040
Group B, master's degree	7,700	7,980	8,260	8,540	8,820	9,100	9,450	9,800	10,150	10,500	10,850	11,200	11,550	12,110	12,740
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,050	8,330	8,610	8,890	9,170	9,450	9,800	10,150	10,500	10,850	11,200	11,550	11,900	12,460	13,090
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	8,400	8,680	8,960	9,240	9,520	9,800	10,155	10,500	10,850	11,200	11,550	11,900	12,250	12,810	13,440
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.															
Attendance officer.															
Child labor inspectors.															
Counselor, placement.															
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, teachers college.															
Research assistant.															
School social worker.															
Speech correctionist.															
Instructor, teachers college.															
Instructor, laboratory school.															
School psychologist."															

(3) The third sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1532(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "the same type of position" and inserting in lieu thereof "any type of position covered in salary class 15".

(4) Section 8(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1533(a)) is amended by inserting "or salary class" immediately after "position" each time it appears in such section.

(5) Section 10(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1535(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On and after the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1968, each promotion to group B, group C, or group D, within a salary class, shall become effective—

"(1) on the date of the regular Board meeting of the twelfth month prior to the date of approval of promotion by the Board, or

"(2) on the effective date of the master's degree or doctor's degree or on the completion of thirty or sixty credit hours beyond the master's degree, as the case may be,

whichever is later."

(6) Effective on October 1, 1967, section 13(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is authorized to conduct as part of its public school system the following: summer school programs, extended school year programs, adult education school programs, and an Americanization school, under and within appropriations made by Congress. The pay for teachers, officers, and other educational employees in the summer school programs, adult education school programs, and veterans' summer high school centers shall be as follows:

"Classification	Per period		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist; and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	$5.48	$6.12	$6.68
Psychiatric social worker and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	6.58	7.34	8.02
Clinical psychologist	6.85	7.65	8.35
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.12	7.96	8.68
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools, and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.95	8.87	9.69
Supervising director	8.22	9.18	10.02
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	8.77	9.79	10.69
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher	5.48	6.12	6.68
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	6.03	6.73	7.35
Assistant principal	8.74	9.76	10.66
Principal	9.65	10.77	11.76"

(7) Effective on July 1, 1968, section 13(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is authorized to conduct as part of its public school system the following: summer school programs, extended school year programs, adult education school programs, and an Americanization school, under and within appropriations made by Congress. The pay for teachers, officers, and other educational employees in the summer school programs, adult education school programs, and veterans' summer high school centers shall be as follows:

"Classification	Per period		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist; and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	$6.00	$6.66	$7.37
Psychiatric social worker and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.02	7.79	8.62
Clinical psychologist	7.20	7.99	8.84
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.50	8.33	9.21
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8.40	9.32	10.32
Supervising director	8.70	9.66	10.69
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	9.35	10.39	11.50
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher	6.00	6.66	7.37
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	6.60	7.33	8.11
Assistant principal	9.24	10.26	11.35
Principal	10.30	11.44	12.65"

SEC. 3. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act who retired during the period beginning on October 1, 1967, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on October 1, 1967, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by any such employee who dies during such period.

(b) For purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code (relating to Government employees group life insurance), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. The last sentence of the first section of the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–691) is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that in the case of leave taken under this sentence for any purpose (other than to attend a religious service or to observe a religious holiday), no more than 5 per centum of the total number of the teachers in any school in the District of Columbia public school system, or 1 teacher in such school, whichever is greater, may be on leave under this sentence".

SEC. 6. The amendments made by paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to commend to this body for favorable action the bill H.R. 16409, introduced jointly by myself and a number of my colleagues on the House Committee on the District of Columbia, for the purpose of providing realistic and substantial increases in the salaries of the teachers and other professional personnel in the District of Columbia public school system.

On October 1, 1967, all the employees of the Federal Government, and of the District of Columbia government except for its teachers, policemen, and firemen, were given the first step of a three-stage salary increase. The second stage will go into effect on July 1 of this year, and the third increment will become effective in 1969, for a total increase of some 11 percent in the salaries of these employees. Further, on February 26 of this year, the House approved the bill H.R. 15131, which will provide a very substantial increase in the salaries of the policemen and firemen in the District, with a starting salary for privates of $8,000 per year.

Thus, the teachers and school officers remain as the only District of Columbia government employees for whom no action has been taken during this Congress in the matter of salary increases.

The last salary increase for District of Columbia teachers was enacted in July 1966. At that time, this increase of some 7.9 percent placed the District school system in a satisfactory competitive position with the systems in the other jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area. Since that time, however, this position has steadily deteriorated, as a result of an average 7-percent increase in teachers' salaries for the current school year in the six suburban jurisdictions, and further increases averaging nearly 8 percent for the coming school year of 1968–69 in these surrounding school systems.

Furthermore, teachers' salaries were increased by an average of 8.2 percent for the present school year in all of the 20 other U.S. cities with populations in excess of 500,000, and additional increases for the coming school year are in prospect in a number of these cities.

The result of these increases is that today, when the District of Columbia public school system must be exerting its maximum effort in recruiting new teachers for the coming school year, the salaries which they must offer are considerably the lowest in the metropolitan area for 1968–69, and compare quite unfavorably with those offered in the other large cities. For example, the salary presently offered for beginning teachers with the bachelor's degree in the District of Columbia ranks 15th among the 21 largest cities.

Like all large cities, the District of Columbia faces its most vigorous competition in the recruitment of new teacher personnel from its relatively affluent suburban communities, where salaries are at least comparable and there are generally fewer teaching problems and newer buildings and equipment. This competition is particularly severe for the District, as a large segment of its school population come from underprivileged, substandard homes where culture and discipline are almost nonexistent. The result is that the District of Columbia teachers must spend a great deal of their time and energy in trying to maintain order and discipline, rather than in teaching.

Under these circumstances, it is imperative that the Congress provide the District of Columbia school system with a salary scale which is at least as high as, and preferably somewhat higher than, those which prevail in the suburban jurisdictions. While I realize that salaries alone cannot solve the problem of recruitment and retention of qualified teachers in the District of Columbia, I submit that in its present position with respect to salaries, the District simply cannot compete successfully; and I am convinced that the salary schedules offered in H.R. 16409 will have a highly salutary effect on this situation.

H.R. 16409 provides two new salary schedules. The first is to be retroactive to October 1, 1967, and will raise the starting salary for teachers with the bachelor's degree from $5,840 to $6,400. The maximum salary for such teachers will be increased from $10,185 to $10,800, attainable in 19 years of service. This schedule represents an average increase of 8.3 percent, and is estimated to cost approximately $5 million for the portion of the current fiscal year beginning last October 1. This increase, effective on that date, will provide equitable treatment for the District of Columbia teachers as compared to all the other District government employees as of that time.

Perhaps more significant and important, however, is the second new salary schedule provided in this proposed legislation. This schedule is to become effective on July 1, 1968, and will involve an additional increase averaging 10.9 percent, estimated to cost some $13 million for a full years. It is this salary scale which will place the District of Columbia in a truly competitive position, salary-wise, with its neighboring communities and with the other large cities, by providing a starting salary for teachers with the bachelor's degree of $7,000, and a maximum of $12,040.

The minimum and maximum salaries which this prospective increase will place in effect in the District system for the coming school year at the various levels of preparation, together with the rankings of the District in comparison with the six other jurisdictions of the Washington metropolitan area in each instance, are shown in the following chart:

Level	Minimum	Rank in area	Maximum	Rank in area
Bachelor's degree	$7,000	1	$12,040	3
Master's degree	7,700	1	12,740	5
Master's degree plus 30 hours	8,050	1	13,090	5
Master's degree plus 60 hours; or earned doctor's degree	8,400	3	13,440	4

In the maximum salaries, where the District does not rank high among the seven local school systems, the differences between the District of Columbia salaries and those in the suburbs which are higher are not great, and also there is the matter of the number of years required to reach the maximum, which also closes this gap in some instances. For example, In Montgomery County, Md., although the maximum salaries are somewhat higher than in the District, 29 years of service is required to attain this maximum level, as compared to only 19 years in the District system.

This proposed new salary schedule will also place the District at or near the top among all the 21 largest U.S. cities in starting salaries for teachers in all categories, and at a greatly improved comparative level in maximum salaries.

Thus, this salary scale for the coming school year will greatly enhance the District's competitive position in the vitally important area of recruitment and retention of capable teachers.

I wish to take this occasion to appeal to the District of Columbia Board of Education to improve its administrative policies in certain respects, in order that these new and attractive salary sched-

ules may have a maximum beneficial effect in providing the District public school system with quality education potential. For example, it has come to my attention that the infamous black power advocate, Stokely Carmichael, was recently invited to address several classes in one of the senior high schools in the city. I submit that the teachers in the District of Columbia have sufficient problems in their classrooms, without adding the effect of this insidious propaganda of racial hatred, resistance to authority, and contempt for law and order which people like Mr. Carmichael seek to instill among young people. Permitting such doctrine to be spread among captive audiences of schoolchildren in our Nation's Capital is, in my opinion, an incredible error in administrative judgment, which I hope and trust will not be repeated. I can assure the Board of Education that mistakes of this kind are extremely difficult to overcome with increases in salaries, as far as attracting and retaining capable teaching personnel is concerned.

The other principal provision of H.R. 16409 is an amendment to the present District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act, to restrict the number of teachers in any given school who may be permitted to take general leave, with pay, on the same day. On the occasion of the recent "walkout" on the part of a large segment of the District of Columbia teachers, which of course was nothing but a strike in principle, I understand that it was ruled that under the present law, the school administration cannot limit the number of teachers who wish to take one of their 3 days of leave with pay which the law provides them, for any purpose, on any given day. Realizing this weakness in the law, these teachers were encouraged by their leadership to apply for a day of such leave on that particular day, as a subterfuge to cloak the 1-day strike. They did so in such numbers as to force the closing of the entire school system for that day, thus demonstrating the indifference of these leaders and these particular teachers to the best interests of the city's schoolchildren. As a matter of fact, this administrative situation should be corrected regardless of this incident, because it is possible that a sufficient number of the teachers in any given school may apply for general leave on the same day, for the most defensible of reasons, so as to seriously handicap the operation of that school or even force its closing for lack of teaching personnel.

For these reasons, H.R. 16409 provides that not more than 5 percent of the teachers in any school, or one teacher, whichever is greater, shall be granted general leave on the same day, except for attendance at a religious service or observance of a religious holiday. I wish to point out that present law restricts the number of teachers in the District who may be on sabbatical leave at one time to 2 percent of the total number of teachers.

I wish to make it clear that my earnest support of this bill is motivated by my sincere admiration and respect for the dedicated members of this profession whose services are so vitally important to the well-being of the District of Columbia, and who demonstrated this spirit of dedication by reporting to their classrooms for duty on the day referred to above, when their colleagues in large numbers chose to neglect their responsibilities and to detract from the dignity of their profession by engaging in a 1-day strike as a demonstration in favor of a salary increase. I do not believe that any member of our committee or of the entire Congress was influenced one iota in favor of legislation for salary increases for District of Columbia teachers by this unfortunate incident. Rather, our committee reported out this bill on its merits alone. And as I have said, I wish to pay tribute to the 3,000 teachers in the city who remained loyal to their responsibilities on the above-cited occasion, and who thus demonstrated the admirable spirit of service which has typified the District of Columbia Education Association for many years. I particularly want to commend the leaders of the District of Columbia Education Association for their tremendous contribution to the District of Columbia school system over the past several years and their help and advice to our committee on all legislation vital to a good school system. I want to express special appreciation to Helen Samuels, Elizabeth Griffith, and Mrs. Datcher, current president of the District of Columbia Education Association.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly endorse this proposed legislation and commend it to my colleagues for favorable action.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'MILLAN

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: On page 2, strike out the salary schedule beginning after line 2 and ending before line 1 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1	$28,000								
Superintendent.									
Class 2	24,000								
Deputy superintendent.									
Class 3	17,515	$17,930	$18,345	$18,760	$19,175	$19,590	$20,005	$20,420	$20,835
Assistant superintendent.									
President, teachers college.									
Class 4	15,380	15,745	16,110	16,475	16,840	17,205	17,570	17,935	18,300
Director, curriculum.									
Dean, teachers college.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	13,905	14,250	14,595	14,940	15,285	15,630	15,975	16,320	16,665
Group B, master's degree	14,525	14,870	15,215	15,560	15,905	16,250	16,595	16,940	17,285
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	14,835	15,180	15,525	15,870	16,215	16,560	16,905	17,250	17,595
Group D, doctor's degree	15,145	15,490	15,835	16,180	16,525	16,870	17,215	17,560	17,905
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial adult education.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	14,100	14,435	14,770	15,105	15,440	15,775	16,110	16,445	16,780
Principal, level IV	14,100	14,435	14,770	15,105	15,440	15,775	16,110	16,445	16,780
Principal, level III	13,795	14,130	14,465	14,800	15,135	15,470	15,805	16,140	16,475
Principal, level II	13,490	13,825	14,160	14,495	14,830	15,165	15,500	15,835	16,170
Principal, level I	13,185	13,520	13,855	14,190	14,525	14,860	15,195	15,530	15,865
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	14,410	14,745	15,080	15,415	15,750	16,085	16,420	16,755	17,090
Principal, level IV	14,410	14,745	15,080	15,415	15,750	16,085	16,420	16,755	17,090
Principal, level III	14,105	14,440	14,775	15,110	15,445	15,780	16,115	16,450	16,785
Principal, level II	13,800	14,135	14,470	14,805	15,140	15,475	15,810	16,145	16,480
Principal, level I	13,495	13,830	14,165	14,500	14,835	15,170	15,505	15,840	16,175
Group D, doctor's degree	14,720	15,055	15,390	15,725	16,060	16,395	16,730	17,065	17,400
Principal, level IV	14,720	15,055	15,390	15,725	16,060	16,395	16,730	17,065	17,400
Principal, level III	14,415	14,750	15,085	15,420	15,755	16,090	16,425	16,760	17,095
Principal, level II	14,110	14,445	14,780	15,115	15,450	15,785	16,120	16,455	16,790
Principal, level I	13,805	14,140	14,475	14,810	15,145	15,480	15,815	16,150	16,485
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil personnel services).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 6—Continued									
Group D, doctor's degree—Continued									
Principal, level I—Continued									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	$12,815	$13,120	$13,425	$13,730	$14,035	$14,340	$14,645	$14,950	$15,255
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	13,125	13,430	13,735	14,040	14,345	14,650	14,955	15,260	15,565
Group D, doctor's degree	13,435	13,740	14,045	14,350	14,655	14,960	15,265	15,570	15,875
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	12,305	12,610	12,915	13,320	13,525	13,830	14,135	14,440	14,745
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	12,615	12,920	13,225	13,530	13,835	14,140	14,445	14,750	15,055
Group D, doctor's degree	12,925	13,230	13,535	13,840	14,145	14,450	14,755	15,060	15,365
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	11,180	11,485	11,790	12,095	12,400	12,705	13,010	13,315	13,620
Group B, master's degree	11,800	12,105	12,410	12,715	13,020	13,325	13,630	13,935	14,240
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	12,110	12,415	12,720	13,025	13,330	13,635	13,940	14,245	14,550
Group D, doctor's degree	12,420	12,725	13,030	13,335	13,640	13,945	14,250	14,555	14,860
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	11,290	11,595	11,900	12,205	12,510	12,815	13,120	13,425	13,730
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	11,600	11,905	12,210	12,515	12,820	13,125	13,430	13,735	14,040
Group D, doctor's degree	11,910	12,215	12,520	12,825	13,130	13,435	13,740	14,045	14,350
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	10,780	11,085	11,390	11,695	12,000	12,305	12,610	12,915	13,220
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	11,090	11,395	11,700	12,005	12,310	12,615	12,920	13,225	13,530
Group D, doctor's degree	11,400	11,705	12,010	12,315	12,620	12,925	13,230	13,535	13,840
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	10,270	10,575	10,880	11,185	11,490	11,795	12,100	12,405	12,710
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	10,580	10,885	11,190	11,495	11,800	12,105	12,410	12,715	13,020
Group D, doctor's degree	10,890	11,195	11,500	11,805	12,110	12,415	12,720	12,025	13,330
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	9,215	9,590	9,965	10,340	10,715	11,090	11,465	11,840	12,215
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	9,525	9,900	10,275	10,650	11,025	11,400	11,775	12,150	12,525
Group D, doctor's degree	9,835	10,210	10,585	10,960	11,335	11,710	12,085	12,460	12,835
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									
Psychiatric social worker.									

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 14:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	$7,430	$7,745	$8,060	$8,375	$8,690	$9,005	$9,320	$9,635	$9,950	$10,265	$10,580	$10,895	$11,210	----	----
Group B, master's degree	8,050	8,365	8,680	8,995	9,310	9,625	9,940	10,255	10,570	10,885	11,200	11,515	11,830	----	----
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	8,360	8,675	8,990	9,305	9,620	9,935	10,250	10,565	10,880	11,195	11,510	11,825	12,140	----	----
Group D, doctor's degree	8,670	8,985	9,300	9,615	9,930	10,245	10,560	10,875	11,190	11,505	11,820	12,135	12,450	----	----
Coordinator of practical nursing.															
Census supervisor.															
Class 15:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	6,200	6,450	6,700	6,950	7,315	7,625	7,935	8,245	8,555	8,805	9,050	9,300	9,550	$10,045	$10,665
Group B, master's degree	6,820	7,070	7,320	7,570	7,935	8,245	8,555	8,865	9,175	9,425	9,670	9,920	10,170	10,665	11,285
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	7,130	7,380	7,630	7,880	8,245	8,555	8,865	9,175	9,485	9,735	9,980	10,230	10,480	10,975	11,595

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 15—Continued															
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit-hours or doctor's degree	$7,440	$7,690	$7,940	$8,190	$8,555	$8,865	$9,175	$9,485	$9,795	$10,045	$10,290	$10,540	$10,790	$11,285	$11,905
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.															
Attendance officer.															
Child labor inspectors.															
Counselor, placement.															
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, teachers college.															
Research assistant.															
School social worker.															
Speech correctionist.															
Instructor, teachers college.															
Instructor, laboratory school.															
School psychologist."															

On page 4, strike out the salary schedule beginning after line 2 and ending before line 1 of page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1	$28,000								
Superintendent.									
Class 2	24,000								
Deputy superintendent.									
Class 3	19,200	$19,655	$20,110	$20,565	$21,020	$21,475	$21,930	$22,385	$22,840
Assistant superintendent.									
President, teachers college.									
Class 4	16,850	17,250	17,650	18,050	18,450	18,850	19,250	19,650	20,050
Director, curriculum.									
Dean, teachers college.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	15,235	15,615	15,995	16,375	16,755	17,135	17,515	17,895	18,275
Group B, master's degree	15,915	16,295	16,675	17,055	17,435	17,815	18,195	18,575	18,955
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	16,255	16,635	17,015	17,395	17,775	18,155	18,535	18,915	19,295
Group D, doctor's degree	16,595	16,975	17,355	17,735	18,115	18,495	18,875	19,255	19,635
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial adult education.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	15,450	15,815	16,180	16,545	16,910	17,275	17,640	18,005	18,370
Principal, level IV	15,450	15,815	16,180	16,545	16,910	17,275	17,640	18,005	18,370
Principal, level III	15,135	15,500	15,865	16,230	16,595	16,960	17,325	17,690	18,055
Principal, level II	14,800	15,165	15,530	15,895	16,260	16,625	16,990	17,355	17,720
Principal, level I	14,465	14,830	15,195	15,560	15,925	16,290	16,655	17,020	17,385
Group C, master's degree	15,790	16,155	16,520	16,885	17,250	17,615	17,980	18,345	18,710
Principal, level IV	15,790	16,155	16,520	16,885	17,250	17,615	17,980	18,345	18,710
Principal, level III	15,475	15,840	16,205	16,570	16,935	17,300	17,665	18,030	18,395
Principal, level II	15,140	15,505	15,870	16,235	16,600	16,965	17,330	17,695	18,060
Principal, level I	14,805	15,170	15,535	15,900	16,265	16,630	16,995	17,360	17,725
Group D, doctor's degree	16,130	16,495	16,860	17,225	17,590	17,955	18,320	18,685	19,050
Principal, level IV	16,130	16,495	16,860	17,225	17,590	17,955	18,320	18,685	19,050
Principal, level III	15,815	16,180	16,545	16,910	17,275	17,640	18,005	18,370	18,735
Principal, level II	15,480	15,845	16,210	16,575	16,940	17,305	17,670	18,035	18,400
Principal, level I	15,145	15,510	15,875	16,240	16,605	16,970	17,335	17,700	18,065
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil personnel services).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety).									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	14,045	14,380	14,715	15,050	15,385	15,720	16,055	16,390	16,725
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	14,385	14,720	15,055	15,390	15,725	16,060	16,395	16,730	17,065
Group D, doctor's degree	14,725	15,060	15,395	15,730	16,065	16,400	16,735	17,070	17,405
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	$13,575	$13,900	$14,225	$14,550	$14,875	$15,200	$15,525	$15,850	$16,175
Group C, master's degree, plus 30 credit-hours	13,915	14,240	14,565	14,890	15,215	15,540	15,865	16,190	16,515
Group D, doctor's degree	14,255	14,580	14,905	15,230	15,555	15,880	16,205	16,530	16,855
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	12,425	12,735	13,045	13,355	13,665	13,970	14,285	14,595	14,905
Group B, master's degree	13,105	13,415	13,725	14,035	14,345	14,655	14,965	15,275	15,585
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	13,445	13,755	14,065	14,375	14,685	14,995	15,305	15,615	15,925
Group D, doctor's degree	13,785	14,095	14,405	14,715	15,025	15,335	15,645	15,955	16,265
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	12,640	12,940	13,240	13,540	13,840	14,140	14,440	14,740	15,040
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	12,980	13,280	13,580	13,880	14,180	14,480	14,780	15,080	15,380
Group D, doctor's degree	13,320	13,620	13,920	14,220	14,520	14,820	15,120	15,420	15,720
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	12,170	12,460	12,750	13,040	13,330	13,620	13,910	14,200	14,490
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	12,510	12,800	13,090	13,380	13,670	13,960	14,250	14,540	14,830
Group D, doctor's degree	12,850	13,140	13,430	13,720	14,010	14,300	14,590	14,880	15,170
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	11,610	11,900	12,190	12,480	12,770	13,060	13,350	13,640	13,930
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	11,950	12,240	12,530	12,820	13,110	13,400	13,690	13,980	14,270
Group D, doctor's degree	12,290	12,580	12,870	13,160	13,450	13,740	14,030	14,320	14,610
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	10,575	10,925	11,275	11,625	11,975	12,325	12,675	13,025	13,375
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	10,915	11,265	11,615	11,965	12,315	12,665	13,015	13,365	13,715
Group D, doctor's degree	11,255	11,605	11,955	12,305	12,655	13,005	13,355	13,705	14,055
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									
Psychiatric social worker.									

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 14:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	$8,140	$8,485	$8,830	$9,175	$9,520	$9,865	$10,210	$10,555	$10,900	$11,245	$11,590	$11,935	$12,280	----	----
Group B, master's degree	8,820	9,165	9,510	9,855	10,200	10,545	10,890	11,235	11,580	11,925	12,270	12,615	12,960	----	----
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	9,160	9,505	9,850	10,195	10,540	10,885	11,230	11,575	11,920	12,265	12,610	12,955	13,300	----	----
Group D, doctor's degree	9,500	9,845	10,190	10,535	10,880	11,225	11,570	11,915	12,260	12,605	12,950	13,295	13,640	----	----
Coordinator of practical nursing.															
Census supervisor.															
Class 15:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	6,800	7,070	7,340	7,610	8,025	8,365	8,705	9,045	9,385	9,655	9,925	10,195	10,465	$11,015	$11,700
Group B, master's degree	7,480	7,750	8,020	8,290	8,705	9,045	9,385	9,725	10,065	10,335	10,605	10,875	11,145	11,695	12,380
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	7,820	8,090	8,360	8,630	9,045	9,385	9,725	10,065	10,405	10,675	10,945	11,215	11,485	12,035	12,720
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit-hours or doctor's degree	8,160	8,430	8,700	8,970	9,385	9,725	10,065	10,405	10,745	11,015	11,285	11,555	11,825	12,375	13,060
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.															
Attendance officer.															
Child labor inspectors.															
Counselor, placement.															
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, teachers college.															
Research assistant.															
School social worker.															
Speech correctionist.															
Instructor, teachers college.															
Instructor, laboratory school															
School psychologist."															

On page 9, strike out the salary schedule beginning after line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Classification	Per period		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist; and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	$5.39	$6.02	$6.57
Psychiatric social worker and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	6.47	7.22	7.88
Clinical psychologist	6.74	7.55	8.21
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.01	7.83	8.54
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools, and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.82	8.73	9.53
Supervising director	8.09	9.03	9.86
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	8.62	9.63	10.51
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher	5.39	6.02	6.57
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	5.93	6.62	7.23
Assistant principal	8.45	9.60	10.48
Principal	9.33	10.59	11.57."

On page 9, strike out the salary schedule beginning after line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Classification	Per period		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist; and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	$5.92	$6.61	$7.21
Psychiatric social worker and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.10	7.93	8.65
Clinical psychologist	7.40	8.26	9.01
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.70	8.59	9.37
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools, and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8.58	9.58	10.46
Supervising director	8.88	9.92	10.82
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	9.47	10.58	11.54
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher	5.92	6.61	7.21
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	6.51	7.27	7.93
Assistant principal	9.44	10.54	11.50
Principal	10.42	11.63	12.69."

Mr. McMILLAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. I shall explain the bill and the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides for two salary schedules to be substituted for those in the reported bill (H.R. 16409) with the following effect:

First, schedule 1 of my amendment provides that the starting salary for teachers with a B.A. degree will be $6,200—with a maximum of $10,665—effective October 1, 1967—as contrasted with $6,400 minimum and $10,800 maximum of the reported bill.

In this regard, my amendment provides a pay raise of 6.4 percent costing an estimated $4.4 million, as against the 8.3-percent raise costing an estimated $5 million called for by schedule 1 of the reported bill.

Second, schedule 2 of my amendment provides that starting teachers with a B.A. degree will be paid $6,800—with a maximum of $11,700—effective July 1, 1968, as contrasted with the $7,000 minimum and $12,040 maximum in the reported bill.

My amendment in this regard provides a pay raise of 16.8 percent, costing an estimated $11.3 million, as contrasted with a 19.2-percent raise costing an estimated $15.8 million for schedule 2 of the reported bill.

As is shown by the committee report on H.R. 16409, the teachers of the District of Columbia have been treated very generously by the Congress down through the years. So much so that, as the report shows on page 2, the District of Columbia teachers have received to date since 1955 a total of 62.9-percent increase in salary. This is a higher percent increase than that received by any other District of Columbia government employee during the same period. The police and firemen in this same time have received an increase of only 59.2 percent.

If the reported bill becomes law, the total pay increase for teachers since 1955 will be 82.8 percent.

Mr. Speaker, if you will examine carefully the pay schedules provided in the reported bill and the information contained in the committee report and the committee hearings, you will find that the first salary schedule in the reported bill, starting at $6,400 for teachers with B.A. degrees retroactive to October 1, 1967, is higher than that of any other school in the surrounding metropolitan area—Fairfax is the only one even to equal this starting salary.

Also, on this same basis, only four cities in the United States with population of over 500,000—Milwaukee, Detroit, Los Angeles, and San Francisco—have a higher salary in this regard than the proposed $6,400 for Washington.

Further, as to the second salary schedule in the reported bill, starting at $7,000, that figure would place the District of Columbia teachers higher than those in any other city in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the reported bill, H.R. 16409, includes two salary schedules providing marked increases in the pay of the District of Columbia teachers as follows:

First. The first schedule provides a starting salary of $6,400 per annum—and maximum of $10,800—for teachers with B.A. degrees. This increase, effective October 1, 1967, was that originally recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It represents an 8.3-percent increase for such teachers over their present starting salary of $5,840. The estimated cost of this increase is $5.7 million per year, or $5 million for that part of fiscal year 1968 retroactive to October 1, 1967.

Second. The second schedule provides a starting salary of $7,000—maximum $12,040—for teachers with B.A. degrees. It represents a 19.2-percent increase for such teachers over their present starting salary of $5,840. This schedule, effective July 1, 1968, will cost an estimated $13 million per year.

The present annual budget for teachers' salaries in the District of Columbia is $64.5 million.

The increased pay provided teachers in the reported bill, continues District of Columbia teachers in first place among pay raises since 1954 to employees of the District of Columbia government, as shown by the following tabulation:

PAY RAISES TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES

[Percent]

Pay increases	Teachers	Police and firemen	Classified personnel
Since 1954	62.9	59.2	50.3
Proposed increases	[1] 8.3	10.1	5.0
Total	71.2	69.3	55.3

[1] This represents the increase to the $6,400 *starting level.* When the $7,000 level becomes effective July 1, 1968, the pay increase to teachers will be 19.2 percent over present salaries, or 82.8 percent total pay increase since 1954.

The average salary for teachers in the District, as of June 1967, was $7,888. If to this is added the 8.3-percent increase of the first schedule of this bill, the average District of Columbia teacher salary will be $8,536.

On the other hand, if to the $7,888 average is added the second schedule's higher—19.2 percent—increase, the average District of Columbia teacher salary will be $9,402.

The following charts reveal the relative rank of the District of Columbia among the 21 U.S. cities of populations in excess of 500,000 in the matter of minimum and maximum salaries for teachers with the bachelor's degree and with the master's degree—both at present and as this position would be affected by the new salary schedules incorporated in H.R. 16409.

Comparison of minimum salaries paid to teachers with bachelor's degrees

Washington (proposed effective July 1, 1968)	$7,000
Milwaukee	6,800
Detroit	[1] 6,650
Los Angeles	6,500
San Francisco	6,430
Washington (proposed effective (October 1, 1967)	6,400
Chicago	6,400
Cleveland	6,250
New York	[2] 6,200
San Diego	6,200
Philadelphia	6,100
Boston	6,000
Baltimore	6,000
Seattle	6,000
Cincinnati	5,920
Pittsburgh	5,900
Washington (present)	5,840
Buffalo	5,800
St. Louis	5,800
Dallas	5,800
Houston	5,616
New Orleans	5,400
San Antonio	5,350

See footnotes at end of tables.

Comparison of maximum salaries paid to teachers with bachelor's degrees

Washington (proposed, effective July 1, 1968)	$12,040
Chicago	11,150
San Francisco	11,045
Milwaukee	10,810
Washington (proposed, effective Oct. 1, 1967)	10,800
Cleveland	10,500
Detroit	[1] 10,500
New York	[2] 10,350
Washington (present)	10,185
Boston	10,000
Cincinnati	9,985
Buffalo	9,975
Philadelphia	9,900
St. Louis	9,860
Baltimore	9,800
Los Angeles	9,720
Pittsburgh	9,500
San Diego	8,824
New Orleans	8,700
Dallas	7,900
Houston	7,687
San Antonio	7,300
Seattle	6,750

Comparison of minimum salaries paid to teachers with master's degrees

Washington (proposed, effective July 1, 1968)	$7,700
New York	[2] 7,700
San Francisco	7,300
San Diego	7,192
Detroit	[1] 7,150
Milwaukee	7,072
Washington (proposed, effective Oct. 1, 1967)	7,030
Los Angeles	6,900
Chicago	6,800
Seattle	6,620
Cleveland	6,550
Baltimore	6,500
Boston	6,500
Cincinnati	6,445
Philadelphia	6,400
Washington (present)	6,385
St. Louis	6,380
Buffalo	6,300
Pittsburgh	6,200
Houston	6,075
Dallas	6,000
New Orleans	5,700
San Antonio	5,500

Comparison of maximum salaries paid to teachers with master's degrees

Washington (proposed, effective July 1, 1968)	$12,740
San Francisco	11,980
Chicago	11,950
New York	[2] 11,850
Cleveland	11,650
Washington (proposed, effective Oct. 1, 1967)	11,430
Milwaukee	11,326
Detroit	[1] 11,000
Washington (present)	10,730
Baltimore	10,600
San Diego	10,537
Cincinnati	10,510
Boston	10,500
Buffalo	10,475
St. Louis	10,440
Philadelphia	10,300
Los Angeles	10,260
Pittsburgh	10,100
New Orleans	9,300
Seattle	9,260
Dallas	8,850
Houston	8,647
San Antonio	8,000

[1] Bachelor degree salaries for Detroit Teachers as of September 1, 1967 range from $6,650 to $10,500. However, the salary levels for the 1968–69 school year will again be increased and will range from $7,500 to $11,350 for the Bachelor's degree. Teachers with masters' degrees now receive from $7,150 to $11,000 and next year will receive from $8,000 to $11,850.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what his amendment does? Does the amendment cut back the salary of the starting teachers from the proposal set forth in H.R. 16409.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. HORTON. What is the cutback—$200 from the amount we reported out of the committee?

Mr. McMILLAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HORTON. Is this for both the October 1967 and the July starting dates?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. HORTON. So instead of $6,400, it will be $6,200?

Mr. McMILLAN. Your statement is correct, and $6,800 instead of $7,000 after July 1, 1968.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment. This was studied in the committee, and the full committee reported out the bill and started the teachers at the $6,400 and $7,000 levels. I feel it is appropriate that we provide these starting levels for the teachers. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: Is there an amendment pending at this time offered by the gentleman from South Carolina?

The SPEAKER. The answer to that is in the affirmative. The gentleman from South Carolina has offered an amendment which is pending.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I appreciate the fact that there are very serious fiscal problems with which we are confronted in the Nation's Capital. However, the bill which is now pending before the House has been approved by the Committee on the District of Columbia after lengthy hearings and discussions. It has the recommendation of the District government and the District Commissioner and the Bureau of the Budget, and provisions have been made in the fiscal recommendations to the Congress to provide for these increases.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we find at the present time that the salaries of the school teachers in the District of Columbia do not compare favorably with those of the school systems in the suburbs, and here in the District of Columbia there are a great many more educational problems than exist in the suburbs. The District of Columbia school population is made up of many children who come from lower income homes, and many of them have neither proper discipline nor cultural training. This makes more difficult problems for the teachers. Our starting salaries at the present time are much lower than in the suburbs, and even with this bill approved the average salary of all teachers, including the starting, median, and maximum salaries, would not be any greater than the average for the suburbs.

I feel that we are going to have a law of diminishing returns setting in unless we provide a pay increase in the District of Columbia at least as high as has been recommended in this bill as reported.

We must not overlook the fact, Mr. Speaker, that on last October 1 we raised the pay levels of all Federal employees, including legislative and District employees, to take effect in three separate stages. The only thing this bill proposes to do at the present time for the teachers of the District of Columbia is what we did for other employees last fall. I hope the House will vote down the proposed amendment and approve the bill as reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

[2] New York's newly ratified contract provides for a basic pay scale for teachers with bachelors' degrees ranging from $6,200 to $10,350 in 14 steps, effective September 1, 1967. September 1, 1968, the 14-step scale becomes $6,600 to $11,000 and on March 1, 1969, additional pay increases will provide for a $6,750 to $11,150 scale. Teachers with masters' degrees plus 30 additional credits will now receive a maximum salary of $12,600. September 1, 1968, this will be increased to $13,600, and to $13,900 on March 1, 1969.

Source: *National Education Association Research Report, 1967–68;* 1967–R–16; Unpublished data collected by D.C. Personnel Officer; Unpublished data assembled by D.C. Personnel Office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 97]

Abbitt	Dowdy	Jonas
Adair	Dwyer	Jones, Ala.
Addabbo	Eckhardt	Jones, Mo.
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, N.C.
Anderson, Tenn.	Eilberg	Kastenmeier
Andrews, Ala.	Eshleman	Keith
Ashley	Everett	King, Calif.
Ashmore	Fallon	Kirwan
Aspinall	Farbstein	Kluczynski
Ayres	Feighan	Kornegay
Barrett	Findley	Kupferman
Berry	Fino	Laird
Bingham	Flood	Lloyd
Blackburn	Ford, Gerald R.	Long, La.
Bolling	Ford, William D.	Lukens
Bolton	Fountain	McClure
Bow	Fraser	McCulloch
Brademas	Fulton, Tenn.	McFall
Brasco	Galifianakis	Mailliard
Brock	Gardner	May
Brown, Ohio	Giaimo	Michel
Burleson	Gibbons	Miller, Calif.
Button	Goodell	Minshall
Byrne, Pa.	Gray	Moore
Byrnes, Wis.	Green, Oreg.	Morgan
Carey	Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
Celler	Gubser	Nichols
Clark	Gurney	Nix
Cohelan	Hagan	Olsen
Collier	Halpern	O'Neill, Mass.
Conable	Hansen, Idaho	Pepper
Conyers	Hansen, Wash.	Pickle
Corbett	Harrison	Pollock
Corman	Harsha	Pool
Cramer	Harvey	Pryor
Curtis	Hébert	Pucinski
Delaney	Holifield	Purcell
Dellenback	Holland	Randall
Dent	Howard	Rees
Diggs	Ichord	Reid, Ill.
Dole	Irwin	Reinecke
Dorn	Jacobs	Resnick
		Rhodes, Pa.

Riegle	Slack	Waldie
Rogers, Colo.	Stafford	Walker
Ronan	Stephens	Wampler
Rooney, Pa.	Stubblefield	Watkins
Roth	Stuckey	Watson
Roush	Taft	Whalley
Roybal	Teague, Calif.	Widnall
Sandman	Tenzer	Wiggins
St Germain	Tuck	Wilson, Bob
St. Onge	Tunney	Wilson, Charles H.
Saylor	Udall	
Scheuer	Vanik	Wolff
Selden	Vigorito	Wydler

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 264 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1968

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask someone, perhaps the gentleman from Virginia or the chairman of the committee, if it is true the average salary for teachers in the District as of June 1967 was $7,888?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. If the gentleman is getting those figures from the report, it is a correct statement.

Mr. GROSS. How does that compare with average salaries paid in other cities of the United States?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The District ranks 15th among the 21 cities having a population of over 500,000 people in starting salaries for teachers with B.S. degrees. This is very low.

Mr. GROSS. What was that statement?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The District ranks No. 15 among the 21 cities of the United States having populations in excess of 500,000 people, for starting salaries for teachers.

Mr. GROSS. If the 19.2-percent increase proposed in this bill is approved, then what would be the comparison with the other cities of the United States?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It would be top among the 21 cities I have mentioned, and it would compare favorably with the average of the school systems in the suburbs. It would be a little higher on the starting salaries, and a little lower so far as maximum salaries are concerned.

Mr. GROSS. Of course the Members of the House have nothing to do with the salaries paid in the suburbs, but everything to do with the salaries paid in the District of Columbia. This would be the top, the gentleman says, over the country; is that correct?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Insofar as starting salaries are concerned, yes. However, I am not certain as to the comparison as far as average salaries are concerned.

The gentleman says we have nothing to do with the salaries paid on the suburbs, but we have to compete with these suburban communities in getting teachers for the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I meant in terms of voting on the proposition of the teachers salaries established by Congress.

I understand there is competition for teachers. But this bill would bring the average teacher's salary in the District of Columbia to $9,402. I assume that is for a 9-month school year; is that correct?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It is a little more than that. It is approximately 10 months.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I have searched the report and now have the teachers pay increase hearings available. For the life of me I cannot find what the total cost of H.R. 16409 would be, nor how it is to be financed.

I wonder if the gentleman would yield to those who know, for a further explanation of those two points.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It would cost a total of $13 million per full fiscal year when the July 1 increase is put into effect. In other words, when the second level is placed into full effect, the increase would cost $13 million per fiscal year.

Mr. HALL. Thirteen million dollars per annum?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Per annum.

Mr. HALL. Is there any further comment the gentleman or the distinguished chairman of the committee would care to make as to how this is to be financed? Is it in the budget? Is it just to be taken out of general revenues we anticipate may or may not come in as taxes, or is it part of the administration's planned deficit for this year again?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further, there is a revenue bill now pending before the House Committee on the District of Columbia which would provide several areas of tax increases, as well as an increase in the Federal payment. There are also proposals to increase the real property tax for the people living in the District of Columbia. It will be a general revenue increase measure.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's responding in this manner. He does concur with me it is not set forth in the report; is that correct?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. No, the matter of additional revenues is not in the report.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Was the gentleman giving me comparisons as between those who hold bachelor's degrees or master's degrees? Which was he using in his figures?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Actually, when I mentioned the maximum salary in talking about a comparison with the suburbs, the District of Columbia would rank third, with all of the school systems in the suburbs, insofar as the maximum for bachelor's degrees; fifth in the maximum of master's degrees; fifth in the master's degrees plus 30 hours; fourth in the master's degrees plus 60 hours—compared with the systems in the suburbs.

Mr. GROSS. How many teachers in the District of Columbia would be benefited by this legislation who hold only temporary certificates?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I do not know what the percentage is at the present time. Perhaps the gentleman from South Carolina has that information.

Mr. GROSS. It has been 36 or 37 percent.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. About 35 to 40 percent of the teachers are not fully qualified for permanent status.

Mr. GROSS. This increase would be given to those who hold temporary certificates?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Yes. It is to be provided for all schoolteachers in the system. It certainly is, and it should be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are here again yielding to pressure.

I have Public Law 330 of the 84th Congress before me. It provides as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, who—

(3) participates in any strike or asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agency;

Public Law 637 provides in section 3 that:

From and after July 1, 1956, the provisions of Public Law 330 of the 84th Congress, approved August 9, 1955, shall be applicable to the Government of the District of Columbia.

I recall that it was only a short time ago that the teachers of the District of Columbia went on strike and spent a day lobbying the Congress in behalf of the teachers salary bill.

The question I want to ask someone on the District Committee is why the provisions of Public Law 330 and Public Law 637 were not invoked. The question I want answered is how the teachers in the District of Columbia could strike and bring pressure on the Congress and still retain their jobs. Why did the Government of the District of Columbia not invoke the law which prohibits teachers or any other District of Columbia employees from striking?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that a play on words is involved here. The teachers union contends that this was not a strike. I agree with the gentleman, however, that it was in fact a strike and hence a

violation of the law. But the teachers stated they were taking administrative leave, which they have authority to take up to a limit of 3 days a year. The committee corrected that problem, however, by making provision in this bill that no more than 5 percent of the schoolteachers in the District of Columbia may be allowed to take administrative leave at any one time, which will prevent this type of leave being taken in the future to conceal a strike or whatever it may be called. But if they do walk out in a strike, it is certainly a violation of the law and they should be prosecuted for it. However, I do not think it is a responsibility of the House Committee on the District of Columbia to do that.

Mr. GROSS. This is again after the fact of the action taken by the Congress. The action we propose to take in this bill has nothing whatever to do with the provisions of Public Laws 330 and 637.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield, it will prevent more than 5 percent of them from using administrative leave all at one time.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman agrees with me that they went out on strike?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I think that in fact it was a strike. I may point out to the gentleman from Iowa, however, that at that time we were considering the salary legislation. We were planning to act on the legislation, and we did so strictly on its merits. The strike or the pressure attempted by the teachers notwithstanding, we acted on this bill on its merits and only on its merits.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of the increase in pay for Class Act employees. *Is it not true* that since 1954 the increase has been 55.3 percent for Class Act employees of the Federal Government?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The increase is in three stages: October 1, 1967, July 1, 1968, and then again next year.

Mr. GROSS. Your own report states that it is an increase of 55.3 percent since 1954.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. This bill would bring the increase in teachers salaries for the District of Columbia to 82.8 percent or almost 83 percent over the same period. Is that not correct, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is correct. The reason for that is that over a period of many years, the schoolteachers of the District of Columbia have not been making proper salaries in relationship to their professional responsibilities, as compared with employees under the Class Act.

Mr. GROSS. But in committee you did make this bill retroactive to October 1, 1967.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Did we not make the Class Act increases retroactive to that same date?

Mr. GROSS. You did. I did not.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The Congress did. And the House also approved for a pay increase for the police and firemen, retroactive to October 1, 1967.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the financial crisis that faces the District of Columbia, I do not agree with this retroactive windfall for the teachers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I support the McMillan amendment to cut this bill, and unless it is adopted I will have no alternative but to vote against the increase.

In view of the financial crisis that confronts this country it is impossible for me to vote a 19-percent increase in teacher pay in the District of Columbia, raising the pay level here to the highest in the Nation. Moreover, this would be capitulation to the worst kind of pressure.

Some of the speakers have indicated that these increases in pay will cure the problems of the schools of the District of Columbia. Nothing could be further from the truth and I predict that time and events will demonstrate that this is but another attempt to appease through the use of the public purse.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us want to do what is right in the promotion of education in our country. I think there are some issues which should be mentioned in connection with the consideration of legislation relating to the District of Columbia schools.

I have in my hand a publication issued by the Washington Teachers Union headed "Why Did Washington Burn?—A Relevant Lesson Plan and Resources for District of Columbia Teachers."

This publication is a suggested lesson plan, not given by the persons charged with responsibility for running the schools and administering them in the District of Columbia, but by the Washington Teachers Union. The union says this lesson plan was developed by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in cooperation with the Washington Teachers Union. It says it was prepared to deal with the current social unrest. They say, among other things, that it would be disastrous if the teachers in the District of Columbia returned to "Dick and Jane," and to biased history textbooks and to an observance of Afro-American history that is limited to 1 week a year.

The first item in this so-called lesson plan is a vocabulary section. The words listed are ones to be emphasized and the teachers are to indoctrinate the children in the use of those words. What are they? "Revolution, rebellion, insurrection, police state, curfew, reparations, credit, maze, democracy, ghetto, quality education, urban renewal, power structure, Kerner Commission Report, deprivation, uprising, occupation troops, civil disobedience, institutional racism, riot, self-determination, soul brother, coming together, freeway, exploitation, black power."

These are the words that in the vocabulary training the teachers in the District of Columbia are to burn into the minds of children.

Mr. Speaker, I see nowhere in this article the words "love," or "brotherhood," or "performance," or "Americanism," or any of those which many of us believe should be words with which children should be familiar.

When they get over to the fourth item they refer to "contemporary forces in the black community." They say this is to be utilized as a point of departure in discussing the movement. I do not know what movement they are talking about. It is a very limited list. Listed among the group is Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Stokely Carmichael, Julius Hobson, Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr., Fannie Lou Hamer, Rufus "Catfish" Mayfield, Marion Barry, C. Sumner "Chuck" Stone, Muhammad Ali—I believe that is Cassius Clay—Eartha Kitt, Adam Clayton Powell, Mrs. Willie Hardy, Rev. Channing Phillips, Bayard Rustin, Rev. Albert B. Cleage, Sterling Tucker, Floyd McKissick, Elijah Muhammad, Sammy Davis, Jr., and H. Rap Brown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITENER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITENER (continuing). Mr. Speaker, Malcolm X, Roy Wilkins. Then they say "most importantly those many grassroots leaders who come from the corners, the barber shops, the block clubs, et cetera."

In this material they ask that the teachers discuss the question of looting in Washington, and after saying that one question raised by this thought is who really did the looting, they say "what about the store owners who have overpriced their goods for years in black communities?"

In other words, they are attempting to justify looting by overpricing charges against merchants.

They then ask the question on the rebuilding of the District of Columbia in this manner: "Who should control the establishment of a new District of Columbia?"

They ask the students whether it should be the city power structure, or whether it should be another group calling itself the Beacon House, whose spokesman is C. Sumner "Chuck" Stone. The entire lesson plan—which is not, as I understand it, an authorized plan by the school authorities—indicates that those who run this organization are not, by their program, contributing to the well-being of the community.

When they get to the last part on suggested reading material for students, these are the suggested books: "The Autobiography of Malcolm X," "Dark Ghetto," "Black Power," "Tell It Like It Is," by Chuck Stone, "Civil Disorders" "Black Man's Burden," "Tally's Corner," "The Negro in 20th Century America," "The Invention of the Negro," "The Black Muslims in America," "What Chance for Black Power?" by New Republic, "Why We Can't Wait," by Dr. Martin Luther King, "An Advocate of Black Power Defines It," by Charles V. Hamilton, "When Black Students Take Over a Campus," by Ernest Holsendolph and John Mathews, and "The Black Power Revolt," edited by Floyd B. Barbour.

That is the lesson plan. They say that the battle of Lexington and Concord is cited by historians as an act of patriot-

ism. They say that teachers should tell the students that those who fought were engaging in fact in a kind of guerrilla warfare. That they were "snipers."

Again, "this question can be discussed with respect to the major outbreaks in our urban centers today."

There are many people of both races in this country who are trying to seek a method whereby law and order will prevail. It shocks me to see that a group charged with the responsibility of educating our youth would develop a so-called lesson plan such as that proposed by the Washington Teachers Union.

I might point out that in another place they say that what is happening in this country today raises the question of racial genocide. "One should not overlook the rape or 'looting' of Africans from their homeland by the white slave traders who began the tradition of racism in the United States."

This is startling, Mr. Speaker, and I ask unanimous consent that this document may be made a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The document referred to follows:

WHY DID WASHINGTON BURN?—A RELEVANT LESSON PLAN AND RESOURCES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

The brutal murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., demands that teachers everywhere continue to confront the issue of racism in their classrooms. As we all know, the murder of Dr. King should not really be a shock to America, for he is only one of the many freedom fighters who have died at the hands of a white racist society in recent years.

In an effort to confront this burning issue, particularly in view of Dr. King's assassination and the recent uprising in the District of Columbia, a committee of The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, in cooperation with the WTU, has prepared the following lesson plan to deal with the current social unrest.

The plan is merely a suggested one, for it does not provide a comprehensive study guide. However, we hope it can serve as a starting point with respect to offering a relevant curriculum to our students for the remainder of the school year.

As Dr. King once said, "We can't afford to return to a business-as-usual attitude." It will be disastrous if the teachers in D.C. return to *Dick and Jane,* to biased history textbooks, and to an observance of Afro-American history that is limited to one week a year.

I. VOCABULARY

Revolution	Deprivation
Rebellion	Racism
Insurrection	Uprising
Police State	Occupation Troops
Curfew	Civil Disobedience
Reparations	Institutional Racism
Credit	Riot
Maze	Self-determination
Democracy	Soul Brother
Ghetto	Coming Together
Quality Education	Freeway
Urban Renewal	Exploitation
Power Structure	Black Power
Kerner Commission Report	

II. VIOLENT EVENTS IN THE CONTEMPORARY FREEDOM STRUGGLE

A. Death of Emmett Till in Mississippi, 1956.

B. Murder of Medgar Evers, field secretary, Mississippi NAACP, 1963.

C. Death of four Sunday school children in a Birmingham, Ala. church, 1963.

D. Murder of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner in Philadelphia, Miss., 1964, while with the Mississippi Freedom Project.

E. Death of Col. Lemuel Penn of Washington, D.C. while driving through the South.

F. Death of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo of Detroit following the Selma to Montgomery, Ala., March, 1965.

G. Death of Jimmie Lee Jackson in Selma, Ala., 1965.

H. Death of Malcolm X in New York City, 1965.

I. Murder of the Orangeburg, S.C., students, 1968.

J. Assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Memphis, Tenn., 1968.

III. APPROACHES TO RESOLVING THE PROBLEM OF RACISM IN THE UNITED STATES

A. Nonviolent Confrontation: This philosophy was the one advocated by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

1. The approach to nonviolence does not preclude the use of self-defense.

2. Dr. King's philosophy as manifested by his direct confrontations with all kinds of power structures did not mean passive acceptance of the status quo. This point should be stressed.

a. Dr. King said, in 1967: "We will be greatly misled if we feel that the problem will work itself out. Structures of evil do not crumble by passive waiting. If history teaches anything, it is that evil is recalcitrant and determined and never voluntarily relinquishes its hold short of an almost fanatical resistance. Racism can well be that corrosive evil that will bring down the curtain on Western civilization."

b. Some confrontations that might be discussed in class include: The Montgomery, Ala., bus boycott, Albany, Ga., 1962, Birmingham, Ala., 1963, Selma, Ala., 1965, Poor People's Campaign, 1968.

3. Nonviolence as a philosophy.

4. Nonviolence as a tactical method in dealing with the power structure. Note: It might be very worthwhile here to discuss the comment made by Dick Gregory in Washington, D.C., April 13, 1968, in which he pointed out that "Those concerned about justice should start talking about Dr. King's purpose, not about his method."

B. Other Approaches Employed:

1. Deacons for Self-Defense, Louisiana.

2. Militant urban guerrilla tactics.

3. Organizational approaches.

a. Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

b. Congress on Racial Equality (CORE).

c. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).

d. The Urban League.

e. The Black Muslims.

IV. CONTEMPORARY FORCES IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY

(To be utilized as a point of departure in discussing the movement. It is a very limited list:)

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.
Stokely Carmichael.
Dick Gregory.
Julius Hobson.
Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.
Fannie Lou Hamer.
Rufus (Catfish) Mayfield.
Marion Barry.
C. Sumner (Chuck) Stone.
Muhammad Ali.
Eartha Kitt.
Adam Clayton Powell.
Mrs. Willie Hardy.
The Rev. Channing Phillips.
Bayard Rustin.
The Rev. Albert B. Cleage.
Sterling Tucker.
Floyd McKissick.
Elijah Muhammad.
Sammy Davis, Jr.
H. Rap Brown.
Malcolm X.
Roy Wilkins.

And, most important, those many grassroots leaders who come from the corner, the barber shops, the block clubs, etc.

V. WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL, 1968—CIVIL DISORDER OR INSURRECTION?

A. From the *Washington Post,* April 14, column by Wolf Von Eckhardt: *"There must be a lesson in this. It is certainly obvious that urban renewal can no longer be used to take land from the poor for the benefit of the rich, as was done in Washington's Southwest."* This comment can be used to start a discussion of the whole area of urban renewal, and why it is often called "Negro removal."

B. From the *Evening Star,* April 14, column by John Mathews and Ernest Holdendolph: ("The following is a comment by a black student which appeared in the article.) *"'The Negro has wanted all of these years for the white man to listen to him; now the white man is ready to listen to him . . . I am sorry it took the burning of his store in order for him to listen, but in my opinion, that's the price you have to pay. It has been made clear these past few days that the Negro isn't going to let Mr. White Man push him around any longer. And I cannot blame this generation.'"*

One question raised by this thought is, who really did the looting? What about the store owners who have overpriced their goods for years in black communities. For reference, recall the series of articles that appeared in the *Washington Post* about two months ago on the credit stores operating in the black community, particularly those on 7th St. Last fall, a Congressional Subcommittee found that a large chain store raised its prices on the day welfare checks came out and sold poor-quality produce to its stores in the ghettos while high-quality produce was being sold in white area stores.

C. Rebuilding the District of Columbia. Who should control the establishment of a *new* D.C.?

1. The city power structure has established the Urban Coalition, which is comprised primarily of local business leaders, professional people, and politicians.

2. Another group, calling itself Beacon, whose spokesman is C. Sumner (Chuck) Stone, stated April 12 that this all-black group is ready to supervise the rebuilding of the city's devastated areas. Stone stated that the organization "will have veto powers over any employment of consultants by the government, and expressly rejects the utilization of white so-called urbanologists with their plantation psychology."

3. A discussion of the term "black power" as it relates to political, economic, and cultural life, and of its implications in discussing the question of who should rebuild Washington. As Dr. Charles Hamilton wrote in the *New York Times* of April 14, 1968, *"Black power must not be naive about the intentions of white decision makers to yield to anything without a struggle and a confrontation by organized power. Black people will gain only as much as they can win through their ability to organize independent bases of economic and political power through boycotts, electoral activity, rent strikes, work stoppages, and pressure-group bargaining. And it must be clear that whites will have to bargain with blacks or continue to fight them in the streets of the Detroits and Newarks."* Dr. Hamilton's thoughts offer a basis for a lively discussion on the entire issue of who should rebuild D.C.

VI. SOME HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. The Declaration of Independence.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain in-

alienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it."

Speaking in Georgetown on April 13, Dick Gregory quoted this passage from the Declaration of Independence, pointing out that it can justify revolution for black citizens now, as it did for the colonists nearly 200 years ago. The injection of this thought into the classroom should certainly provide some provocative discussions.

B. In one of his last talks in Washington, D.C., Dr. King told his audience he was not unmindful of the concentration camps the United States established for the Japanese-Americans during World War II. This point could be discussed, particularly if it raised in connection with what has happened to the American Indians. This whole subject raises the question of racial genocide. One should not overlook the rape or "looting" of Africans from their homeland by the white slave traders who began the tradition of racism in the United States.

C. The American Revolution, 1776—The Freedom Movement Revolution, 1968.

1. The Boston Tea Party is viewed by American historians as an act of patriotism. England however, viewed this action as "looting." What were these "vandals" striking out against? Turning to the contemporary scene, what were black citizens striking out against in Detroit, Newark, Watts, Cincinnati, Rochester, Washington, Baltimore, etc.?

2. The battle of Lexington and Concord is again viewed by American historians as an act of patriotism. Those who fought were, in fact, engaged in guerrilla warfare. They were "snipers." Again, this question can be discussed with respect to the major outbreaks in our urban centers today.

3. The famous Boston Massacre, where a black American, Crispus Attucks, was shot down by the British, is also viewed as another act of patriotism. The real situation found a group of young men hurling verbal venom and snowballs at the constituted authority, British soldiers. These young men were, in today's language "inciting a riot." The same point illustrated in items 1 and 2 above can be raised here.

4. The whole question of law and order, and what this concept means to black Americans. From the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, pp. 10–11: "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 open defiance of law and federal authority, by state and local officials resisting desegregation."

a. What about the seating of the Congressmen from Mississippi, where Afro-Americans are still denied political freedom? In fact, Mississippi is in violation of the U.S. Constitution and therefore one could raise the question of whether she is entitled to have Congressional representation.

b. The current governors of both Georgia and Alabama are on record as being officially opposed to any laws dealing with civil rights.

c. The mayor of Dearborn, Mich, is officially sponsoring gun clubs for Dearborn citizens in an effort to prepare for the hot summer. Dearborn is a lily-white community outside Detroit. What would happen if H. Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael were openly sponsoring such "recreational activity."

d. What about laws broken each day with respect to slum landlords here in the District, or job discrimination in the D.C. recreation department or in the federal government, etc. At this point the teacher can discuss with the students the kind of racism and discrimination the students observe every day in their community.

e. The question of law and order then should be raised in terms of how the law is being enforced, and upon whom is it being enforced?

f. Who is interested in preserving order? Is it the current people who have power and do not want any social change? Do these same people who want order violate civil-rights laws every day? Finally, should we even discuss law and order in the same context?

g. Racism in Education. Get copies of Hobson's brief in the case of Hobson vs. Hansen, and also Judge J. Skelly Wright's decision in that case, especially the section concerning textbooks. Why are school facilities so poor in ghetto areas? Why is the record of student achievement less than is considered satisfactory? What are students being measured by and for, and is this a fair way to judge them?

h. The political "clout" of the white community is illustrated by the recent developments concerning the route of a new freeway through the District of Columbia. Congress stopped a freeway from coming down Wisconsin Ave. through wealthy white neighborhoods and passed a law prohibiting freeways west of 12th St. N.W. and then tried to put the "concrete monster" through Brookland, a black and poor peoples' neighborhood, according to the Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis.

VII. A MAJOR POINT TO DISCUSS REGARDING DR. KING'S MURDER

Many civil rights leaders, including members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and many "folks" on the streets have accused a sick white society, a racist white society, a violent society, of murdering Dr. King. Then there are those who believe the murderers were sick, thus focusing attention on the individual killer or killers. Thus, the burning question to discuss is, who really killed Dr. King?

VIII. SUGGESTED READING MATERIAL

"The Autobiography of Malcolm X" (Grove Press, 1965).

"Dark Ghetto" by Dr. Kenneth B. Clark (Harper & Row, 1965).

"Black Power," by Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton (Random House, 1968).

Tell It Like It Is, by Chuck Stone (Trident, 1967).

Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder (Bantam Books, 1968).

Black Man's Burden, by John Oliver Killens (Trident Press, 1965).

Tally's Corner, by Elliot Liebow (Little, 1967).

The Negro in 20th Century America, by John Hope Franklin and Isidore Starr (Vintage Press).

The Invention of the Negro, by Earl Conrad (Hill & Wang, 1966).

The Black Muslim in America, by C. Eric Lincoln (Beacon Press, 1965).

What Chance for Black Power? New Republic, March 30, 1968.

Why We Can't Wait, by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., (Harper & Row, 1964).

"An Advocate of Black Power Defines It," by Charles V. Hamilton in the New York Times Magazine, April 14, 1968.

"When Black Students Take Over a Campus," by Ernest Holsendolph and John Mathews, p. 10, New Republic, April 13, 1968.

"The Black Power Revolt, edited by Floyd B. Barbour (Porter Sargent, 1968).

A NEW KIND OF TEACHING

Discover how exciting a really free-student-directed classroom can be. Join us in volunteering to teach in Freedom Schools this spring and summer.

Call the Washington Teachers' Union, 223–2460.

One need not to be a teacher by occupation to teach in the Freedom Schools.

WHITE RACISM [1]

Malcolm X, appearing at a Harvard Law School forum on Dec. 16, 1964, shortly before his death, was asked to explain the difference between white racism and black racism. He said:

"If we react to white racism with a violent reaction, to me that's not black racism. If you come to put a rope around my neck and I hang you for it, to me that's not racism. Yours is racism, but my reaction has nothing to do with racism. My reaction is the reaction of a human being, reacting to defend himself and protect himself. This is what our people haven't done, and some of them, at least at the high academic level, don't want to. But most of us aren't at that level."

MARTIN LUTHER KING'S LAST WARNING [1]

"Our national government is playing Russian roulette with riots; it gambles with another summer of disaster. Not a single basic social cause of riots has been corrected. Though ample resources are available, they are squandered substantially on war. However, the inhumanity and irresponsibility of Congress and the Administration are not a reflection of popular attitudes—legislation to abolish slums and end all unemployment have been endorsed by a wide majority of the American people in reputable polls. Yet, these positive proposals, like the recommendations of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, will be filed away to gather dust if the people do not generate relentless pressure on Congress.

"It was obdurate government callousness to misery that first stoked the flames of rage and frustration. With unemployment a scourge in Negro ghettos, the government still tinkers with trivial half-hearted measures, refuses still to become an employer of last resort. It asks the business community to solve the problem as though its past failures qualified it for future success."—Dr. Martin Luther King's last letter asking support for his march in Washington, as reprinted in I. F. Stone's Weekly for April 15, 1968.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that when we are considering pay increases that we should look at the record, and determine whether or not there is a situation here at which we should look very closely to see just what kind of information is being suggested for the students in the District of Columbia.

The Nation is demanding that we get back on the track of law and order. If the Members do not believe that, then they should go home to their districts and talk to their people. This type of lesson plan, I say in all kindness, will result only in chaos in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

(On the request of Mr. Gross, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WHITENER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct in assuming that the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, mentioned as having a part in laying out this program for instruction in the District of Columbia, is the same Southern Christian Leadership Conference which intervened in the strike of garbage disposal workers in Memphis, Tenn.? Does the gentleman

[1] Transposed from original copy to preserve continuity.

know whether this is the same organization?

Mr. WHITENER. I read the same press reports the gentleman has read.

Mr. GROSS. Under the guise of protecting civil rights, or having something to do with civil rights, the organization intervened in the garbage disposal strike in Memphis, Tenn.?

Mr. WHITENER. In the so-called lesson plan it is interesting to note that Malcolm X is quoted very liberally along with other individuals who I do not believe can be likened to the patriots at the Boston Tea Party.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman heard a single word from the so-called city government in Washington headed by Mayor Washington or Commissioner Washington or whatever you want to call him, in protest to the strike by teachers in the District of Columbia on, I believe it was, March 6 or 7 of this year? Did the gentleman hear one word of protest that the schools were closed, that the teachers were on strike, and in droves were lobbying Congress for a pay increase?

Mr. WHITENER. I think the gentleman and I would agree that a society will not long last, a democratic society, when the schoolteachers show so little regard for the responsibility that they have. At the end of the year, if they desire to resign, they certainly can do so. They should not show a callous disregard of the welfare of their students by walking out of the classrooms during a school session.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all share a concern for the nature of the curriculum in the District of Columbia, and the quality of education in the District of Columbia. As the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Iowa in colloquy a moment ago have pointed out, things are not as we would all like to see them. There is concern. But where I would differ with these gentlemen is in what I think we ought to do about it.

Are you going to continue with a school system in which 95 percent of all the new teachers have to be hired on a temporary basis because you could not recruit fully qualified teachers? Are you going to continue with that kind of situation? Or are you going to go along with a school system in which the number of faculty members with masters degrees has dropped in 4 years from 36 percent to 25 percent—and this is one of the indices which is depended upon by educators to test the quality of a school system and to give leadership in strengthening the curriculum and broadening the curriculum? Are you going to go on with that sort of situation indefinitely? Are you going to tolerate a school system in which the percentage of permanent teachers has dropped from 71 percent in the 1956–57 year to a low of 42.5 percent in 1966–67? Is that the kind of situation that you want to perpetuate?

Mr. Speaker, I think if we do not defeat this amendment, and if we do not pass the bill as the committee recommended it to the House, then we are going to perpetuate these kinds of lower standards, standards that are lower than those acceptable to any Member of this House.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I think at this point we should talk in this House about the alternatives which we have. I think any impression that this bill is a direct response to some type of threat should immediately be put aside, because this bill is a compromise between the bill originally offered, which was $7,000 per year retroactive to October of last year, and other proposals that were made in the committee. It was carefully thought out, and a tax program has been proposed in support of it.

The thing that worries me most of all are the comments of some of the recent speakers, who seem to say the solution to the problem we have in Washington, D.C.—and we all admit it is a desperately difficult time—is some type of "let us punish someone now," or "let us punish the schoolchildren," or "let us not pay the teachers." In other words, "let us drive our people into two competing groups"—two groups competing often in a violent fashion.

I, for one, do not want to be a part of that. I do not think the Congress of the United States wants to be a part of that. I have heard Member after Member on this floor stand and say that one of the touchstones, one of the few key things that can now be done in this country in our cities is to improve our educational system in the urban centers, so that our people, black and white, can compete in the type of industrial society that we have today.

Yet, to get a teacher who is capable, a teacher who is dedicated, a teacher who has the talent to go into a central city, we must pay the teacher more than we pay in the suburbs. The schools in the cities are more difficult, the classes are larger, discipline is more difficult, and the buildings are falling down around them. The classes are not integrated classes in this city. It is hard to try to bring people in to do the things that have to be done in education in Washington, D.C. It takes a salary schedule to do it. This salary schedule is not out of line.

To the gentleman who asked the question about the report—and I think the report is well done—it indicates direct comparisons on pages 5, 6, and 7 between the various cities of the United States. The only place where the salary will be first will be on bringing people in, and there is a reason for that. We have the most difficult recruiting job of any place in this geographic area. If we want to bring in the teachers and thus have people who can bridge the gap here, if we are to have dedicated and good people, we must not shut them out. Do not shut out the people who can really begin to make the whole educational system work.

In addition to that, we know, for example, one of the problems in the rioting recently here was with schoolchildren. There is good reason to believe children should not be released from school on days like this. If we are to improve this situation we must have capable and dedicated people as teachers.

One article has been read into the RECORD here, but that does not represent all the schoolteachers who get up every morning, who work all day long, who work in the afternoon to correct papers, and who go to school in the summertime to try to bring themselves up. If we are going to have a good school system, this bill is the place to spend money and not to cut back.

Finally, I would say this educational system is falling down around our ears. The reading level for students in many high school classes is the sixth grade level. Children read at the third grade level in the sixth grade. I send my children to the public schools here, and I know the problems, and I talk to the teachers. We do not have much time if we are going to bring in the sort of people we need. Give them a break, pay them this salary, and maybe we will begin to make some steps forward.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what the situation in the District of Columbia is with respect to the students? Do they rank well in the District of Columbia as compared with the rest of the country, or what is the ranking as compared with the rest of the United States?

Mr. ADAMS. In our school system here we have one high school that ranks in the top 10 percent of schools of the country, and the remainder of the schools rank in the bottom 10 percent in America. I think that is inexcusable in this city.

Mr. BELL. Would it be a good argument for wanting to make the center of American Government and the school system of the American Government possibly the top school system in the Nation or at least among the top ranking school systems? Would that be an inspiration or would it not be important? Should not this be done to help bring our whole educational system up throughout the Nation?

Mr. ADAMS. I believe it should be the top system. What is more, we have the opportunity here to show the way to the other metropolitan centers of America, to show how they can improve the center school systems that are deteriorating so rapidly. Public education as we have known it does not exist in many of our central cities. We can show them the way it can be put back together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(On request of Mr. BELL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ADAMS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Is it not also very important that the District of Columbia develop teachers who will not just go to the outlying suburban areas but who will go into the areas where the need really exists? Is this not a fundamental point?

Mr. ADAMS. That is absolutely true. We need to obtain dedicated teachers who will stay in the central school districts. This is true throughout America. To do this, they must be paid salaries at least comparable to those in suburbia.

I refer any Members who are worried about the size of these salaries to the report. They will find we will not become the highest at the master's level and at the doctor's level, where we need these people.

Mr. BELL. In my opinion one of the most important factors in the building up of our school system, for the whole Nation, is to have adequate schoolteachers.

Mr. ADAMS. Absolutely, the teacher, more than the building or any other single thing, is the important thing in an elementary school or a junior or senior high school.

I pray that the House will reject this amendment and vote through this bill.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the debate reference was made to a local newspaper article. One thing which was not mentioned was the fact that in it is a story headlined, "Teachers Raises Should Not Involve Any D.C. Sales Tax Hike." So declares one of the schoolteacher union leaders.

I call attention to the fact that Walter Washington, the Mayor, has come up with revenue recommendations which would finance the proposed pay bill.

I should also like to call attention to the fact that it is unfortunate that a strike or demonstration was even suggested.

One of the union leaders called me, and I advised him not to strike or demonstrate and I said, "Because the disposition of the Congress is to move in the direction of higher salary raises for the teachers, police, and the firemen, anyway, simply because raises are strongly justified."

Now, many of the terrible things we are decrying that have happened recently in the city and that have been mentioned here today still do not solve the problems that were here before the disorders and will remain after if we do not act.

At the same time, the depressing facts are these: In 1966 the District of Columbia lost almost 18 percent of its teacher corps, the highest loss in 40 years. The percent of permanent teachers has dropped from 71 percent in 1957 to approximately 35 percent at the present time.

Ninety-five percent of the teachers who were newly hired by the District in 1966 were hired as temporaries, meaning that they were not fully qualified. This is incredible. The District of Columbia is unable to hire; it cannot compete. The District of Columbia presently ranks fifth in the District of Columbia metropolitan area; and 15th out of the 20 cities with over 500,000 population. Under the terms of the proposed bill, we would move up to near the top. But, already Chicago and Detroit are offering close to $7,500 a year for starting pay or $500 more than the bill before us.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. What is a fireman in the city of Washington paid?

Mr. NELSEN. We will get that for you in just a moment.

Mr. McMILLAN. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is $6,700.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. What is the proposed pay?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The proposed salary is $8,000.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Are you going to pay them more because they are better educated or because they are men?

Mr. NELSEN. I am sure you realize—and you and I are not in disagreement—that the teachers should have an increase, and I think your point is well taken.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Thank you.

Mr. NELSEN. I have nothing but compliments for those who are careful with the taxpayers' dollars because I am one of them. However, I think we need to recognize here in the District of Columbia a hiring crisis exists and is getting worse, if that is possible. I have nothing but the highest esteem for the chairman of the committee, who has given me and other members of the committee help in supporting better education in the District of Columbia. I cite the new Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute, the first public colleges in the District. Congressman WHITENER was one of the bulwarks of support in education as well as the chairman of the committee, Mr. McMILLAN. Today, the President will sign a bill to authorize an elected School Board for the District. All of these needed programs received my support and the support of the gentlemen I named and many others of our colleagues.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I think it may be well to point out that in view of the question asked by the gentlewoman from Michigan, from 1954 up to today, the teachers have received increases which amount to a 71.2-percent increase in pay whereas the police and firemen have only received 69.3 percent increase. So I do not think it is fair to imply that the Congress has not been fair to the schoolteachers.

I might point out further that I am told by some of those who have worked here for many years that in 1954 practically all of the schools in the District of Columbia, if not all, had a high rating educationally as compared to schools in other parts of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NELSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. And notwithstanding the fact that in that period of time you have had a 71.2 percent increase in teachers' pay, you have a situation which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS] paints as such a bleak picture of what is happening to the schools here. So I am not arguing against adequate pay, but I take it that the gentleman from Washington is in effect saying that raising the pay 71.2 percent for the teachers in the District of Columbia has caused a retrogression in the quality of education in the city.

Mr. NELSEN. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to point out that it was the committee's almost unanimous disposition to treat the teachers better salarywise. It is a matter of how far do you go and how far do we need to go. In looking at teachers' salaries I recall looking at a document before our committee which showed that Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has a starting salary of $6,800 a year. I would much rather go to Milwaukee, Wis., to teach than to teach under the severe conditions currently existing in the District of Columbia school system.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Would the gentleman tell us why?

Mr. NELSEN. You know the answer. We have had a good deal of unrest, broken families, and discipline problems. I hope that we can move in the direction of curing those problems. Practically speaking, the schools bear the brunt of trying to fulfill for the child the training and discipline he does not get in a broken or impoverished home.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is that not the reason why they are having so much trouble in getting teachers here?

Mr. NELSEN. Certainly, but we need not just teachers, but excellent teachers. The point is that we need them and need them now. You cannot punish the schools for the problems of the city. To cure the problems you must start by improving the schools.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What if you doubled the pay? Would not the same situation still prevail?

Mr. NELSEN. I am not going to get into a debate about that. The point is I think we need to pass this bill. I want to point out that the committee reported the bill out supporting a starting salary of $6,400 retroactive to October 1, 1967, and rising to $7,000 commencing September 1, 1968.

I believe these figures are modest when you consider that the sums do not put the District in an enormously better competitive position with school systems that do not have half the problems of the District of Columbia. Competition for teachers is fierce. Washington has to compete for teacher personnel with such cities as Chicago and Detroit. We have been told that commencing in September, Detroit's starting salary will be $7,500 or $500 more than is here proposed for the District of Columbia. Chicago will offer a starting salary of $7,350; this, too, is higher than what this modest bill offers. Other cities will, no doubt, be considering additional salary rises to enhance their competitive position in the marketplace for good teachers. The bill before us, as you can see, is at most a holding action for the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state to the gentleman from Minnesota that there is no person who has ever served in this House of Representatives and on the Committee on the District of Columbia who has done more to try to take care of the people in the Nation's Capital and to take care of the taxpayers' dollars or money as the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

He and I agreed that the $7,000—the report of $7,000 I did not vote for it in the main bill but I agreed to go along with it just the same and write the report because I would like to say that since we reported this bill out there have been some happenings which have occurred in the District in recent days which I think should be looked into. The Budget Director sent a budget down here asking for an increase in taxes, for instance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

(On request of Mr. McMILLAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. NELSEN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, since that time we know that there have been several hundred business establishments burned up in the Nation's Capital, and I just wonder where we are going to get the taxes to pay for this additional money for the teachers and for the police as well as everyone else. That is the only reason I am opposing this bill today.

Mr. NELSEN. I think the point is well taken and I think some of the things that have happened have been tragic. But, concerning the schools problem, I want to mention the fact that Mayor Washington and Congressman BROYHILL met with the leaders of the teachers union and begged them not to disrupt the school program—not even for a minute—and at this time I wish to compliment my colleague as well as the Mayor. Many of us realize that Mr. Washington had a very difficult role to play and did a capable job in providing good leadership during the disturbances.

But I must say, and this is my sincere conviction, that the action that the committee has taken is fully justified, especially in view of the fact that when we look at the salaries paid in this and other towns just for a receptionist we realize that the salaries in this bill is not out of line. Especially in this city where prices are sky-high. And teachers must live, too.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed in its present form and that the amendment be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GUDE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. NELSEN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I would like to commend the gentleman from Minnesota and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

The gentleman from Minnesota has performed a great service to the city of Washington over a number of years. He also performed a great service in helping to establish the Washington Technical Institute, an institute which is so important in providing the type of education which is going to make the city move upward.

I certainly do not feel that the Congress is acting under pressure here or that it will act under pressure of threats of violence. I think our support of this legislation is just and right. Education has always been a key factor in our society. A good educational system throughout the country, has the potential for solving many of our problems. In particular now, good urban school systems are imperative if progress is to be made in removing the root causes of our domestic crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McMILLAN) there were—ayes 10, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORTON

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORTON: On page 9, immediately after the table appearing above line 3, insert the following new paragraph:

"(8) Section 5(c) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1522 (c)) is amended—

"(A) by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The Board of Education shall prescribe minimum qualifications for appointment to such position.'; and

"(B) by striking out the fifth sentence."

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my amendment would, first, remove the current 5-percent maximum ratio of teacher aides to teachers; and, second, remove the present requirements that such aides possess a minimum education of at least 60 semester hours from an accredited college, and would allow the school board to set the educational requirements.

Because of the ratio limit, the District of Columbia can employ only approximately 350 aides to help 7,000 teachers.

Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 150,000 pupils in the District of Columbia school system who must share the 350 teacher aides. For purposes of comparison, I would like to cite some statistics from several other school districts around the country which show the extent of teacher aides used in both urban and nonurban districts.

In Rock Hill, S.C., there are 85 paid teacher aides for only 12,000 students. Tavares, Fla., has 200 aides and 220 volunteers for 13,000 students.

In San Jose, Calif., with 31,000 students, there are 269 paid teacher aides.

Atlanta, Ga., with 110,000 pupils, has 1,000 teacher aides with 380 volunteers.

Pittsburgh has 77,000 students with 256 paid aides.

St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn., have a total of 112,000 pupils and 500 teacher aides in addition to nearly 100 volunteers.

Pikeville, Ky., has 187 teacher aides for 18,000 students.

Frederick, Md., has 104 teacher aides for 16,000 students.

Louisville, Ky., has 230 aides and 150 volunteers for 69,000 students.

Rochester, N.Y., my home community, employs 450 paid professional aides for 2,300 teachers, nearly one aide for every five teachers, where the District of Columbia is restricted to one for every 20.

In none of the cities I have mentioned above is the problem of inner-city education so severe as it is in Washington, and the ratio of para-professional aides per student in the District of Columbia is lower than any of the others, because of the 5 percent limitation, which my amendment seeks to repeal.

I might add that this amendment requests no new or additional authorization of funds for the purpose of hiring teacher aides, it merely gives the board of education needed flexibility to allocate funds for the teacher aide program out of the present budget. This amendment provides no additional money, but does provide a sorely needed flexibility in educational policy and action that can help to bring the school system of this city into the 1960's. The many city school systems I have cited above have become part of a national educational movement to employ greater numbers of teacher aides in order to reduce the effects of a teacher shortage, which results in larger classes.

It has been found in virtually every school system where aides are used extensively that teachers have more time and freedom to teach.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a letter which I have received from the principal of the Garrison Elementary School here in the District of Columbia, which gives a very good illustration of the practical use of teacher aides, and I believe it pretty well defines what these teacher aides do. I am quoting from a letter from Gloria Jones, principal of the Garrison Elementary School here in Washington, D.C. She says:

For the past 3 years we have had 10 teacher aides at Garrison Elementary School.

They have functioned adequately in various ways. One of their primary assets has been as friendly adults whose attitude with the children conveys a feeling of personal respect, interest and acceptance to each child. They give direct personal attention and encouragement to each child, ranging from a conversation after school or in the lunchroom to a wink or smile in class. They are concerned when the children are injured or have difficulty with their studies.

Their work in the classroom has been invaluable to the teachers. Since the aides perform all routine clerical jobs, they free the teachers to carry on their educational program. In addition, the aides serve as the teachers' assistants in preparing instructional materials, correcting papers, operating duplicating and audio-visual machines, and checking out textbooks and library books.

Under the direction and supervision of the teacher, the aides work directly with individual pupils and small groups in activities related to instruction and enrichment activities, such as language development, remedial reading games and number-fact games. From time to time the aides assume responsibility while the children are working independently on assignments or when they are engaged in some other activity outside the classroom.

The teacher aide program has added a second adult, carefully selected and trained to work with children. This direct assistance to their teachers at Garrison School has significantly improved both teacher and pupil morale and the educational program in general at Garrison School. We need more of these qualified and dedicated persons.

Mr. Speaker, I also would point out that, because of this 5-percent restriction, the District of Columbia is not able to share in the use of Federal funds nor to get additional Federal funds under the Educational Professions Development Act for training teacher aides. I think that here we are restricting the District unnecessarily, and this restriction should not be permitted.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk in terms of the need for these teacher aides. The Republican coordinating committee earlier this month issued a very meaningful and well-considered position paper on "Urban Education, Problems and Priorities." An important segment of this paper, on page 10, underscores the need for paraprofessionals in urban school systems. It states, and I quote:

To relieve the heavy load on the professional teacher, greater use should be made of teaching assistants recruited whenever possible from the immediate community. Personnel of this type could relieve the teacher of the burden of many tasks which are important to classroom and school operations, but do not require the preparation of a professional teacher. They could also serve as another communication link between the teacher and community.

So ends the quote from the Republican coordinating committee which was just issued this month.

I am also gratified and proud that nine of our colleagues in the House serve on the coordinating committee. They are Messrs. GERALD FORD, LESLIE ARENDS, MELVIN LAIRD, JOHN RHODES, H. ALLEN SMITH, BOB WILSON, CHARLES GOODELL, RICHARD POFF, and WILLIAM CRAMER; they had a share in the preparation and adoption of this farsighted document. We can take up the challenge of this document for the Washington school system by today making it possible for the use of teacher assistants to be expanded.

In addition to eliminating any percentage restriction on the number of teacher aides which the school system can employ, my amendment would give the Board of Education the responsibility for setting educational requirements for teacher aides who are hired. Presently there is a statutory provision requiring a minimum of 60 semester hours of college work for teacher aides. This is unrealistic and restrictive, because the duties of these aides are not such as to require a college background. These people are hired to serve as paraprofessionals, not as teachers.

There is no question that teacher aides must be capable of working with children and teenagers, and they must have certain clerical or other nonprofessional skills.

Today the President is signing into a law a bill providing for an elected School Board in the District of Columbia. One benefit of this new Board could be that it relieves the Congress of this burden so that the Board of Education could establish the qualifications and requirements for these teacher aides.

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

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his very excellent statement. I certainly support his amendment.

Could the gentleman tell me, in economically deprived areas such as certain areas in this District, whether or not teachers' aides would be of considerable help to youngsters who maybe in a period of time would be dropouts and cause some of the educational problems we have had here and in other areas?

Mr. HORTON. Yes. I think the gentleman makes a very good point, and that was made in the report of the coordinating committee. One of the prime uses in the schools where these teachers' aides are being used throughout the country is that they do give assistance and in many cases personal attention to potential dropouts—particularly where there are large classes. It seems to me that as important even as salaries for teachers is that teachers in urban schools need to be provided with capable assistants so they can have additional help in the classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members of the House will vote for this amendment.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has presented his amendment, but I think the gentleman has failed to set forth really some important aspects of it which we should all consider.

Under the present law the teachers' aides must have at least 60 semester hours at an accredited junior college, college, or university. Under the gentleman's amendment there would not be any such requirement, because his amendment says the Board of Education shall prescribe minimum qualifications for such positions.

When this matter first came to the Congress, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sent up a communication to the Committee on the District of Columbia and recommended that such employees have at least 3 years or more of college. The committee and the Congress reduced the requirement to 2 years of college, which is very reasonable. Now my friend, the gentleman from New York, has referred to many other cities of the country, but he has not yet pointed out that in many, many areas of the country these teachers' aides do not have any college training, and there is no such requirement.

The gentleman also suggests that under the bill that is now before us, unless it is amended as the gentleman suggests, there can only be 358 aides appointed. As a matter of fact, at this moment there are 698 of those aides working in the schools of the District of Columbia. So the gentleman is underestimating entirely the number of aides that they now have. The limitation of 5 percent was placed into the law after hearing the District Commissioner some 2 or 3 years ago—it was fully considered by the Committee.

The gentleman apparently has not been in touch with his people lately—unless they disagree greatly with the people I represent—because we hear a great deal about spending. The estimate for the gentleman's proposal is an increase of $2 million.

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

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made so many allegations that it is difficult for me to refer to all of them.

Mr. WHITENER. I made no allegations. I made statements of fact.

Mr. HORTON. First of all, with respect to the last statement the gentleman made about cost, this will not cost any additional amount except as approved by the Appropriations Committee. In other words, there are funds available now.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WHITENER. Will the gentleman let me respond to that?

The gentleman is saying, in the typical manner of the spenders, "Leave it to the Appropriations Committee to do what the Congress ought to face up to in authorizations."

Mr. HORTON. That is not what I am saying, if the gentleman will yield. What I am saying is that there is money now that could be used for these teacher aides, and this would not cost any additional sums other than what is in the budget at the present time.

Mr. WHITENER. Perhaps the gentleman can tell us where all this money is, because we have all been looking for it for a long time.

Mr. HORTON. If the gentleman will yield, I do want to make the point that this amendment has the support of the Commissioner for the District of Columbia, Commissioner Washington; of the City Council; of the District of Columbia

Board of Education; of the District of Columbia Education Association; of the District of Columbia Teachers Union; of the District of Columbia Parent Teachers Association; and also is included in the Passow report, which was a recent comprehensive study of the District of Columbia school system by the Teachers College of Columbia University.

The point I make is, Yes, the 5-percent restriction was adopted on a look-see basis some 2 or 3 years ago by the Congress.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further.

Mr. HORTON. We should make some changes, and leave this up to the Board of Education, which should appropriately have the responsibility for hiring and qualifying teacher aides.

Mr. WHITENER. I might point out, I am happy the gentleman pointed out that the Washington Teachers Union had advocated the expenditure of $2 million more. I regret very much that their official publication indicates that the head of their union says that unless the teachers join the fight against the proposed District of Columbia sales tax increase part of their anticipated pay raise may be eaten up by higher taxes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITENER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has again pointed out what we hear so often, that there are always great spenders who are willing to spend but complain about taxes.

The gentleman from New York has proposed the expenditure of an additional $2 million, when we are already providing teacher aides, 698 of them, and we have had no great contention on the part of the PTA's or anybody else before our committee saying they do not have an adequate number.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be soundly trounced.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

I believe that supporting or opposing this amendment does not indicate whether one is for or against teacher aides, whether one is for a certain type of classification or allocation or pay, or whether or not one supports the Committee on the District of Columbia as to what the committee recommended in this particular field.

Mr. Speaker, there are presently actually two groups of these noninstructional aides in the District school system. First, we have what are called "teacher-aides," and their duties were described in the act of November 13, 1966, as follows:

> To assist teachers by performing such noninstructional duties as setting up science experiments, monitoring libraries or homerooms, acting as lay leaders, correcting test papers, and similar duties.

Then we have another group which we refer to as "classroom assistants." These employees perform more menial duties, such as maintenance and checking of equipment, helping students with various physical problems, erasing blackboards, and so forth.

The teacher aides, the group actually referred to in this proposed amendment, are authorized on a level of GS–4, with a starting salary of more than $4,900 per year. The classroom assistants are classified as GS–2, and receive a starting pay of $4,108.

What this amendment seeks to do, as I understand it, is to eliminate the 5-percent ceiling that we provided in the act of November 13, 1966, as to the number of teacher aides, and the requirement that they have at least 60 semester hours or roughly 2 years of college education.

There is no limit whatsoever in the present law for the number of classroom assistants.

Under the present law, or at the present time there is a total of 121 of these teachers' aides actually employed. So why should we lift the ceiling of 5 percent, when under the present ceiling the city is authorized to have as many as 358 teachers' aides? There is no need for this amendment to permit the hiring of more of these teachers' aides. The real thrust of the amendment of the gentleman from New York is to eliminate the requirement of 60 semester hours of college education and thus to lower the qualifications of these teachers' aides. Actually, if it is desirable to lower these standards, they can just go ahead and hire more of the classroom assistants which are already authorized in an unlimited number at the GS–2 level, at a salary of $4,108 a year. When it comes to the reclassification of these people from GS–2 to GS–4, however, I believe we should leave this up to the Civil Service Commission. This is a very technical question, and it should not be done by an amendment made here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] when this measure was first considered by the committee, the District government and the District of Columbia Board of Education recommended at that time that the educational requirements be placed at a minimum of 3 years of college. Now, in just a little more than 1 year, we are advocating on the floor of the House of Representatives that that standard be completely abolished, or that the 2-year limitation which we provided in the bill be abolished. There has been a good deal of colloquy about the cost of this legislation. Its cost is $3 million a year, just for teachers' salaries. If the full number of teachers' aids authorized in existing law were hired, this would cost approximately $2 million more. If we lift the ceiling entirely, then we do not know how much more it will cost. The real thrust of this amendment would be to increase the GS–2 to GS–4 ratings, and we have already provided a three-step increase in salaries for both levels, GS–2 and GS–4. So what we are doing is not only reclassifying on the floor of the House of Representatives, and lowering the educational standards of a part of the District of Columbia school system, but we are also adding another pay increase on top of three salary increases they have already had. Therefore, if we are concerned about fiscal problems here, we should take a long, hard look at this particular amendment.

Two years ago, when this teachers' aide program was first recommended, it was suggested that it be created in order to help in the schools in the impoverished and deprived areas of the District of Columbia. We set it up completely on that basis. The 5-percent limitation already authorized is enough to take care of these deprived and depressed areas. Furthermore, the District Committee studied this matter, and considered it in detail before recommending against it. If we have to change this law in any further way, we should study it in great detail and have hearings on it. Also, we will have the matter in conference with the Senate in just a few days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I take it from the gentleman's statement that he is saying that this amendment might well be a lesson in how to spend more money and to reduce the quality of education.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That would be the net result as I see it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to this amendment, I first have a little difficulty with the gentleman from North Carolina in that the last time we debated education I was suggesting we ought to have extra pay for policemen who had 2 years of college or 60 credit hours. Yet now the gentleman seems to be indicating that we should maintain a 60 semester hour requirement for the teachers' aides or that we should not allow them to help. I am not strenuously objecting to the 60 semester hours here and I wondered about the gentlemen's position.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. My reply to the gentleman will be that I really did not realize when the gentleman made the statement that he and some of my other friends around here had such an influence on me. When I came to the Congress I was a consistent individual. If I am inconsistent now, I have been brought to it by association.

Mr. ADAMS I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

I just wanted to remind you all of that because I think it is important at this time that we look at what is being done with the teachers' aides.

I would say this: For example, this is an amendment that would not neces-

sarily cost more money, but it does provide an opportunity for a decision to be made by superintendents and principals as to how they will handle a classroom problem.

For example, in some of the elementary schools here—and I can list some of them, for example, in the class in which my child is being instructed there are 36 pupils in that class with only one teacher. I can see a decision being made by a principal of a school that she is better off to try, instead of lowering those classes to 28—and, certainly, we would like to lower them all to 22 or 23—that with the money available at least putting an aide in that classroom would give the teacher the time to do the grading and have the contacts and to do the things with the child that are necessary.

If you are going to have classes of 30 and above—and, certainly, in some of the schools where you have some disciplinary problems—an aide in such classroom could have a tremendous effect on that class. This does not mean you are spending more money. You are allocating those resources in a different way.

I agree with the earlier remarks of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia who indicated he was offering some amendments to this bill that were different than when we came out of the committee with the bill, because he had a feeling about some things that have happened since the bill came in. I too feel there have been some changes.

However, I want to say this. There are a number of persons on the committee who are supporting the increases for teachers and the teachers' aides. And, we will also support the tax increases in order to balance the budget in that particular area.

It seems to me that we should understand and recognize these problems throughout the Nation in this important area of education, but on this particular issue and in this particular area we should be able to surmount the obstacles which stand in our way and find the solutions.

There may be other areas where we will have to cut and if we have to do it, we will. Some of us supported the flexible bonding proposal which if adopted was designed to borrow money for capital improvements.

Mr. Speaker, we believe in America. This is one of the only ways we can save the central parts of our cities. I do not say that by merely spending more money there will be the answer. But I say that there are some answers here and education is one, and that we do not have to have two separate societies growing in this country. This in my opinion represents one of the best ways to prevent a disaster and I think we should all agree upon a program to avoid this.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the largest single use of funds is for teachers' aides. I just wanted to point that out.

Now, I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from California made that point. I also want to take this opportunity to reply to the gentleman from North Carolina with respect to the allegation that this would cost some $2 million more. Actually, it is my understanding that the House Committee on the District of Columbia has never provided a cent for teachers' aides salaries in the District schools nor are they asking now. The funds for the 411 GS–2 school assistants and the 110 GS–4 teachers' aides who are currently employed are allocated by the school administration out of the temporary fund from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the antipoverty program.

So none of these funds and none of these anticipated funds would come from any allocation we would make with regard to funds to District schools.

I might also point out, parenthetically, and emphasize again that the 5-percent restriction prevents the District of Columbia from qualifying and receiving additional Federal funds that are available to provide these teachers' aides.

I think it is very important to provide these aides by removing this 5-percent restriction.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York. I think it would be inadvisable to maintain the present 5-percent artificial limitation that presently exists under this legislation, and that would be removed if the amendment which has been offered were adopted.

As the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] indicated, under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the largest single use of those funds made available throughout the country is for teachers' aides.

Under title I of ESEA the funds made available which are used for teacher aides there is no limitation, to the best of my knowledge, in any community, that would say they cannot use more than 5 or 6 or 2 percent of the funds for teacher aides. This limit acts as a detriment to the District of Columbia under the legislation in its present form. A further detriment is the artificial creation of standards. Again, under title I, we impose no standards on the number of classroom hours that are to be required for a person to serve as a paraprofessional. We recognize that there has to be an upgrading on career ladder for the nonprofessionals, and this was provided under some amendments that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] and I coauthored in the Committee on Education and Labor in the title I amendments of 1967.

I believe that the teacher aides have become recognized as an educational advantage for the child and for the professional teacher. I believe it is unwise to say that the teacher aides in the District of Columbia have to be required to have higher educational standards than the teacher aides in Milwaukee or Rochester or Richmond, Va., or any other city in this country. And that is what we will be doing unless we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] will be adopted. I believe it would be an improvement in the educational process for the District of Columbia when we know full well that through the teacher aides and other nonprofessionals we can help the professional teachers to have greater chance to individualize their instruction for those who most need the instruction.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

I want to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON]. I believe that we have learned now of the use of teachers' aides, and that through their use there has been a tremendous boost given toward improving the educational development of the young people of our country.

I know that when teacher aides were first used, the teachers did not know how to use them to their fullest extent. However, there has been a great change in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I visited in my own district quite a number of schools, and saw the advantages of the uses of teacher aides. I believe it would be a bad thing for us to put an artificial limit on the number of teacher aides that can be utilized.

I believe that the decision as to these needs can be made by the administrators of the schools, because as they find out, and accept the value of the teacher aides for their own teachers, and as the teachers learn to work with the teacher aides, these teacher aides will be developed to their best extent, and all of this to the advantage of the children.

As the Members know, in the District of Columbia there is a much greater distance that these young people must travel, and their problems are greater—much more so than in some of the other districts throughout our country. I believe that the use of teacher aides in the District of Columbia can offset this. Therefore I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(On request of Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BELL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard it repeatedly stated that this amendment would remove an arbitrary ceiling. Actually, they are using only one-third the number of teacher aides that they are authorized to use under existing legislation.

Further, another effect of this amendment would be to greatly lower the educational requirements so that we can hire more teacher aides.

Further, as the gentleman from New York pointed out, this money does not come out of funds that might be appropriated for the District of Columbia or, rather, appropriated by the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, but from another form of legislation, from another committee. I say that whether they come out of one committee or another piece of Federal legislation, what is the difference? It is still the money of the taxpayers that we are talking about, whether it comes from one source, one act, or another act. And if there are funds that are not needed, and we are talking about increased costs, as it is, then I say that we ought to take a long, hard look at the amendment that is pending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, when the President outlined a broad program for strengthening the educational system of the District of Columbia in his recent message on the state of the city, he included in it a request that teachers' salaries be increased to a level where they were competitive with those paid by other jurisdictions. I firmly support the provisions of H.R. 16409 which would give teachers a starting salary of $6,400 retroactive to October 1, 1967, and raise starting salaries to $7,000 effective July 1 of this year. If the President's broad program of educational uplifting for the District of Columbia is to be carried out, we need to pass this legislation.

I believe that we are now at a historic moment in the history of American education and the District public schools are the focal point. If you pick up any of the daily newspapers, you will find at least one lead article dealing with education. The great test in American education is about to begin. The questions as to whether we can bring our schools in the large urban centers up to the standards of the 20th century and provide them with the tools to advance into the 21st century will be answered in the next few years.

The public schools of the District of Columbia are the repositories for a great variety of hopes, plans and expectations. In the past 6 months, much has been said and written about the District of Columbia public schools. Summing it all up and being perfectly candid, I believe it can be said that Washington is fast developing yet another monument; a living monument to failure, its public school system. Much that has been said about the District of Columbia schools can be said about all urban education. But there is a difference, I believe. This is the Nation's Capital.

The salaries of teachers is money to pay the bills. In these times of rising costs, this is important and reason enough for salary increases. But, salary as we all know is much more than money to meet the bills. Salary is a direct reflection of the importance placed on individuals and their work. Salary is prestige, it is morale, it is incentive, it is hiring, and it is the power to retain high-quality personnel in the District's school system.

I believe that the eyes of the Nation are on the District's schools. The citizenry of the Nation, and particularly the educators are concerned. Everyone wants to help. I believe that the District must recruit and hold the highest quality teachers available. In order for these teachers to come, we must provide a salary level that is adequate.

It is certainly true that we cannot change the character of the District's schools merely by providing an increase in teachers' salaries. Surely many other things must be done as well. But one thing is certain, none of these things will come about if the District does not have the ability to be competitive in recruiting top-quality staff to carry these plans to fruition. The lessons of the past are clear. It may be possible to attract a few of the highest quality teachers to tackle the toughest teaching job in the Nation for equal money or perhaps a little less than they would earn in more affluent areas. But we do not need just a few of these people in the District. We need a goodly number. Certainly, it is not reasonable to expect teachers to take on a more difficult job for less money.

Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to join with me in supporting H.R. 16409.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HORTON) there were—ayes 30, noes 41.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 140, not voting 146, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—147

Adams	Brown, Mich.	Dow
Albert	Burke, Mass.	Dulski
Anderson, Tenn.	Burton, Calif.	Esch
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cahill	Evans, Colo.
Annunzio	Chamberlain	Foley
Ashley	Cleveland	Friedel
Bell	Conte	Fulton, Pa.
Biester	Culver	Gallagher
Blatnik	Daddario	Gilbert
Boland	Daniels	Gonzalez
Brooks	Dawson	Gray
Brown, Calif.	Dellenback	Griffiths
	Dingell	Grover
	Donohue	Gude
Hamilton	Mathias, Calif.	Rodino
Hanley	Mathias, Md.	Rooney, N.Y.
Hanna	Matsunaga	Rosenthal
Hathaway	Meeds	Rostenkowski
Hawkins	Meskill	Roush
Hechler, W. Va.	Miller, Ohio	Rumsfeld
Heckler, Mass.	Minish	Ruppe
Helstoski	Mink	Ryan
Horton	Mize	St. Onge
Hosmer	Monagan	Schweiker
Hungate	Moorhead	Schwengel
Hutchinson	Morse, Mass.	Shipley
Joelson	Mosher	Shriver
Johnson, Calif.	Moss	Sisk
Karsten	Murphy, Ill.	Skubitz
Karth	Nedzi	Smith, Iowa
Kee	Nelsen	Smith, N.Y.
Kelly	O'Hara, Ill.	Springer
Kirwan	O'Hara, Mich.	Staggers
Kyros	Ottinger	Stanton
Laird	Patman	Steiger, Wis.
Langen	Patten	Stratton
Latta	Perkins	Sullivan
Leggett	Pettis	Tenzer
Long, Md.	Philbin	Thompson, N.J.
McCarthy	Pike	Thomson, Wis.
McClory	Pirnie	Tiernan
McCloskey	Podell	Udall
McClure	Price, Ill.	Van Deerlin
McDade	Quie	Vander Jagt
McEwen	Railsback	Whalen
Macdonald, Mass.	Randall	Wyatt
	Reid, N.Y.	Wylie
MacGregor	Reifel	Yates
Machen	Reuss	Zablocki
Madden	Robison	

NAYS—140

Abbitt	Erlenborn	Myers
Abernethy	Evins, Tenn.	Natcher
Arends	Fascell	O'Konski
Ashbrook	Findley	O'Neal, Ga.
Baring	Fisher	Passman
Bates	Flynt	Pelly
Battin	Frelinghuysen	Poage
Belcher	Fuqua	Poff
Bennett	Garmatz	Price, Tex.
Betts	Gathings	Quillen
Bevill	Gettys	Rarick
Blanton	Goodling	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boggs	Griffin	Rivers
Bolton	Gross	Roberts
Bray	Hagan	Rogers, Fla.
Brinkley	Haley	Roudebush
Broomfield	Hall	Satterfield
Brotzman	Halleck	Schadeberg
Broyhill, N.C.	Hammer-schmidt	Scherle
Broyhill, Va.		Schneebeli
Buchanan	Hardy	Scott
Burke, Fla.	Hays	Sikes
Burton, Utah	Henderson	Smith, Calif.
Bush	Herlong	Smith, Okla.
Cabell	Hicks	Snyder
Carter	Hull	Steed
Casey	Hunt	Steiger, Ariz.
Cederberg	Jarman	Talcott
Clancy	Johnson, Pa.	Taylor
Clausen, Don H.	Kazen	Teague, Tex.
	King, N.Y.	Thompson, Ga.
Clawson, Del	Kleppe	Tuck
Colmer	Kornegay	Ullman
Cowger	Kuykendall	Utt
Cunningham	Kyl	Waggonner
Curtis	Lennon	Watson
Davis, Ga.	Lipscomb	White
Davis, Wis.	McDonald, Mich.	Whitener
de la Garza		Whitten
Denney	McMillan	Williams, Pa.
Derwinski	Mahon	Willis
Devine	Marsh	Winn
Dickinson	Martin	Wright
Downing	Mayne	Wyman
Duncan	Mills	Young
Edmondson	Montgomery	Zion
Edwards, Ala.	Morris, N. Mex.	Zwach
Edwards, La.	Morton	

NOT VOTING—146

Adair	Brown, Ohio	Dent
Addabbo	Burleson	Diggs
Anderson, Ill.	Button	Dole
Andrews, Ala.	Byrne, Pa.	Dorn
Ashmore	Byrnes, Wis.	Dowdy
Aspinall	Carey	Dwyer
Ayres	Celler	Eckhardt
Barrett	Clark	Edwards, Calif.
Berry	Cohelan	Eilberg
Bingham	Collier	Eshleman
Blackburn	Conable	Everett
Bolling	Conyers	Fallon
Bow	Corbett	Farbstein
Brademas	Corman	Feighan
Brasco	Cramer	Fino
Brock	Delaney	Flood

Ford, Gerald R.	King, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Ford, William D.	Kluczynski	Ronan
Fountain	Kupferman	Rooney, Pa.
Fraser	Landrum	Roth
Fulton, Tenn.	Lloyd	Roybal
Galifianakis	Long, La.	St Germain
Gardner	Lukens	Sandman
Giaimo	McCulloch	Saylor
Gibbons	McFall	Scheuer
Goodell	Mailliard	Selden
Green, Oreg.	May	Slack
Green, Pa.	Michel	Stafford
Gubser	Miller, Calif.	Stephens
Gurney	Minshall	Stubblefield
Halpern	Moore	Stuckey
Hansen, Idaho	Morgan	Taft
Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Harrison	Nichols	Tunney
Harsha	Nix	Vanik
Harvey	Olsen	Vigorito
Hébert	O'Neill, Mass.	Waldie
Holifield	Pepper	Walker
Holland	Pickle	Wampler
Howard	Pollock	Watkins
Ichord	Pool	Watts
Irwin	Pryor	Whalley
Jacobs	Pucinski	Widnall
Jonas	Purcell	Wiggins
Jones, Ala.	Rees	Wilson, Bob
Jones, Mo.	Reid, Ill.	Wilson, Charles H.
Jones, N.C.	Reinecke	Wolff
Kastenmeier	Resnick	Wydler
Keith	Rhodes, Pa.	
	Riegle	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Galifianakis against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Stuckey against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Andrews of Alabama against.

Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Ashmore against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Stubblefield against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Stafford for, with Mr. Nichols against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Pryor against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Bow against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Harrison against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Minshall against.

Mr. Brasco for, with Mrs. Reid of Illinois against.

Mr. Giaimo for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Dole.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. McFall with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Burleson with Mrs. May.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Dole.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Walker with Mr. Gardner.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Roth.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Wampler.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Eilberg.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Pool.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Rees.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Wolff.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Vanik.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. Stephens with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Holland.

Mr. DOW changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MORTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. McDADE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. In its present form I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN moves to recommit the bill H.R. 16409 to the Committee on the District of Columbia with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, strike out the salary schedule beginning after line 2 and ending before line 1 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1	$28,000								
Superintendent.									
Class 2	24,000								
Deputy Superintendent.									
Class 3	17,515	$17,930	$18,345	$18,760	$19,175	$19,590	$20,005	$20,420	$20,835
Assistant superintendent.									
President, teachers college.									
Class 4	15,380	15,745	16,110	16,475	16,840	17,205	17,570	17,935	18,300
Director, curriculum.									
Dean, teachers college.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	13,905	14,250	14,595	14,940	15,285	15,630	15,975	16,320	16,665
Group B, master's degree	14,525	14,870	15,215	15,560	15,905	16,250	16,595	16,940	17,285
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	14,835	15,180	15,525	15,870	16,215	16,560	16,905	17,250	17,595
Group D, doctor's degree	15,145	15,490	15,835	16,180	16,525	16,870	17,215	17,560	17,905
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial adult education.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	14,100	14,435	14,770	15,105	15,440	15,775	16,110	16,445	16,780
Principal, level IV	14,100	14,435	14,770	15,105	15,440	15,775	16,110	16,445	16,780
Principal, level III	13,795	14,130	14,465	14,800	15,135	15,470	15,805	16,140	16,475
Principal, level II	13,490	13,825	14,160	14,495	14,830	15,165	15,500	15,835	16,170
Principal, level I	13,185	13,520	13,855	14,190	14,525	14,860	15,195	15,530	15,865
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	14,410	14,745	15,080	15,415	15,750	16,085	16,420	16,755	17,090
Principal, level IV	14,410	14,745	15,080	15,415	15,750	16,085	16,420	16,755	17,090
Principal, level III	14,105	14,440	14,775	15,110	15,445	15,780	16,115	16,450	16,785
Principal, level II	13,800	14,135	14,470	14,805	15,140	15,475	15,810	16,145	16,480
Principal, level I	13,495	13,830	14,165	14,500	14,835	15,170	15,505	15,840	16,175
Group D, doctor's degree	14,720	15,055	15,390	15,725	16,060	16,395	16,730	17,065	17,400
Principal, level IV	14,720	15,055	15,390	15,725	16,060	16,395	16,730	17,065	17,400
Principal, level III	14,415	14,750	15,085	15,420	15,755	16,090	16,425	16,760	17,095
Principal, level II	14,110	14,445	14,780	15,115	15,450	15,785	16,120	16,455	16,790
Principal, level I	13,805	14,140	14,475	14,810	15,145	15,480	15,815	16,150	16,485

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 6—Continued									
Group D, doctor's degree—Continued									
Principal, level I—Continued									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil personnel services).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, (athletics, and safety).									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	$12,815	$13,120	$13,425	$13,730	$14,035	$14,340	$14,645	$14,950	$15,255
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	13,125	13,430	13,735	14,040	14,345	14,650	14,955	15,260	15,565
Group D, doctor's degree	13,435	13,740	14,045	14,350	14,655	14,960	15,265	15,570	15,875
Supervising director, elementary education, (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	12,305	12,610	12,915	13,320	13,525	13,830	14,135	14,440	14,745
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	12,615	12,920	13,225	13,530	13,835	14,140	14,445	14,750	15,055
Group D, doctor's degree	12,925	13,230	13,535	13,840	14,145	14,450	14,755	15,060	15,365
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	11,180	11,485	11,790	12,095	12,400	12,705	13,010	13,315	13,620
Group B, master's degree	11,800	12,105	12,410	12,715	13,020	13,325	13,630	13,935	14,240
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	12,110	12,415	12,720	13,025	13,330	13,635	13,940	14,245	14,550
Group D, doctor's degree	12,420	12,725	13,030	13,335	13,640	13,945	14,250	14,555	14,860
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	11,290	11,595	11,900	12,205	12,510	12,815	13,120	13,425	13,730
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	11,600	11,905	12,210	12,515	12,820	13,125	13,430	13,735	14,040
Group D, doctor's degree	11,910	12,215	12,520	12,825	13,130	13,425	13,740	14,045	14,350
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	10,780	11,085	11,390	11,695	12,000	12,305	12,610	12,915	13,220
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	11,090	11,395	11,700	12,005	12,310	12,615	12,920	13,225	13,530
Group D, doctor's degree	11,400	11,705	12,010	12,315	12,620	12,925	13,230	13,535	13,840
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	10,270	10,575	10,880	11,185	11,490	11,795	12,100	12,405	12,710
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	10,580	10,885	11,190	11,495	11,800	12,105	12,410	12,715	13,020
Group D, doctor's degree	10,890	11,195	11,500	11,805	12,110	12,415	12,720	12,025	13,330
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	9,215	9,590	9,965	10,340	10,715	11,090	11,465	11,840	12,215
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	9,525	9,900	10,275	10,650	11,025	11,400	11,775	12,150	12,525
Group D, doctor's degree	9,835	10,210	10,585	10,960	11,335	11,710	12,085	12,460	12,835
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									
Psychiatric social worker.									

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 14:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	$7,430	$7,475	$8,060	$8,375	$8,690	$9,005	$9,320	$9,635	$9,950	$10,265	$10,580	$10,895	$11,210	----------	----------
Group B, master's degree	8,050	8,365	8,680	8,995	9,310	9,625	9,940	10,255	10,570	10,885	11,200	11,515	11,830	----------	----------
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	8,360	8,675	8,990	9,305	9,620	9,935	10,250	10,565	10,880	11,195	11,510	11,825	12,140	----------	----------
Group D, doctor's degree	8,670	8,985	9,300	9,615	9,930	10,245	10,560	10,875	11,190	11,505	11,820	12,135	12,450	----------	----------
Coordinator of practical nursing.															
Census supervisor.															
Class 15:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	6,200	6,450	6,700	6,950	7,315	7,625	7,935	8,245	8,555	8,805	9,050	9,300	9,550	$10,045	$10,665
Group B, master's degree	6,820	7,070	7,320	7,570	7,935	8,245	8,555	8,865	9,175	9,425	9,670	9,920	10,170	10,668	11,285
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	7,130	7,380	7,630	7,880	8,245	8,555	8,865	9,175	9,485	9,735	9,980	10,230	10,480	10,975	11,595

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 15—Continued															
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit-hours or doctor's degree	$7,440	$7,690	$7,940	$8,190	$8,555	$8,865	$9,175	$9,485	$9,795	$10,045	$10,290	$10,540	$10,790	$11,285	$11,905
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.															
Attendance officer.															
Child labor inspectors.															
Counselor, placement.															
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, teachers college.															
Research assistant.															
School social worker.															
Speech correctionist.															
Instructor, teachers college.															
Instructor, laboratory school.															
School psychologist."															

On page 4, strike out the salary schedule beginning after line 2 and ending before line 1 on page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1	$28,000								
Superintendent.									
Class 2	24,000								
Deputy superintendent.									
Class 3	19,200	$19,655	$20,110	$20,565	$21,020	$21,475	$21,930	$22,385	$22,840
Assistant superintendent.									
President, teachers college.									
Class 4	16,850	17,250	17,650	18,050	18,450	18,850	19,250	19,650	20,050
Director, curriculum.									
Dean, teachers college.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	15,235	15,615	15,995	16,375	16,755	17,135	17,515	17,895	18,275
Group B, master's degree	15,915	16,295	16,675	17,055	17,435	17,815	18,195	18,575	18,955
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	16,255	16,635	17,015	17,395	17,775	18,155	18,535	18,915	19,295
Group D, doctor's degree	16,595	16,975	17,355	17,735	18,115	18,495	18,875	19,255	19,635
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial adult education.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	15,450	15,815	16,180	16,545	16,910	17,275	17,640	18,005	18,370
Principal, level IV	15,450	15,815	16,180	16,545	16,910	17,275	17,640	18,005	18,370
Principal, level III	15,135	15,500	15,865	16,230	16,595	16,960	17,325	17,690	18,055
Principal, level II	14,800	15,165	15,530	15,895	16,260	16,625	16,990	17,355	17,720
Principal, level I	14,465	14,830	15,195	15,560	15,925	16,290	16,655	17,020	17,385
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	15,790	16,155	16,520	16,885	17,250	17,615	17,980	18,345	18,710
Principal, level IV	15,790	16,155	16,520	16,885	17,250	17,615	17,980	18,345	18,710
Principal, level III	15,475	15,840	16,205	16,570	16,935	17,300	17,665	18,030	18,395
Principal, level II	15,140	15,505	15,870	16,235	16,600	16,965	17,330	17,695	18,060
Principal, level I	14,805	15,170	15,535	15,900	16,265	16,630	16,995	17,360	17,725
Group D, doctor's degree	16,130	16,495	16,860	17,225	17,590	17,955	18,320	18,685	19,050
Principal, level IV	16,130	16,495	16,860	17,225	17,590	17,955	18,320	18,685	19,050
Principal, level III	15,815	16,180	16,545	16,910	17,275	17,640	18,005	18,370	18,735
Principal, level II	15,480	15,845	16,210	16,575	16,940	17,305	17,670	18,035	18,400
Principal, level I	15,145	15,510	15,875	16,240	16,605	16,970	17,335	17,700	18,065
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil personnel services).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	14,045	14,380	14,715	15,050	15,385	15,720	16,055	16,390	16,725
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	14,385	14,720	15,055	15,390	15,725	16,060	16,395	16,730	17,065
Group D, doctor's degree	14,725	15,060	15,395	15,730	16,065	16,400	16,735	17,070	17,405
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									

"Salary class and group	Service step								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	$13,575	$13,900	$14,225	$14,550	$14,875	$15,200	$15,525	$15,850	$16,175
Group C, master's degree, plus 30 credit-hours	13,915	14,240	14,565	14,890	15,215	15,540	15,865	16,190	16,515
Group D, doctor's degree	14,255	14,580	14,905	15,230	15,555	15,880	16,205	16,530	16,855
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	12,425	12,735	13,045	13,355	13,665	13,970	14,285	14,595	14,905
Group B, master's degree	13,105	13,415	13,725	14,035	14,345	14,655	14,965	15,275	15,585
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	13,445	13,755	14,065	14,375	14,685	14,995	15,305	15,615	15,925
Group D, doctor's degree	13,785	14,095	14,405	14,715	15,025	15,335	15,645	15,955	16,265
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	12,640	12,940	13,240	13,540	13,840	14,140	14,440	14,740	15,040
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	12,980	13,280	13,580	13,880	14,180	14,480	14,780	15,080	15,380
Group D, doctor's degree	13,320	13,620	13,920	14,220	14,520	14,820	15,120	15,420	15,720
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	12,170	12,460	12,750	13,040	13,330	13,620	13,910	14,200	14,490
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	12,510	12,800	13,090	13,380	13,670	13,960	14,250	14,540	14,830
Group D, doctor's degree	12,850	13,140	13,430	13,720	14,010	14,300	14,590	14,880	15,170
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	11,610	11,900	12,190	12,480	12,770	13,060	13,350	13,640	13,930
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	11,950	12,240	12,530	12,820	13,110	13,400	13,690	13,980	14,270
Group D, doctor's degree	12,290	12,580	12,870	13,160	13,450	13,740	14,030	14,320	14,610
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	10,575	10,925	11,275	11,625	11,975	12,325	12,675	13,025	13,375
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	10,915	11,265	11,615	11,965	12,315	12,665	13,015	13,365	13,715
Group D, doctor's degree	11,255	11,605	11,955	12,305	12,655	13,005	13,355	13,705	14,055
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									
Psychiatric social worker.									

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 14:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	$8,140	$8,485	$8,830	$9,175	$9,520	$9,865	$10,210	$10,555	$10,900	$11,245	$11,590	$11,935	$12,280	----------	
Group B, master's degree	8,820	9,165	9,510	9,855	10,200	10,545	10,890	11,235	11,580	11,925	12,270	12,615	12,960	----------	
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	9,160	9,505	9,850	10,195	10,540	10,885	11,230	11,575	11,920	12,265	12,610	12,955	13,300	----------	
Group D, doctor's degree	9,500	9,845	10,190	10,535	10,880	11,225	11,570	11,915	12,260	12,605	12,950	13,295	13,640	----------	
Coordinator of practical nursing.															
Census supervisor.															
Class 15:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	6,800	7,070	7,340	7,610	8,025	8,365	8,705	9,045	9,385	9,655	9,925	10,195	10,465	$11,015	$11,700
Group B, master's degree	7,480	7,750	8,020	8,290	8,705	9,045	9,385	9,725	10,065	10,335	10,605	10,875	11,145	11,695	12,380
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit-hours	7,820	8,090	8,360	8,630	9,045	9,385	9,725	10,065	10,405	10,675	10,945	11,215	11,485	12,035	12,720
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit-hours or doctor's degree	8,160	8,430	8,700	8,970	9,385	9,725	10,065	10,405	10,745	11,015	11,285	11,555	11,825	12,375	13,060
Teacher elementary and secondary schools.															
Attendance officer.															
Child labor inspectors.															
Counselor, placement.															
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, teachers college.															
Research assistant.															
School social worker.															
Speech correctionist.															
Instructor, teachers college.															
Instructor, laboratory school.															
School psychologist."															

Page 8, strike out the salary schedule beginning after line 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Salary class and group	"Classification	Per period		
		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):				
	Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist; and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	$5.39	$6.02	$6.57
	Psychiatric social worker and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	6.47	7.22	7.88
	Clinical psychologist	6.74	7.55	8.21
	Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.01	7.83	8.54
	Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools, and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.82	8.73	9.53
	Supervising director	8.09	9.03	9.86
	Principal, elementary and secondary schools	8.62	9.63	10.51
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher		5.39	6.02	6.57
Adult education schools:				
	Teacher	5.93	6.62	7.23
	Assistant principal	8.45	9.60	10.48
	Principal	9.33	10.59	11.57."

On page 9, strike out the salary schedule beginning after line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Classification	Per period		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist; and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	$5.92	$6.61	$7.21
Psychiatric social worker and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.10	7.93	8.65
Clinical psychologist	7.40	8.26	9.01
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	7.70	8.59	9.37
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools, and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8.58	9.58	10.46
Supervising director	8.88	9.92	10.82
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	9.47	10.58	11.54
Veterans' summer school centers: Teacher	5.92	6.61	7.21
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	6.51	7.27	7.93
Assistant principal	9.44	10.54	11.50
Principal	10.42	11.63	12.69."

Mr. McMILLAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the motion to recommit and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, is the amendment the gentleman has offered as a motion to recommit the same amendment which the gentleman offered during the debate on the bill which would reduce the salary structure by $200?

Mr. McMILLAN. Two hundred dollars across the board.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 32, not voting 146, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—255

Adams	Brooks	Culver
Albert	Broomfield	Cunningham
Anderson, Tenn.	Brotzman	Curtis
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brown, Calif.	Daddario
Annunzio	Brown, Mich.	Daniels
Arends	Broyhill, N.C.	Davis, Ga.
Ashley	Broyhill, Va.	Davis, Wis.
Baring	Buchanan	Dawson
Bates	Burke, Fla.	de la Garza
Battin	Burke, Mass.	Dellenback
Belcher	Burton, Calif.	Denney
Bell	Burton, Utah	Derwinski
Bennett	Bush	Devine
Betts	Cahill	Dingell
Bevill	Carter	Donohue
Biester	Casey	Dow
Blanton	Cederberg	Downing
Blatnik	Chamberlain	Dulski
Boggs	Clancy	Duncan
Boland	Clausen, Don H.	Edmondson
Bolton	Clawson, Del	Edwards, Ala.
Bray	Cleveland	Edwards, La.
Brinkley	Conte	Erlenborn
	Cowger	Esch
	Evans, Colo.	Evins, Tenn.
	Fascell	Findley
	Fisher	Foley
	Frelinghuysen	Friedel
	Fulton, Pa.	Gallagher
	Garmatz	Gilbert
	Gonzalez	Goodling
	Gray	Griffiths
	Grover	Gude
	Haley	Halleck
	Hamilton	Hammer-schmidt
	Hanley	Hanna
	Hardy	Hathaway
	Hawkins	Hays
	Hechler, W. Va.	Heckler, Mass.
	Helstoski	Henderson
	Herlong	Hicks
	Horton	Hosmer
	Hull	Hungate
	Hunt	Hutchinson
	Jarman	Joelson
	Johnson, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.
	Karsten	Karth
	Kazen	Kee
	Kelly	King, N.Y.
	Kirwan	Kleppe
	Kornegay	Kuykendall
	Kyl	Kyros
	Laird	Langen
	Latta	Leggett
	Lennon	Lipscomb
	Long, Md.	Rhodes, Ariz.
	McCarthy	Robison
	McClory	Rodino
	McCloskey	Rogers, Fla.
	McClure	Rooney, N.Y.
	McDade	Rosenthal
	McDonald, Mich.	Rostenkowski
	McEwen	Roudebush
	Macdonald, Mass.	Roush
	MacGregor	Rumsfeld
	Machen	Ruppe
	Madden	Ryan
	Mahon	St. Onge
	Marsh	Schadeberg
	Martin	Schneebeli
	Mathias, Calif.	Schweiker
	Mathias, Md.	Schwengel
	Matsunaga	Scott
	Mayne	Shipley
	Meeds	Shriver
	Meskill	Sisk
	Miller, Ohio	Skubitz
	Minish	Smith, Calif.
	Mink	Smith, Iowa
	Mize	Smith, N.Y.
	Monagan	Smith, Okla.
	Moorhead	Snyder
	Morris, N. Mex.	Springer
	Morse, Mass.	Staggers
	Morton	Stanton
	Mosher	Steed
	Moss	Steiger, Ariz.
	Murphy, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
	Myers	Stratton
	Natcher	Sullivan
	Nedzi	Talcott
	Nelsen	Taylor
	O'Hara, Ill.	Tenzer
	O'Hara, Mich.	Thompson, Ga.
	O'Konski	Thompson, N.J.
	Ottinger	Thomson, Wis.
	Patman	Tiernan
	Patten	Udall
	Pelly	Ullman
	Perkins	Utt
	Pettis	Van Deerlin
	Philbin	Vander Jagt
	Pike	Watts
	Pirnie	Whalen
	Podell	White
	Poff	Widnall
	Price, Ill.	Willis
	Price, Tex.	Winn
	Quie	Wright
	Quillen	Wyatt
	Railsback	Wylie
	Randall	Wyman
	Reid, N.Y.	Yates
	Reifel	Young
	Reuss	Zablocki
		Zion
		Zwach

NAYS—32

Abbitt	Gross	Roberts
Abernethy	Hagan	Satterfield
Ashbrook	Hall	Scherle
Cabell	McMillan	Sikes
Colmer	Mills	Teague, Tex.
Dickinson	Montgomery	Tuck
Flynt	O'Neal, Ga.	Waggonner
Fuqua	Passman	Watson
Gathings	Poage	Whitener
Gettys	Rarick	Whitten
Griffin	Rivers	

NOT VOTING—146

Adair	Aspinall	Blackburn
Addabbo	Ayres	Bolling
Anderson, Ill.	Barrett	Bow
Andrews, Ala.	Berry	Brademas
Ashmore	Bingham	Brasco
	Brock	Green, Pa.
	Brown, Ohio	Gubser
	Burleson	Gurney
	Button	Halpern
	Byrne, Pa.	Hansen, Idaho
	Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.
	Carey	Harrison
	Celler	Harsha
	Clark	Harvey
	Cohelan	Hébert
	Collier	Holifield
	Conable	Holland
	Conyers	Howard
	Corbett	Ichord
	Corman	Irwin
	Cramer	Jacobs
	Delaney	Jonas
	Dent	Jones, Ala.
	Diggs	Jones, Mo.
	Dole	Jones, N.C.
	Dorn	Kastenmeier
	Dowdy	Keith
	Dwyer	King, Calif.
	Eckhardt	Kluczynski
	Edwards, Calif.	Kupferman
	Eilberg	Landrum
	Eshleman	Lloyd
	Everett	Long, La.
	Fallon	Lukens
	Farbstein	McCulloch
	Feighan	McFall
	Fino	Mailliard
	Flood	May
	Ford, Gerald R.	Michel
	Ford, William D.	Miller, Calif.
	Fountain	Minshall
	Fraser	Moore
	Fulton, Tenn.	Morgan
	Galifianakis	Murphy, N.Y.
	Gardner	Nichols
	Giaimo	Nix
	Gibbons	Olsen
	Goodell	O'Neill, Mass.
	Green, Oreg.	Pepper
		Pickle
		Pollock
		Pool
		Pryor
		Pucinski
		Purcell
		Rees
		Reid, Ill.
		Reinecke
		Resnick
		Rhodes, Pa.
		Riegle
		Rogers, Colo.
		Ronan
		Rooney, Pa.
		Roth
		Roybal
		St Germain
		Sandman
		Saylor
		Scheuer
		Selden
		Slack
		Stafford
		Stephens
		Stubblefield
		Stuckey
		Taft
		Teague, Calif.
		Tunney
		Vanik
		Vigorito
		Waldie
		Walker
		Wampler
		Watkins
		Whalley
		Wiggins
		Williams, Pa.
		Wilson, Bob
		Wilson, Charles H.
		Wolff
		Wydler

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Olsen with Mr. Dole.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Kupferman.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Conable.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. McFall with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Burleson with Mrs. May.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Walker with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Adair.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Button.
Mr. Howard with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Wampler.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Eilberg.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Everett.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Pryor.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Purcell.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Slack.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Wolff.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Selden.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPLEMENTING THE RIOT COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate fact that many reports published by Federal agencies and commissions are neither readable nor useful. From time to time, however, we are privileged to receive a really well-done and meaningful report, and the recent report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders is such a document.

I am sure that most of the Members of Congress are familiar with this report; in my view, it should also be read by every high school student and by every American of voting age. It documents clearly the nature and extent of the problems confronting America today and demonstrates that we can no longer sit back and let tomorrow take care of today's problems. Today's problems are urgently with us today and must be dealt with today—to do otherwise would be morally irresponsible and sociologically lethal.

Action to overcome social disorder is not just a domestic problem, either. Our world leadership depends upon how well we take care of our problems at home. It is largely because we are failing on the domestic front that we find ourselves failing abroad. We established our international prestige by developing a reputation as a land of refuge from oppression, a land which offered unique freedom, equality and opportunity. Unless we continue to build upon and to justify this reputation, our international position will continue to dissipate.

In view of the pressing need for action, official apathy and indifference to the report and its recommendation are deplorable. Spokesmen for the administration have blown both hot and cold. Little visible effort has been made to implement the report. The report seems to have been relegated to the limbo which is the ultimate resting place of so many Government reports—good and bad. We cannot let this happen. We cannot afford to let it happen.

Senator BROOKE and a number of his colleagues have introduced several bills that take the initiative in implementing the recommendations of the Kerner Commission. I am privileged to have been asked to sponsor these on the House side, and to say that I am happy to do so would be an understatement. Without involving massive new Federal expenditures, this legislation will make the much-needed start to implement the Riot Commission's report through existing administrative machinery and current appropriations.

Massive new funds must soon be made available for jobs, education, and housing. We can and must do this without expanding our present Federal budget. Until that can be accomplished, however, this legislation will enable us to make a start that is probably our most meaningful to date.

The funds required to meet the sweeping challenges of our urban unrest are available within the present Federal budget—it is vital that the public understand this. The current budget shows that more than $10 billion have been allocated to such items as public works, highway construction, farm subsidies, space, and the supersonic transport. These low-priority expenditures must be curtailed and, in some cases, eliminated. I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these programs are not worthwhile. I do not suggest that under other circumstances these expenditures might not be appropriate. I do suggest that today, now, in the aftermath of extended civil disorder, with another hot summer stretching before us, a drastic reordering of our national priorities is essential—and that before we set out to create the rest of the world in our own image, we must be very certain that the image we have is worthy of recreation.

The first of these bills, Mr. Speaker—H.R. 16672—extends the 1964 Civil Rights Act antidiscrimination provisions regarding employment to State and Federal agencies and to local employment services receiving Federal assistance. At present, title VII of that act exempts such hiring practices from its purview, and I cannot see how such an action can be justified. We who pass and administer the laws should not simultaneously exempt ourselves from their operation. This is neither good citizenship nor good sense. This bill would remove that exemption.

The second bill—H.R. 16659—reaches another serious problem—this time in the ghetto. Under present law, the Small Business Act requires that loans extended by the Small Business Administration be of such sound value or so secured as to reasonably assure repayment. This is hardly objectionable as it applies in a normal situation. The ghetto today is hardly a normal situation however, and extraordinary measures are required. The application of these requirements to low-income neighborhoods effectively prohibits the granting of such loans in the places where they are most needed.

This bill would amend the Small Business Act to permit the SBA to relax its usual standards in certain defined high-risk areas to identify acceptable credit risks in these areas. The development of stable businesses in ghettos, assisted by SBA loans, will provide additional stability to these communities and should also help to freeze out the profiteers and operators who exploit the disadvantaged by selling them inferior goods at exorbitant prices.

The third bill—H.R. 16660—reaches into yet another critical area for the underprivileged. A number of school districts in our Nation have just a few underprivileged students and are entitled to and receive assistance under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some of these school systems, are, indeed, in my own district. The standards of eligibility in title I are based primarily upon the presence of these children; the result is that communities with excellent school systems are receiving this assistance when it is so badly needed elsewhere. My bill, therefore, changes the distribution formula to restrict title I funds to the communities and school systems which need them the most. It does so by excluding from eligibility for grants those communities with less than 10 percent of their children in the disadvantaged category.

The fourth piece of legislation—House Concurrent Resolution 764—attacks another problem, welfare assistance. The welfare system of this country has grown by fits and starts. There is no logical consistency to its various components; nor do we really know the extent to which the system operates to meet the legitimate needs of the people it was set up to help. Statistically, it appears costly and wasteful. It perpetuates itself, making people dependent on public assistance instead of helping them to become self-sufficient.

We all can look at the welfare situation and see specific instances where it is not working properly. Urgent action for revision is required. To do so soundly, we need to know more about the reasons

for failure of the present system and study the various proposals that have been made for changing it. The measure I am sponsoring, therefore, provides for the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Social Welfare, responsible for examining present and proposed welfare programs. The committee would be instructed to report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1969, making such recommendations as may be appropriate. The results of such a study should permit this Congress to meaningfully evaluate the Federal public assistance program, and to take steps to bring order out of what, even charitably, we can only call chaos.

We are long past the time when we can pretend that this Nation's urban ills either do not exist or that they will go away through some mystical process of attrition. Discrimination in employment, lack of proper education, shortages of decent, sanitary housing—these and the myriad other problems of our cities and our suburbs can only be solved through a dramatically renewed commitment to the American ideals of freedom, justice, and opportunity. The measures I am sponsoring with Senator BROOKE take a first step in the right direction.

The task remaining far exceeds the task undertaken here. I am working on a series of additional bills to put flesh on the proposed skeleton of revised national priorities. One measure that suggests itself immediately is an expansion of responsibility and funds for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This Commission and its Chairman, Clifford Alexander, have been doing splendid work and should be encouraged to do even more. Beyond this, what is needed are specific measures attacking specific urban problems. I believe these problems should be tied to the source from which funding would be obtained—a job stimulation program tied to a cut in space appropriations, an education or housing or welfare program tied to elimination of specific special interest expense or tax subsidies, and so forth—to confront the Congress and the public with the choice of priorities. If the choice can be made clear enough, the answers will be the right answers—of this I am confident.

Mr. Speaker, the time for inaction has passed, if, in fact, we ever had the luxury of such time. To delay longer is to invite disaster. I urge prompt action on this legislation.

OLD DOC MARTIN'S MAGIC ELIXIR

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, five members of the Federal Reserve Board last Thursday afternoon forced another draft of their favorite cure-all down the throats of the American people.

For the third time in 5 months, these members detected an alarming rise in the temperature of the economy. They promptly poured out another brimming spoonful of Old Doc Martin's handy-dandy elixir for all complaints known to man or beast: A raise in the discount rate.

The trouble with Old Doc Martin's elixir is that it does nothing but raise the price of money. And high-priced money inevitably produces nothing but high-priced goods and services for the American people.

This time around, Old Doc and his colleagues were not content just to create higher prices for everybody. They also wanted to take a little of the sting out of their medicine for big businesses and large corporations. And so they raised the certificate of deposit rate to a new high of 6¼ percent on CD's of $100,000 or more.

This little pinch of antidote eases the pain for big banks by allowing them to pay more money to hold onto their certificates of deposit. It helps the big corporations with large amounts of retained earnings and treasuries full of liquid funds. But small businesses and individuals with small savings are stung.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have been gargling Old Doc Martin's remedy for nigh on to 17 years. The only thing they have to show for it is a bill for more than $43 billion in excess interest costs paid on the Federal debt since 1951.

Let me make that clear to everybody. If interest rates had been held to their 1951 levels, or even to the levels of the first quarter of 1953, the interest cost on the national debt over the past 17 years would have been $116.8 billion. But with the help of Old Doc's remedy, the interest cost for those years has been pushed to $160 billion.

As I said before the Congress recessed early this month, a better remedy would be an equitable tax increase. It would take purchasing power from business and consumers alike. It might sting a little, but it would be effective.

Up to this moment, the Congress has failed to act on a tax increase. I think the Congress should put Old Doc Martin's magic elixir back on the shelf and approve a tax increase.

BOB GOALBY—MASTERS CHAMPION

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to note that the coveted green jacket, emblematic of victory in the prestigious Masters Golf Tournament, is now worn by one of my constituents, Mr. Bob Goalby of Belleville, Ill. On Easter Sunday, the 37-year-old pro shot a 6-under-par 66 for a four-round total of 277, bringing him the 32d Masters Golf Tournament championship.

One of last year's leading money winners, Bob Goalby has now joined that select circle of golfing greats with his 11-under-par score. Bob Goalby, always a great golfer, has now been accorded golf's greatest championship.

Throughout his 11-year pro career in which he has earned over $320,000, Bob Goalby has been considered one of the fine touring pros who could win any given tournament. Past winner of the Los Angeles and San Diego Opens, among others, his performance in the Masters tournament at Augusta, Ga., confirms this contention. It should be noted in fact that he is only one of five Masters winners to shoot below par golf for all four rounds.

Previously selected for the U.S. Ryder Cup team, Bob Goalby has now earned himself a distinct place in American golf. Because of his outstanding performance I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the Belleville News Democrat's account of his win:

EXCITING EASTER FOR GOALBY CLAN

A belated but exciting—and brief—Easter celebration was in progress late today at the home of Mr. and Mrs. George Goalby, parents of the 1968 Masters golf champion.

Bob Goalby, who captured the coveted and prestigious title yesterday at Augusta, Ga., reached his home shortly after noon today. He was met at St. Louis Lambert Airport by his parents and his wife, Sara and their two sons who had touched-down just 15 minutes earlier on a flight from Little Rock, Ark., where Mrs. Bob Goalby and children had spent the Easter weekend with her parents.

A delegation of Belleville area residents, many of them longtime fans and followers of Bob Goalby, were on hand at the airport as a semi-official welcoming committee. The group organized hastily this morning when it was learned that Goalby would return to his home here for a few days before resuming his professional golf chores. Bob Gaiswinkler represented Mayor Charles E. Nichols in presenting a key to the city.

As the Masters' champion he will play this week in the $150,000 Tournament of Champions at Las Vegas, Nev. Only 26 golfers have qualified for this event. An even more exclusive tournament will be held in September on the Firestone Course at Akron, Ohio. Entered will be Goalby plus the winners of the U.S. Open, PGA Tournament and British Open. These four will split a $77,000 purse.

Mrs. George Goalby told the News-Democrat this morning she and her husband were "just too excited," to get much sleep last night.

"We're both so happy for Bob, we hardly know what to say," said Mrs. Goalby.

The telephone at the residence was kept busy until late last night by local area well-wishers who called to express congratulations after watching the exciting final round of the tournament on nationwide television.

Bob himself was caught in a sea of public acclaim at exclusive Augusta National Golf Course. Hemmed in by reporters from all parts of the nation and overseas, Goalby later was feted at a special dinner. It was after midnight before he returned to his motel and had a few minutes to telephone his family.

Besides the $20,000 first prize money and the traditional "green coat" of the Masters Champion, Goalby received a silver plaque, a gold medal, a gold locket containing a picture of Bobby Jones, founder and designer of the Augusta National, and life-time playing privileges at the Augusta National which is the most exclusive and autocratic golf course in the United States. Along with these prizes go scores of endorsement opportunity. This factor has prompted many of the top professional golfers to tab the Masters "a million-dollar prize."

Goalby, who entered Sunday's final round just one stroke behind the lead, quickly drew a large gallery. He received a noisy standing ovation when he dropped a four-foot putt under extreme pressure for a par 4 on the final hole.

Earlier in the tourney, however, it had been a different story. On Thursday and Friday, for example, Goalby's "gallery consisted of just two—P. J. Keeley, a crack amateur of Belleville and his 11-year-old son, Mark, long-time personal friends and fans of Goalby. Ironically, Keeley defeated Goalby, 149 to 153 in last year's St. Clair Country Club Open tournament long considered Goalby's personal title.

The Belleville pro has been hampered for weeks by a painful elbow injury suffered this fall while playing football at his home here during the pro-tour "vacation." The former University of Illinois quarterback told the News-Democrat that he had been under treatment for several weeks for the muscle injury caused when he attempted to pass a football left-handed.

Goalby left Belleville early last week for a few rounds of practice during which he worked on a new swing—one with a higher arc—to compensate for the defective arm muscle. He shot an opening round 70 and was dubbed a "darkhorse" for the title when he came back with another 70 on Friday and moved into contention with a 71 on Saturday. His 6-under-par 66 on Sunday took the prize.

MARINE OFFICER FROM SECOND DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS AGAIN CITED FOR SERVICES IN VIETNAM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 it was my privilege and pleasure to nominate for admission to the West Point Military Academy Larned U. Bearce, who was graduated in 1959 and commissioned a first lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps.

In 1964 Bearce, then a Marine Corps captain assigned as an adviser to the Republic of South Vietnam, was cited for exceptional services and bravery measuring to the highest standards of the Marines.

I am proud and, happy to announce that my appointee of 13 years ago, now Major Bearce, has again been cited, receiving a gold star in lieu of a second Bronze Star Medal, for meritorious service in connection with operations against insurgent Communist forces in Vietnam.

Maj. Larned U. Bearce, presently group supply officer with Headquarters and Headquarters Squadron 38, at El Toro, served as supply officer and subsequently as executive officer of the 3d Antitank Battalion in Vietnam from March 22 to December 5, 1967. The citation reads:

As supply officer, he displayed exceptional skill and initiative in supplying the battalion's widely dispersed unit. With complete disregard for his own safety, he regularly visited each unit in the field to assess the logistical situation and provide assistance wherever needed.

In addition, Maj. Bearce rendered valuable assistance to the battalion commander and company commanders during Ontos reconnaissance missions over vast areas of adverse terrain. He assisted in establishing and improving the defensive perimeter at the Gia Le combat base.

Reassigned as battalion executive officer on November 21, 1967, Maj. Bearce continued to perform his duties in an exemplary manner.

HEMISFAIR'S U.S. PAVILION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, HemisFair 1968 opened on April 6. My colleagues in the House supported my bills which made it possible for the United States to build a most impressive pavilion at the exposition. Those who have seen the pavilion are almost universally impressed with it. Not only is this a beautiful building, but it will be a lasting one, for after HemisFair closes the permament structure will be turned over for a permanent public use.

There have been some unkind remarks about the principal feature of the U.S. exhibit, which is a film called "U.S." The film seeks to portray the message of HemisFair, which is that there has been in this country a confluence of civilizations. Many people from many lands built our country, and left behind them a legacy of which we are justly proud. We are harvesting the fruits of that legacy today, and look forward to the proud promise of tomorrow. The film shows this land as it really is, including our problems as well as our achievements. It is an honest account, one of which the viewer sees himself. One representative of a foreign country said that the film so moved him that he wished that he were an American. There can be no finer tribute than that.

Mr. Speaker, I place two articles regarding this exhibit in the RECORD, since I know my colleagues will be interested:

[From the San Antonio Express/News, Apr. 7, 1968]

U.S. PAVILION BIG HIT; FAIRGOERS LEAVE SMILING

(By Jerry Lochbaum)

The United States Pavilion would have to rate as one of the hits of HemisFair's opening day.

People started crowding up before the imposing marble and glass Confluence Theater and its companion Exhibits Building shortly after fair gates opened at 9 a.m., wanting to see both the federal exhibit and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, who was to dedicate it.

In keeping with the generally amiable spirit of the day, most people took good-naturedly the news they would have to wait, reported one policeman. Most scattered to see other sights and came back later.

They waited until 11:30 to see the dedication ceremonies, standing in large crowds outside the Migration Courtyard area between the two buildings which was roped off for invited guests.

They waited until 2:30 before the pavilion was opened to the general public. Then they lined up in impressive numbers to get in.

And they came out smiling.

In groups small enough for guides to cope with, they went through the Exhibits Building.

People of one group, trailed by a listening reporter, visibly picked up enthusiasm as they were shown exhibits pointing up the pavilion's three-part theme of America's legacy, harvest and promise.

After being reminded of the confluence of immigrants who built the nation, they moved into the harvest area, seeing exhibits on food, on technological progress, on recreation.

One man's attention was grabbed by a display of foods of foreign origin, now Americanized. "Hm," he said, "I never thought of that."

Others were intrigued by a sports display, with such items as Joe Louis' boxing gloves and Knute Rockne's old-style football helmet.

Pointing at an antiquated typewriter in a display contrasting old and new equipment of various kinds, one woman laughed and said to her husband: "That's just like the one we have at home."

One item in the same case was identified by the guide as the space helmet worn by Astronaut John Glenn.

An awed, low-voiced exclamation burst from one woman's lips: "John Glenn's helmet!"

Then came the "promise" section, where a touring group is split into three parts, passing through corridors posing sharp questions: Is it my responsibility? Why stay in school? Am I a part of the problem? Am I a part of the solution?

This section on America's promise, more challenge than forecast, draws a separated group back together, confronting each individual with a mirrored view of himself. There were smiles in the group, and thoughtful expressions.

Explaining exhibits on challenges facing America in fields from urban planning to education, guide Norma Perez couldn't help exclaiming: "I get all excited every time I come through here." People in her tour group grinned back at her as though they knew what she meant.

Then, they saw a short film contrasting the swift surprise of an act of God with the gradual devastation of acts of man, and underscoring problems of pollution, hunger, riots.

It left the group with the question of whether men can solve the problems men have created, and a suggestion that they can.

Thus primed people go in groups to see the 23-minute documentary "US," in the round Confluence Theater, 70 feet high, 195 feet in diameter, a majestic structure which itself drew visible visitor admiration.

This film, work of Academy-Award-winning producer Francis Thompson covers the same three theme points, with stronger impact.

Dramatic effect of walls rising to disclose a great 37-by-140-foot screen midway through the presentation, and the story of beauty and ugliness told through imaginative photography, combine to make the film a stirring experience.

Ending on an inconclusive note of problems still to be solved, it nevertheless seemed more to impress and please than to upset, judging by comments overheard in an audience departing the theater.

"Woooo!" exclaimed one young man. "That was really something." "Oh, it was wonderful," said an exiting woman to an acquaintance outside. "I thought it was intriguing," a man told his wife. "Beautiful!" one woman said.

After an earlier VIP showing, one out-of-town reporter asked another how she liked the film. "It was too loud," she said. "It gave me a headache." He replied: "It was supposed to."

Two foreign newsmen of the party accompanying Mrs. Johnson exchanged views in Spanish. They were impressed, especially, with the objective look America takes at itself in the movie, at both the good and the bad.

[From the San Antonio Light-Sun, Apr. 7, 1968]

U.S. PAVILION DRAWS LARGEST CROWD

(By Don Gardner)

After years of preparation and congressional legislation, the United States Pavilion was dedicated by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and opened to the public at noon Saturday.

The largest crowd of opening day gathered as Mrs. Johnson stood on the steps of the Confluence Theater to open the $8 million structure.

A throng of people packed the pavilion courtyard and spilled across old Goliad Street and onto the ramp that leads to the Arena. The crowd was estimated at 15,000.

SECRET SERVICE

Surrounded by Secret Service men and about 100 members of the press corps, Mrs. Johnson first toured the exhibit building of the U.S. Pavilion. She conversed with several of the guides and hostesses about the exhibits.

At the dedication ceremonies, Secretary of Commerce C. R. Smith, whose department is in charge of the pavilion, introduced Mrs. Johnson.

"This is a proud and happy day for me," Mrs. Johnson said. "HemisFair is the kind of 'happening' that gives a lift to the spirits and makes us all glad to be alive."

She said the U.S. Pavilion "shows the spirit and character and shared heritage that have shaped our country."

FACES OF LEGACY

"Inside this pavilion, we find the faces of our legacy. Aboard the All People's Ship all visitors can share and feel the aspirations and friendship that have united us since the days when explorers, traders, and missionaries arrived in the New World."

She received spontaneous applause from the crowd when she said: "We come through this voyage from the past to the future certain of a feeling that we must care, and if we care enough, we will have the power to solve and to heal.

"The promise of the future is also a challenge for a new confluence, vaster in scope than any that has preceded it—the sharing of assets for the true benefit of all men, rich and poor, old and young, all races, all nations."

COMING BACK

Mrs. Johnson said she wants "to see everything" and "I look forward to coming back at a more leisurely hour."

Then the First Lady pushed a button that started the horizontal fountain in the courtyard.

The official party then entered the Confluence Theater to view Francis Thompson's documentary "U.S."

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am today calling on the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee to hold public hearings at once on the law enforcement recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders—the Kerner Commission—and the related proposals of the President's Crime Commission.

We are determined that civil disorders will not break out again. But we should be sure that every American city is completely ready for such tragedies in case they should recur.

The disorders of this month have reopened discussion of many questions:

How can we find out in advance when tensions grows in a troubled neighborhood?

How can groups be calmed and tense situations defused?

How can enough police—and troops, if needed—be called fast enough to contain trouble?

What is the best way to minimize deaths, injuries, and property damage?

How effective are antiriot, disorderly conduct and weapons control laws? Should they be improved?

What guidelines should police and troops be given for arrests, crowd control, investigations, and the use of force?

Is National Guard and Army planning adequate?

How can justice be administered sensibly in such emergencies? What procedures should courts follow on arraignment, detention, bail, and trials and sentencing?

The Kerner Commission studied all of these questions; the National Crime Commission also dealt with some of them. Many jurisdictions have planned well and met challenges admirably, but it is clear that few cities and States have had the time or resources to prepare for every possibility.

The House Judiciary Committee should now review the two Commission's findings; the experience of many cities and States and the Federal Government; the progress which has been made, and the problems which remain.

In such an inquiry, the committee should seek testimony from many sources, including the Department of Justice, the Armed Forces and National Guard, State officials, and above all the mayors, chiefs of police, and judicial officers of many cities, including Baltimore, Washington, New York, Chicago, and Pittsburgh. Comment from informed citizens should also be encouraged.

Using the reports of the two Commissions as a starting point, we could then find out what reforms and advances have proved effective, what new Federal legislation might be desirable, and what lessons from individual areas would be helpful nationwide.

Our intent should be not to fix any blame, but to help every city become better prepared. Our responsibility is to do all we can to insure that, if such disorders should recur, personal injury and property damage will be minimized and full protection and enforcement of the laws will be maintained.

THE BACONE COLLEGE SINGERS APPEAR ON CAPITOL STEPS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most impressive singing groups won the hearts of many in Washington last Wednesday, with three separate performances, one of which was given on the steps of the Capitol itself.

Oklahoma's famous Bacone College choral group, directed by Miss Jeannine Rainwater, was outstanding in its Capitol appearance and also in presentations before the Daughters of the American Revolution and the First Baptist Church of Washington. Accompanied by President Garold Holstine of Bacone College, and by Mrs. Holstine, members of the singing group were honored guests at a reception given by the Oklahoma congressional delegation last Wednesday, following their concert on the Capitol steps.

In their colorful costumes, some of them in the traditional dress of the various Indian tribes represented, the Bacone singers are a striking group of young Americans, and all Oklahomans are proud of them.

Bacone College, a 2-year coeducational institution of higher learning, located at Muskogee, Okla., has drawn to its campus Indians from all over the United States, but has a student body which includes many non-Indians as well. It is currently engaged in an expansion program and expects to be a 4-year college in the near future.

The Bacone singers are only one of a number of student activities and organizations helping to win national fame for this fine institution, and their recent stop in Washington is another forward step.

HOME FALLOUT PROTECTION SURVEY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during our Easter recess, the Governors of Virginia and Maryland; and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, on April 16, announced the beginning of the home fallout protection survey in their respective jurisdictions. The home fallout protection survey is sponsored jointly by the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, and State and local governments.

Members of the Congress living in one-, two-, or three-family dwellings in the Washington metropolitan area have received, or will soon receive, a questionnaire by mail, or will be contacted by a Bureau of Census enumerator.

Apartments, clubs, and hotels, in which other Members live, have been surveyed through the national fallout shelter survey in the same manner as all the Capitol Hill buildings in which we work.

The national fallout shelter survey of large existing buildings, begun in 1961, is continuing, and to date has identified fallout shelter space for 170,000,000 American people. This lifesaving space, however, is not always well located in relation to where people live, learn, and work.

The home fallout protection survey extends to householders the opportunity

to learn the degree of fallout protection afforded in their homes on a census confidential basis, and how to increase their protection as needed. The survey aids the local governments in telling their people where to go and what to do in the event of an attack, by providing area summaries of the protection which exists in residential areas.

The home fallout protection survey has been completed in 22 States and is in process or scheduled to begin in five States and the District of Columbia. The response of the American people to this practical, low-cost program has been gratifying. Almost 80 percent of the householders receiving a mail questionnaire have responded to the survey. All householders responding and enumerated have received information on the degree of protection afforded in their homes.

I urge the participation of all Members of Congress receiving the survey questionnaire in the Washington area and in their home States.

CIVIL DEFENSE REMAINS VITAL, LYNDON WARNS—REAPPOINTS MEMBERS OF ADVISORY BOARD

(By Robert Young)

AUSTIN, TEX., April 13—President Johnson said today that civil defense to protect the population in the event of a nuclear attack is still established national policy and the "clear and compelling" responsibility of federal, state, and local governments.

Johnson, spending the Easter week-end at his Texas ranch, announced reappointments to the national civil defense advisory council.

The council, headed by Price Daniel, director of the office of emergency planning, was established in 1951 to advise on civil defense and preparations for dealing with nonmilitary emergencies.

"WORKING FOR PEACE

"While we are working for peace and hope that there never will be an attack upon this country, it has been the long-established policy of our nation to maintain both military and nonmilitary preparedness," Johnson said.

"Additional [nuclear] fallout protection for our citizens and complementary preparedness programs will continue to strengthen our strategic defense posture.

"These preparations will also increase the effectiveness of state and local governments in coping with natural disasters. In time of emergency, what matters most is advance preparation."

Johnson emphasized that national security requires an effective partnership between federal, state, and local governments—that the national advisory council and federal government cannot do the job alone.

CALLS ON MAYORS, GOVERNORS

Governors and mayors, he added, "should continue to discharge their clear and compelling responsibility for leadership in civil defense and emergency preparedness."

Johnson reappointed Mayor Joseph M. Barr of Pittsburgh and Mayor Thomas G. Currigan of Denver to three-year terms on the 13-member civil defense advisory council. He appointed Mayor John H. Reading of Oakland, Cal., to fill a vacancy on the council. Gov. Kerner of Illinois is a member of the council, as well as the governors of New Jersey and Arkansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN, for April 22 only, on account of official business.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of April 22, on account of official business.

Mr. WALKER, for Thursday, April 25 through Sunday, April 28, 1968, to attend annual meeting of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo., representing Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman, Armed Services Committee.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL, for 1 hour, on May 20; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYATT.
Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.
Mr. SAYLOR.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. NELSEN in two instances.
Mr. DENNEY.
Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.
Mr. UTT.
Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. ESCH in two instances.
Mr. BELCHER.
Mr. FINDLEY in two instances.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.
Mr. WYMAN in three instances.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mrs. BOLTON.
Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
Mr. DENT in three instances.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. REUSS in six instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. MARSH in three instances.
Mr. BOGGS.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. BARING.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. HELSTOSKI.
Mr. WRIGHT.
Mrs. KELLY in three instances.
Mr. BRINKLEY.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. ALBERT.
Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. HATHAWAY.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. FUQUA in two instances.
Mr. BEVILL in two instances.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. DE LA GARZA in two instances.
Mr. TENZER in five instances.
Mr. FRASER in two instances.
Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
Mr. DOWNING in two instances.
Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in four instances.
Mr. DOW.
Mr. RYAN in two instances.
Mr. TUCK in two instances.
Mr. PHILBIN in three instances.
Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. Moss in three instances.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 15398. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1229. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 234. An act for the relief of James W. Adams and others;

S. 375. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 1664. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; and

S. 2912. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on the following dates, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 11, 1968:

H.J. Res. 1223. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period the 7-percent excise tax rate on automobiles and the 10-percent excise tax rate on communication services; and

H.J. Res. 1229. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

On April 19, 1968:

H.R. 7909. An act for the relief of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. of New York, N.Y.

H.R. 9473. An act to amend provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a common carrier by water in foreign commerce or conference of such carriers to refund a portion of the freight charges;

H.R. 12019. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the B'nai B'rith Henry Monsky Foundation in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 14401. An act to grant the masters of certain United States vessels a lien on those vessels for their wages.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 23, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1967, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following reports for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1968.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In compliance with Section 4(a) of Public Law 85–804, the calendar year 1967 report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense is transmitted herewith.

Table I shows that 347 contractual actions were approved with a cost to the Government of $4,098,000, and that 116 actions were disapproved. Included in the number of actions approved are 113 actions for which a potential Government liability cannot be estimated. Also included are two actions for the sale of Government petroleum products to foreign contractors for use in Government construction.

Reported also in Table I are 49 actions for the Department of the Army using the authority of Public Law 85–804 to require a standard employee compensation clause in all contracts for construction work at the Cape Kennedy complex. The clause specified various items of compensation based on a Project Stabilization Agreement negotiated by and between the Patrick Air Force Base Contractors Association, the Brevard (Fla.) Building and Construction Trades Council and the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO. Adoption of this clause resulted from a determination that adherence to the money provisions of the Project Stabilization Agreement by all contractors and subcontractors performing work at the Patrick Air Force Base and Cape Kennedy complex is desirable in the interest of prompt and orderly performance of construction contracts at these sites.

Table II lists the actions which have an actual or potential cost to the Government of $50,000 or more. Included in this list are the above mentioned contingent liabilities for which a potential dollar cost cannot be estimated.

Sincerely,

THOMAS D. MORRIS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics.

TABLE I.—SUMMARY REPORT OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE, JANUARY–DECEMBER 1967

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Department and type of action	Actions approved			Actions denied	
	Number	Amount requested	Amount approved	Number	Amount
Department of Defense, Total	347	$5,879	$4,098	116	$12,476
Amendments without consideration	5	4,012	2,340	39	10,080
Correction of mistakes	141	1,417	1,321	70	1,829
Formalization of informal commitments	32	450	437	7	567
Contingent liabilities	113				
Disposition of property	2				
Other	54				
Army, total	91	4,399	2,706	19	8,627
Amendments without consideration	2	3,468	1,796	8	7,549
Correction of mistakes	9	583	574	8	690
Formalization of informal commitments	21	348	336	3	388
Contingent liabilities	8				
Disposition of property	2				
Other (employee compensation clauses ASPR 18-703.2)	49				
Navy, total	103	926	889	12	1,509
Amendments without consideration	1	500	500	4	1,230
Navy—Continued					
Correction of mistakes	26	$339	$302	8	$279
Formalization of informal commitments	7	87	87		
Contingent liabilities	69				
Air Force, total	83	201	175	46	1,761
Amendments without consideration	2	44	44	24	999
Correction of mistakes	38	152	126	18	583
Formalization of informal commitments	2	5	5	4	179
Contingent liabilities	36				
Other (contract modification or termination)	5				
Defense Supply Agency, total	70	353	328	39	579
Amendments without consideration				3	302
Correction of mistakes	68	343	319	36	277
Formalization of informal commitments	2	10	9		

TABLE II.—LIST OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS WITH ACTUAL OR POTENTIAL COST OF $50,000 OR MORE TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE, JANUARY–DECEMBER 1967

Name and location of contractor	Actual or estimated potential cost	Description of product or service	Justification
Amendments without consideration:			
Army:			
Siltronics, Inc., 140 Pennsylvania Ave. Oakmont, Pa.	$1,500,000	Prefabricated and portable shelters	The contractor experienced difficulty in meeting the specifications for the shelters and became delinquent on the delivery schedule. Due to these difficulties the contractor has incurred considerable losses. By the time the contract is complete the company's productive capabilities would be permanently impaired. The shelters are to be used to house electronic equipment which has been contracted for and is being delivered. This equipment cannot be used without the shelter. Procurement from another source would entail a delay which the Army cannot afford and result in a purchase cost greater than that required to obtain the undelivered shelters. In addition, the failure of this company would result in the loss of progress payments outstanding to this company.
Aeronca, Inc., Germantown Rd. Middletown, Ohio.	296,236	HAWK shelters	Aeronca, Inc., as a subcontractor for Raytheon, was to supply 195 shelters to house electronic equipment for the HAWK missile system. A ceiling of $10,000 per shelter was arbitrarily imposed by the contracting officer prior to receiving from Raytheon any data as to the cost involved. It has been determined that this action caused the contractor to receive less than what it would have received without the ceiling.
Navy: Dayton Aviation & Radio Equipment Corp., Inc., Troy, Ohio.	500,000	AN/SRR-19 Low frequency radio receiving sets.	The AN/SRR-19 is an essential communications element of the U.S. Navy Fleet. In the event this company should fail to complete its contract there would be many months delay in obtaining an alternate producer. Such delay would be detrimental to the national defense. It is necessary that financial relief be granted in order to provide for the continued performance by the contractor.
Correction of mistakes:			
Army: Midland Contractors, Post Office Box 1360, Columbus, Ga.	491,151	Construction of phase I, Titan II launch facilities near Little Rock AFB, Ark.	Before the opening of the bid the Government changed the specifications and failed to properly set forth the requirement for the use of concrete as backfill for the electric cable pit and ventilation shafts. The contractor bid on the project on the assumption that dirt would be used but he was required to furnish concrete.
Defense Supply Agency: The Gillette Co., Prudential Tower Bldg., Boston, Mass.	140,461	Razor blades	To correct a mutual mistake in bid because of a misplaced decimal point in the unit price.

TABLE II.—LIST OF CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS WITH ACTUAL OR POTENTIAL COST OF $50,000 OR MORE TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE, JANUARY-DECEMBER 1967—Continued

Name and location of contractor	Actual or estimated potential cost	Description of product or service	Justification
Formalization of Informal Commitment, Army: Government of the Republic of Vietnam (GORVN).	$143,478	Technicians for the Military Assistance Command Vietnam from July 1, 1966, through January 19, 1967.	The U.S. Army, since 1956, has made available to the Republic of Vietnam (RVN) funds from which RVN obtained technical training for members of its armed forces. These funds were authorized pursuant to the foreign technicians program. The U.S. Army's obligation to RVN has been set out by contract since 1963. These contracts have been on a year-to-year basis expiring on June 30 of each year. Although authority was granted to enter into a new contract for fiscal year 1967, a new contract was not signed until January 20, 1967. In the meantime the services were continued.
Italian Air Ministry, Republic of Italy	139,018	Transmission and storage of petroleum products.	The United States and Italian Governments entered into an agreement on October 29, 1959, relating to the "operation and maintenance of the NATO pipeline system in Italy." The negotiations for a definitive contract were delayed and the U.S. Government used the pipeline without contractual coverage. This amount represents the U.S. Government's share of the expenses incurred from April 29, 1960, until the execution of the contract.

CONTINGENT LIABILITIES

Provisions to indemnify contractors against liabilities on account of claims for death or injury or property damage arising out of nuclear radiation, use of high energy propellants, or other risks not covered by the contractor's insurance program were included in 113 contracts (the potential cost of these liabilities cannot be estimated inasmuch as the liability to the Government, if any, will depend upon the occurrence of an incident as described in the indemnification clause). Items procured are generally those associated with nuclear-powered vessels, nuclear armed guided missiles experimental work with nuclear energy, handling of explosives or performance in hazardous areas]

Name of contractor	Number of contracts		
	Army	Navy	Air Force
Aerojet General Corp			7
Air America, Inc			1
AVCO Corp		1	
Boeing Co			10
California Nuclear, Inc		1	
Combustion Engineering, Inc		1	
Equipment, Inc	2		
General Dynamics Corp		7	
General Electric Co		14	1
Hercules, Inc		1	3
Honeywell, Inc		1	
Interstate Industrial Uniform Rental Service		2	
Lockheed Aircraft Corp		23	
Martin Marietta Corp			4
Meadow Gold Dairies, Hawaii, Ltd	1		
Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co		2	
North American Rockwell Corp		6	4
Pan American World Airways			1
Raytheon Co		5	
Ryan Aeronautical Co			1
Thiokol Chemical Corp			2
Vitro Corp. of America		1	
Western Electric Co., Inc	2		2
Westinghouse Electric Corp		4	
Proposed Awards	3		
Total	8	69	36

Note: In addition to the above, indemnification clauses will be inserted into all air transportation contracts entered into by the Military Airlift Command for transportation services to be performed by air carriers which own or control aircraft which have been allocated by the Department of Transportation to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1746. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on a study of the administration of training programs, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-787; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1747. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of appropriated funds to support Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps exchanges in certain situations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1748. A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ending March 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1749. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1750. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1967-February 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1751. A letter from the Director, District Unemployment Compensation Board, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Board for the year 1967, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1752. A letter from the Commissioner, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit extortion by means of telephone, telegraph, radio, oral or written message, or otherwise, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1753. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Third Annual Report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-10; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1754. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Bonneville Power Administration for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-448; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1755. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 33d annual report of the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the Communications Satellite Act of 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1756. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend 28 U.S.C. 753(e) to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1757. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to correct certain deficiencies in the law relating to the theft and passing of U.S. money orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1758. A letter from the treasurer, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1967 pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75-358; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, during calendar year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1760. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1761. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report in a certain case involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1762. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according the beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality

Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1763. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1967; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1764. A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the life of the Advisory Commission on Parcel Distribution Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1765. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the problems of providing visitor transportation in the vicinity of the Capitol, the Mall, and the proposed Visitor Center complex, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90–264; to the Committee on Public Works.

1766. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for implementing conventions for free admission of professional equipment and containers, and for ATA, ECS and TIR carnets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1767. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue until the close of June 30, 1970, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 16651. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of a multilevel parking facility in connection with the Federal building, 300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 16652. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 16653. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 16654. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1970, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 16655. A bill to provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 16656. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 16657. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 16658. A bill to prohibit political influence in the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 16659. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to apply an acceptable credit risk standard for loans to small business concerns in certain high-risk areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16660. A bill to alter the method of distribution of funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 16661. A bill to repeal the Civil Rights Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16662. A bill to impose import limitations on fresh, prepared, or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 16663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 16665. A bill to assure to every American a full opportunity to have adequate employment, housing, and education, free from any discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 16666. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit enterprises of gambling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. OLSEN):

H.R. 16667. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 16668. A bill making an appropriation for the appointment of certain additional personnel in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 16669. A bill making an appropriation for the appointment of 100 additional enforcement agents in the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 16670. A bill to establish a commission to plan a permanent memorial to the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 16671. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other statutes to provide a new maritime program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 16672. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide for the application of such title to State and Federal employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. BURTON of California, and Mr. REID of New York):

H.R. 16673. A bill to set forth a congressional statement on a national educational policy and to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate a comprehensive study on the formulation of a plan to implement such policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 16674. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, to improve the capitalization of Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 1231. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the existing compensation system for motor vehicle accident losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HATHAWAY (for himself, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. POLANCO-ABREU):

H.J. Res. 1232. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary funding of the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.J. Res. 1233. Joint resolution to provide for a study and evaluation of scientific research in medicine in the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 764. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Social Welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

335. By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the second session of the 31st Oklahoma Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to support the Soil Conservation Service through the appropriation of adequate funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

336. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the establishment of an insurance fund for offshore oil leasing; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

337. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to expressing the gratitude and appreciation of all inhabitants of the territory for the visits to Guam in January 1968 of delegations of the House and Senate; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

338. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to incorporating the territory of Guam into the American Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

339. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to certification by the Civil Aeronautics Board of a U.S. air carrier to provide direct nonstop service between the State of Hawaii and the country of Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

340. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to a study of immigration into Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

341. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, relative to a method of Federal financing of airports, and to establish guidelines for State and local subdivisions to follow in the expansion of airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

342. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, relative to liberalizing the stringent provisions of the Hatch Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

343. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to legislation providing that World War I veterans receive the same benefits as Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 16675. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cerin and Mafalda Cerin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 16676. A bill for the relief of Josephat Ahing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 16677. A bill for the relief of Franco Affinati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16678. A bill for the relief of Murat Caglar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16679. A bill for the relief of Antonio Campana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16680. A bill for the relief of Maria Martinangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 16681. A bill for the relief of Lauro Alfonso Ochoa Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16682. A bill for the relief of George Yuan Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R.16683. A bill for the relief of Isidro M. Jimenez (also known as Sid Jimenez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 16684. A bill for the relief of Anna Giovine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 16685. A bill for the relief of Arnold Gerardo Borrego-Suero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 16686. A bill for the relief of Louie Yi Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16687. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Lo Bello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16688. A bill for the relief of Remedios De Guzman Mislang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16689. A bill for the relief of Keh-Hsin Shen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 16690. A bill for the relief of Maria David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 16691. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis N. Iliopoidos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 16692. A bill for the relief of Francesco and Giovanna Carini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16693. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pereira Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 16694. A bill for the relief of Ioannis (John) Gioulis, Despina Gioulis, his wife, and Helen Gioulis, Nicholas Gioulis and Prodromos-Ioannis Gioulis, his minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 16695. A bill for the relief of Christos Panagiotacopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 16696. A bill for the relief of Cirino Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16697. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vijay Shiv Hiremath; to the Commmittee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 16698. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Jerzy Gulbas, and their daughter, Ilana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 16699. A bill for the relief of Yu Yuet Moy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 16700. A bill for the relief of Sarah Pardo Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16701. A bill for the relief of Luigi Siano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 16702. A bill for the relief of Clarence S. Lyons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

286. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of certain residents of the 32d Congressional District of California, who demand that impeachment procedures be implemented immediately against the six members of the U.S. Supreme Court whose recent decision declared unconstitutional that section of the Federal law that bars members of Communist action groups from working in defense plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert D. Hodgdon, Springfield, Mo., relative to the forcible practice of medicine upon protesting persons in custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. Also, petition of Robert D. Hodgdon, Springfield, Mo., relative to excessive bail and excessive fines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

289. Also, petition of the Rochester Police Locust Club, Inc., Rochester, N.Y., relative to draft exemption for police officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

290. Also, petition of the City Council, Worcester, Mass., relative to open housing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

291. Also, petition of Juniata Park Evangelical United Brethren Church, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to equal opportunity for all our citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

292. Also, petition of Miss Selma Heasley, Eldridge, N. Dak., relative to petition of impeachment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Monday, April 22, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us.

May our individual lives be as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. In this global contest beyond the light and darkness, make us as individuals the kind of persons which Thou canst use as the instruments of Thy purpose for all mankind. Gird our hearts to seek peace and pursue it, that the sundered family of mankind at last may be bound by golden cords of understanding fellowship around the feet of the one God.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1968.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BURDICK thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 19, 1968, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 16, 1968, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 109) to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VII, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business, during the 15 minutes

previously agreed to, be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McGOVERN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the disposal of the pending measure, H.R. 14940, on arms control and disarmament, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be recognized for 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from South Dakota completes his remarks, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] be recognized for up to 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, warned that America is "in the midst of the worst financial crisis since 1931" and strongly urged that Congress and the administration immediately get together on the package which would embrace a mandatory reduction in expenditures as well as an increase in taxes.

Mr. Martin warned that unless such action was taken, the United States faced "uncontrollable inflation or recession." Mr. Martin's warning, delivered last Friday, followed an earlier increase in the discount rate from 5 percent to 5½ percent, which represents the highest level since 1929. Prime rates by most of the Nation's leading banks were raised to 6½ percent.

About 2 weeks prior to the latter action, the Federal Government had paid as high as 6.45 percent interest on a 100-percent, Government-guaranteed obligation sold through FNMA.

Following the action by the Federal Reserve Board in raising its discount rate, and Mr. Martin's speech, the White House issued the following statement from Austin, Tex., as reported by the UPI wire service:

AUSTIN, TEX.—The White House today said "The increase in the Federal discount rate to 5.5 per cent was the only present line of defense against inflation and underscores the urgency" of passage of President Johnson's proposed tax bill.

Presidential Press Secretary George Christian told newsmen the Federal Reserve Board's action proved that "tighter money has become inevitable as our only present defense against inflation."

"Last summer the Council of Economic Advisers predicted the rate of growth of the economy is very high and unsustainable," he said. "The President has repeatedly urged Congress to adopt a tax increase and said at the outset the action by the Fed underscores the urgency of action on the bill."

Johnson's proposal for a 10 per cent surcharge increase on individual and corporation taxes has been stalemated in Congress.

At first glance, the statement of the President would appear to be supporting Mr. Martin's position, but I call attention to this major difference. While Mr. Martin strongly recommended a package embracing both a reduction of Federal spending as well as a tax increase, the President is still talking about his tax increase and is only giving lip-service to expenditure reductions.

Three weeks ago, on April 2, the Senate adopted an amendment sponsored by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself embracing the 10 percent tax surcharge as requested by the administration, but included in that package was a mandatory reduction of expenditures for fiscal 1969 of $6 billion plus a mandatory rollback in Federal civilian employment to the level prevailing on September 20, 1966—the date of the President's own Executive order purportedly to return employment to that level.

In addition, the same package would require the President to submit a plan for a minimum of $10 billion reductions in new obligational authority for fiscal 1969.

This bill has been in conference for 3 weeks, and it has been stalemated, but let the record be clear that the White House itself is responsible for the stalemate. While the Secretary of the Treasury had publicly and privately endorsed the package as approved by the Senate, the Budget Director, who is the official spokesman for the President, has told the conferees that the White House will not accept expenditure reductions as outlined in this bill. The White House has been told that Congress will not approve the tax increase without mandatory expenditure reductions written into the law.

Personally, I would favor an even greater reduction than the $6 billion provided in this package. My original proposal called for an $8-billion reduction, but the bill with $6 billion was finally agreed upon. Certainly, this is the very least expenditure control that we can or should accept.

This package was attached to the bill extending excise taxes, which originally were scheduled to expire April 1. A continuing resolution extending these excise taxes for 30 days has been approved, with the result that May 1 is the deadline. That leaves but 8 more days for Congress and the administration to approve this package.

I appeal to the President to lend his full support to those of us who have sponsored and pushed this package to its present position. Let us get this measure enacted immediately.

If the administration will reverse its position and, instead of continuing its determined opposition against these expenditure cuts, lend its support, I am confident that this bill can be put on his desk by the end of this week.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, I am equally confident that without these expenditure reductions being retained in this package there will be no tax increase.

To increase taxes without a mandatory reduction in expenditures would in my own opinion accomplish nothing; in fact, it would further aggravate the inflationary situation by pouring more money into the spending stream for the Great Society bureaucracy.

Assuming no action is taken toward expenditure reductions and tax increases, we will be confronted with a $20 billion deficit in the current fiscal year and a $28 billion deficit in fiscal year 1969.

The financial security of millions of American retirees, those living on fixed incomes, is dependent upon the action of the administration and Congress to control this inflationary threat.

Neither Congress nor the administration has any choice, and the hour for action is late.

I conclude by pleading with the President to throw his support in back of the spending cuts as well as in back of the tax increase as approved by the Senate.

STANAVFORLANT—THE FIRST PERMANENT MULTINATIONAL NAVAL FORCE ESTABLISHED BY NATO

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on April 12, I had the privilege of visiting Stanavforlant, the first permanent multinational naval force to be established by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The force will operate in the Atlantic Ocean as a part of the Supreme Allied Command for NATO in the Atlantic—SACLANT—which maintains headquarters in Norfolk, Va.

The standing naval force, which was activated last January 13 and which resulted from the conversion of the Matchmaker Squadron—a fleet of ships from NATO maritime nations which came together for maneuvers in the Atlantic Ocean and then disbanded—into a continuously existing fleet, was making its first port call to SACLANT headquarters. Included in the fleet were the United Kingdom's HMS *Brighton*, the West German frigate FGS *Koeln*, the Dutch destroyer HNLM *Holland*, the Canadian destroyer escort HMCS *Gatineau* and the U.S. destroyer *Holder*. Later a Norwegian vessel will join the fleet.

During my visit, I was able to discuss the activities of the fleet with Commodore Geoffrey C. Mitchell, captain of the H.M.S. *Brighton*, who is currently commanding the fleet, and with the captains of the other participating ships. I was most impressed with Commodore Mitchell's unequivocal statement that Stanavforlant is a success, that the operation is working, that the pragmatic considerations are being tested and consistently found effective.

It is significant for us to remember, I believe, that the standing naval fleet for the Atlantic is a continuously existing fleet, that it operates as a unit and can respond as a unit to emergencies and crises, yet it reflects the policies of many nations. In this force we have a coordinated NATO instrument, which is capable of moving quickly to defend and secure the policies agreed upon by the NATO members.

The naval aspects of NATO are perhaps more important today than ever before. There is abundant evidence of increasing Soviet naval power. There are also indications that this increased Soviet naval strength will pose new threats to our NATO allies. For example, Soviet vessels have been more and more frequently sighted along the shorelines of Italy and Norway.

I would now urge that the United States pursue with its NATO allies the possibility of establishing a similar multinational fleet in the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean, along with the North Atlantic, is an area where the Soviet Union has displayed much of its new naval power. In addition, the smallness in size of the Mediterranean and the geographical position of many of our NATO allies, such as Turkey and Italy, make them particularly susceptible to Soviet naval pressure and harassment. Third, there is the very real possibility that Soviet naval influence in the area may be further enhanced by Russia's acquisition of ports or port rights in various African nations, such as Algeria and Egypt. Fourth, Middle East events, which could to a large extent be affected by naval activities in the Mediterranean, pose a danger to world peace and security and to the economic well-being of our European allies which need the oil resources of the region. And, fifth, problems which have raised questions internally among the NATO allies, such as the recent situations in Greece and Cyprus, may encourage the Soviets to attempt to expand their influence in the area. Certainly, a force to help shelter alliance members from outside pressure during a period in which NATO allies are working to solve internal problems would be helpful.

For a number of years, ships from the NATO maritime nations have joined together for exercises, generally of a few days' duration, in the Mediterranean. When the Mediterranean could be considered a "NATO lake," this approach was adequate. Today's events and situations require more. Formation of a continuously existing multinational fleet for NATO in the Mediterranean could not but help signify a new cooperation among NATO members and present a new counterforce to Soviet pressure and influence in the area.

There are those, both in our country and in the countries of our NATO allies, who question the need to continue or strengthen the alliance. Recent events within the Soviet bloc, especially in Czechoslovakia, may suggest that the strength of the Communist countries is weakening. In some ways, it is undoubtedly changing. At the same time, however, there are numerous other indications, including the increase in Soviet naval power, which suggest that many of the Soviet Union's activities are not designed to promote world peace and security.

NATO has undoubtedly been successful as a means of securing Western Europe against communism. It must, however, be modified and modernized to meet new needs and new situations. In earlier years, the need for NATO naval fleets was not particularly great. Today the situation is different and that difference must not be underestimated. The creation of Stanavforlant—and the possible establishment of a comparable force for the Mediterranean—is the type of modification that NATO must undertake if it is to remain an effective instrument for the collective security of the United States and our allies. It is an example of the initiative which is needed to demonstrate the flexibility of which the Organization is capable and to illustrate the relevance of the alliance to current events. Such factors will be most important when the NATO charter comes up for renewal next year.

Finally, as I have noted before, the creation of Stanavforlant and comparable fleets as a means of enlarging NATO's strength has an advantage which the increasing of ground troops does not have. It eliminates to a great extent the expense and the corresponding balance-of-payments problem which results from the stationing and maintaining of troops and bases in foreign countries. This consideration is important for the United States and for all our allies who have overseas commitments.

I commend Stanavforlant and again I urge the creation of a similar force for the Mediterranean.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have written to Hon. Harlan Cleveland, Ambassador to NATO, dated April 12, 1968.

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

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1968.

Hon. HARLAN CLEVELAND,
American Ambassador to NATO, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: On April 12 I had the privilege of visiting the Standing Naval Fleet for NATO in the Atlantic Ocean. The fleet was making its first port call to Norfolk, Virginia, the headquarters for NATO's Supreme Allied Command in the Atlantic.

I was extremely impressed by my tour, my discussions with the captains of the participating vessels and the unequivocal statement of Commodore Geoffrey C. Mitchell, the commander of the fleet, that the operations of the force have proved successful. I commend the foresight and initiative which led to the creation of this fleet.

In view of the recent increase in Soviet naval power, which has particularly manifested itself in the Mediterranean, I urge that the United States and our NATO allies move toward creation of a similar permanent, multinational fleet for the Mediterranean to serve as a counterbalance to growing Soviet maritime influence and pressure there. I understand that this possibility was discussed briefly at the meeting of the NATO Defense Planning Committee in December of 1967, and believe that the success of the Atlantic NATO naval fleet, together with the Mediterranean situation, provides ample and valid reason for pursuing establishment of a comparable Mediterranean fleet.

I envision a standing naval force-in-being for the Mediterranean, a force to demonstrate that NATO is alert, a force which symbolizes the political and military unity of NATO, a force at sea capable of dealing promptly with various types of aggression in the Mediterranean basin. It would be a force strictly defensive in character, posing no threat to any nation, a force which would give comfort to threatened neutrals and serve as a warning signal to any would-be aggressor. Such a fleet would go far in capturing the public imagination, which in this time of mass communications, can have a profound effect on situations and events.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. SPONG, Jr.,
U.S. Senator.

FEDERAL WAGE POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am keenly disappointed by the action of the President of the AFL–CIO, George Meany, in failing to appoint John Griner as an employee representative to the Federal Wage Policy Committee.

Mr. Meany, surely one of our Nation's great labor leaders and a man whose long and illustrious career leading the ranks of working people all over our land, was given the authority by the recent Federal Wage Board program promulgated by the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies, to appoint four employee representatives to the Federal Wage Policy Committee. Under the terms of the new program, 11 people serve on this vitally important board to establish policy for wage board employment in all Federal agencies, affecting nearly 750,000 people.

By any normal standard, the employee representatives appointed to this committee should be those whose interests are most closely related to Federal Wage Board employees. They have the knowledge, the experience, and the dedication to help develop the new wage board policy that the committee is directed to establish.

They represent the employees affected. They know the problems.

They have lived day in and day out with the helter-skelter wage board policies which have plagued blue-collar employment in the Government for a hundred years.

The establishment of this Wage Policy Committee was a step in the right direction. Although I favor, and the Senate favors, enactment of a statutory wage board employment program, as expressed in our passage of S. 2303, on October 12, 1967, I was nonetheless gratified to see that our action last year prodded the Civil Service Commission to move off dead center and do something.

It is, therefore, very disappointing to see that in the very first effort toward a new wage board system, the president of the greatest labor organization in America, the AFL–CIO, has failed to appoint to this new committee the president of the largest Federal employee union, the employee union which has more members from the rank and file of blue-collar employees than any other union in the United States.

John Griner, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, was not one of the four employee union representatives chosen by President Meany to serve on this Wage Policy Committee.

I cannot understand this. John Griner has worked hard for wage board employees. He has urged upon Congress programs for reform of working conditions, improved pay, and other progressive changes in Federal employment that have done much for our wage board employees.

He fought for their right of appeal in job classification cases where no right of appeal existed and where no one else raised his voice. He fought for decent working conditions and reasonable work schedules; I remember in 1965 he fought long, hard, successfully, and alone to end the practice of scheduling employees to work 12 to 15 hours straight without overtime pay.

As president of the AFGE, he has presided over the growth of their membership from 100,000 when he took over in 1962, to more than 260,000 in 1968.

Of his quarter million members, more than 75,000 are wage board workers—which is about 35 percent of the total number of wage board employees represented by exclusive bargaining agreements. No other union has such a large membership, and no other union represents so many wage board employees.

I think this is a sad state of affairs. The Federal Wage Policy Committee is not a little girl's birthday party where one picks and chooses among his kindergarten classmates for a guest list. It is a vitally important new program designed to benefit the working men and women in wage board jobs in the U.S. Government. I do not believe that cause is served by refusing to seek the advice and council of the leader of the largest union of all.

It is my fond hope—and the Senate's unanimous approval of S. 2303 backs me up on this—that the House of Representatives Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will be prompted to speedy action on S. 2303 to establish by law the framework of a progressive wage board program which will avoid this kind of unfortunate and genuinely embarrassing situation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allowed for the transaction of routine morning business be extended for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIME FOR SECRETARY RUSK TO BOW OUT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, to me it is appalling that President Johnson and the advisers whose advice unfortunately he seems to follow without variance, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Walt Rostow and the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, have voiced strong opposition to meeting with delegates representing North Vietnam at Warsaw, one of the two cities suggested by Hanoi. The reasons publicly given lack validity. President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk during recent months have repeatedly stated in tones loud and clear, to impress heads of state the world over, that they would forthwith and without delay send representatives to a peace conference anywhere at any time to negotiate for a ceasefire and an armistice in Vietnam. Now they have changed their tune. It seems inexcusable that State Department officials and the President drag their feet on this while American youngsters are being killed and wounded in the jungles and swamps of Vietnam. Approximately 25,000 Americans in our Armed Forces have been killed in combat to date and 135,000 wounded in Vietnam. Thousands have been afflicted with malaria, hepatitis, and various jungle diseases including bubonic plague. Many who apparently have recovered will suffer as long as they live from recurrences of malaria fever.

More than 1,000 of our finest airplanes have been destroyed and many hundreds of helicopters. President Johnson knows now that his involving our Armed Forces in an ugly Vietnam civil war which has become the most unpopular war this Nation ever waged in the entire history of our Republic was a tragic mistake.

It is a fearful thing to contemplate that the President, relying on these advisers, may recede from his willingness to meet anywhere to discuss peace and decide to reject the suggestions of officials of North Vietnam who apparently seek face to face negotiations. Instead, the President and Secretary Rusk seem determined to pursue the fighting to ultimate military victory. To what disasters that will ultimately lead us, no one can now foretell. Unfortunately, if the views of the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff prevail and we bomb Haiphong Harbor and Hanoi and then make an amphibious landing in North Vietnam, Communist China will probably enter the war and then possibly the Soviet Union.

Benjamin Franklin wrote "Experience keeps a dear school but fools learn in no other." What he wrote has a direct application to the recommendations and in fact oft repeated demands of the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff. Like the Bourbons of old, these generals never forget and never learn. Unfortunately, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and others surrounding President Johnson and influencing him, including Walt Rostow and the generals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have sold the President a bill of goods in their continuing optimistic reports over our situation in Vietnam. Apparently, they have done it again. It is of the utmost importance that President Johnson disregard the advice of the generals of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of Maxwell D. Taylor and General Westmoreland. They have been proven wrong. The President should assert his primacy and full constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

The North Vietnamese Government has stated that Warsaw would be an acceptable meeting place. There is no valid reason whatever for administration officials to object. For many years our Ambassador to Warsaw has been in continuous and direct contact with the Ambassador to Poland representing Communist China. Now, the excuse given by State Department officials for not accepting Warsaw as the site for peace negotiations is the fact that South Vietnam does not maintain diplomatic relations with Poland and, therefore, it would be embarrassing for South Vietnamese representatives to meet in Warsaw. This is absurd. Furthermore, this argument now advanced underscores the lack of good faith behind those oft repeated assertions from the White House and Secretary Rusk, "We will go anywhere in search for peace. We will gladly go tomorrow." The fact is that the puppet South Vietnamese militarist regime of Thieu and Ky would only last for a day or so without our military support. While thousands of young Americans are being killed and wounded, it is unconscionable to postpone peace negotiations over such irrelevancies.

I urge President Johnson to do what he said in plain unequivocal language on numerous occasions that he would do. He should send representatives to meet anywhere and at any time, with North Vietnamese representatives in Warsaw unless some other meeting place is agreed upon within 48 hours.

Mr. President, it is clear that Secretary of State Rusk and other State Department officials are not in wholehearted agreement with the President's decision to try to bring about a diplomatic settlement to the Vietnam war. It will be difficult enough to achieve a cease-fire and an armistice and eventual peace without constant sniping by the Secretary of State, such as his publicly stated refusal to send delegates to meet with the North Vietnamese in Warsaw. The policy of escalation he has forcefully advocated over the past 5 years has failed miserably. If he is unable to acclimate himself to the President's efforts to bring the war to an end, he should resign and turn over his office to someone who will carry out the intent and spirit of the administration's search for peace.

In February 1966, I stated in a speech in the Senate that—

> I would sleep better at night if Dean Rusk were not the Secretary of State of the United States.

Now I state this in language anyone can understand. In my judgment our Nation would be better off and its people better served if Dean Rusk ceases to be Secretary of State of the United States.

Mr. President, recently there appeared an excellent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Time for Rusk To Bow Out" which very clearly sets forth compelling reasons for a new American Secretary of State in these crucial times. There also appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of April 20, 1968, an outstanding editorial entitled "The Advantage of Warsaw." I commend these editorials to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the edi-

torials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

TIME FOR RUSK TO BOW OUT

Secretary of State Rusk appears now to have joined the ranks of those who are bent on shooting down the Vietnam peace dove before it can take wing. Unless in some obscure way he speaks for the Administration, he is undercutting President Johnson's policy. If he cannot go along with that policy he ought to resign; if he will not resign he ought to be dismissed.

Mr. Johnson himself, in a sense, resigned in order to reverse his policy and begin to deescalate the war. Previous to that he removed his commander in Vietnam, Gen. William Westmoreland; and before that he eased out his Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara. Mr. Rusk has outlived his usefulness. The policy of escalation he has advocated so fanatically has failed. The only graceful thing he can do is turn over his office to someone who will carry out the intent and spirit of the Administration's new search for peace.

Mr. Rusk made his egregious comments on peace prospects after emerging from a closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It was not so much what he said as his sour attitude that conveyed his dislike and distrust of what Mr. Johnson is apparently trying to do. He underscored the "limited" purposes of the talks to which the North Vietnamese have agreed. He tried to sabotage the possibility that Mr. Johnson may order a complete halt to the bombing of North Vietnam as a means of encouraging a settlement of the war.

Reports that the President might take this step as a follow-up to the two bombing cutbacks already placed in effect apparently originated with Administration spokesmen. In ordering the first reduction Mr. Johnson said that "even this limited bombing of the North could come to an early end if our restraint is matched by Hanoi." Mr. Rusk observed on Wedesday that the United States has seen "no evidence of restraint; the infiltration is continuing, perhaps at an increasing rate . . ."

Mr. Rusk may have figures on infiltration that have not been given to the public, but from all published accounts the North Vietnamese have undertaken reciprocal restraint. It is now known that certain contacts between Washington and Hanoi were made two weeks before the President's March 31 peace overture. Logic suggests North Vietnam made the first move—abandonment of the seige of Khe Sanh—and Mr. Johnson the second, the bombing curtailment. The first U.S. test of the Communist response was the dispatch of a relief column to Khe Sanh; the column got through almost without incident.

Mr. Rusk views all this in a negative light. The truth has long been evident that the only peace Mr. Rusk wants is one achieved through a complete military victory, which would mean the obliteration of Vietnam—and which might lead to nuclear war. He is supposed to be the nation's top diplomat, but he obviously has no faith in diplomacy. He has opposed any sort of compromise on which peace might be based.

Whether by accident or presidential design, Mr. Rusk was in New Zealand when President Johnson announced he would de-escalate the war. Mr. Rusk was attending a conference of Southeast Asia Treaty Organization ministers. He reportedly told the ministers at a closed meeting that a coalition government in South Vietnam and neutralization of Vietnam would not be a workable solution.

This is, in fact, the only solution. The National Liberation Front, political arm of the Viet Cong guerrillas, is the effective government of a large part of South Vietnam. Without participation of the NLF there can be no government and no peace; that is what the war is all about. Neutralization guaranteed by the big powers is a logical objective.

Peace will be difficult enough to achieve without sniping by the American Secretary of State. So far the talk is of preliminary meetings between the U.S. and the North Vietnamese, but the South Vietnamese and the NLF will have to be brought into the picture. South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu's call for a general mobilization suggests one of the obstacles. If the example of Syngman Rhee in Korea is valid, the Vietnamese army could come to be used as a threat against the United States, not the Communists.

The search for peace may be full of setbacks, and it may be prolonged. To succeed it will need participation by Americans who believe in it and who will work for it. Mr. Rusk's policy has been repudiated by the American people and their President. He should resign.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 20, 1967]

THE ADVANTAGE OF WARSAW

We cannot help wondering whether the United States may not be passing up a number of golden opportunities through its unwillingness to accept Warsaw as the site for preliminary peace talks with North Vietnam. Indeed, the question arises whether Washington is not showing a singular lack of imagination in its reaction to Hanoi's proposal that Warsaw be the chosen spot.

Agreement on Warsaw would, it seems to us, give America an opportunity to do the three following things:

Prove to the world that President Johnson meant exactly what he said when he promised to go anywhere to meet with the other side in order to get peace talks under way. If the White House did not mean exactly that, it should have been foresighted enough not to have said it. But, having said it, it should now make a virtue of the necessity in world eyes. Acceptance of Warsaw would increase world confidence that the United States is sincere in its search for peace.

Extract from the Polish Government an important concession which could prove not without embarrassment to the Communist world. One of the reasons given for Washington's dislike of Warsaw is that Poland has no diplomatic representation with three of America's immediately concerned allies—South Vietnam, South Korea, and Thailand. Why not, therefore, make acceptance of Warsaw hang upon Poland's granting diplomatic recognition to the two bitterly anti-Communist governments of Saigon and Seoul (Bangkok itself refrains from representation in Warsaw)? Clearly, these two have the right to insist upon such recognition if they are eventually to turn up in Warsaw for talks.

Have in Poland large numbers of shrewd American diplomats at a crucial moment in Polish history. Poland is now undergoing another of its severe internal wrestlings over Marxist ideology. Part of this struggle is the rivalry between communism and nationalism. It is hard to think of a better moment for the American presence to be visible—highly so—on the streets of Warsaw.

One thing seems crystal clear. This is that any talks with the Communists over Vietnam will be long, hard, often frustrating and almost always conducted with an eye on their propaganda effect. Perhaps Washington, by downthumbing first Cambodia and now Poland, believes that it is doing only what the Communists invariably do—playing hard to get.

But such a game should be played with skill. In a tug of war, one side can sometimes gain an advantage by suddenly relaxing its hold on the rope rather than by continually pulling. The United States might well have used this tactic in regard to Warsaw.

ARSON IN WASHINGTON AND PLANNED MARCH OF THE POOR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in that section of the RECORD set aside for Extensions of Remarks an article entitled "Arsonists Set Three of Five Blazes, Others Probed," written by Woody West, and published in today's Washington Evening Star, and various other news articles, published in last week's newspapers, concerning arsons which took place in the city of Washington; and also an article entitled "Plan for March of Poor Listed," published in today's Washington Evening Star.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[These articles appear in the Extensions of Remarks under appropriate headlines.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 234. An act for the relief of James W. Adams and others;

S. 375. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 1664. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; and

S. 2912. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 15344. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for two years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury (Rept. No. 1091).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 3351. A bill for the relief of Cheng-Kee Woo and Kou-Ing Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 3352. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to increase the rate at which loans made pursuant to such Act may be canceled for service in certain schools and to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for payments for such service on loans insured or made pursuant to agreements under such Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROUTY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3353. A bill for the relief of Hermenegildo M. Kadile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 3354. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in recognition of the outstanding services of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to the cause of the individual rights and the equality of men; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3352—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO LOANS MADE UNDER THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958 AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for loan payments for service in certain schools.

In brief, my bill would extend forgiveness of loans to those borrowers who work in hard core low-income schools. The forgiveness provision specifies a rate of 20 percent annually so that borrowers who serve as teachers in these areas for 5 years or more would have their total loan canceled.

The need for a provision in the guaranteed loan program such as the one I am proposing is attested to, I believe, by the current existence and success of a similar provision under the national defense student loan program. Under the provisions of this act now, borrowers who become teachers may be forgiven 10 percent of their loans annually up to a total of 50 percent of the loan. Amendments sponsored by me in 1965 and 1966 provided that teachers in low-income areas, or those who work with handicapped children, may be forgiven 15 percent of their loans annually up to cancellation. This new proposal would extend loan cancellation to a rate of 20 percent a year for those who teach in poverty impacted areas.

This proposal would allow either a National Defense Education Act borrower or one who has taken out a loan under the guaranteed student loan program, who teaches in a poverty school, a loan forgiveness allowance of 20 percent per year for up to 5 years, resulting in 100-percent cancellation of his indebtedness in just under that period of time.

The definition of poverty impacted schools is tied in with the provisions of title I of Public Law 89–10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

For a borrower to qualify for 100-percent forgiveness, he must teach in a school in the area of a local education agency which is receiving aid under that title for the year in question. Further, the Commissioner of Education must have found that the school enrolls a high concentration of children from low-income families. Finally, the Commissioner shall not make such a finding in more than 25 percent of the schools of any one State.

Since 1959, Mr. President, through the end of fiscal 1966, over 142,000 borrowers engaged in teaching had canceled all or part of their loan principal under the national defense student loan program. By extending similar provisions to prospective teachers under the guaranteed loan program, any inequities caused by the existence of a forgiveness provision under only one loan program are removed and while we have figures on how many borrowers are benefitting from the cancellation privileges as a reward for teaching, I have not seen figures indicating the number of graduates who have become teachers because they could get partial forgiveness but who, without this reward, would not have entered teaching. I like to believe that this figure would be a sizable one.

A more eloquent testament to the desirability of a loan cancellation provision in the guaranteed loan program is the need for teachers in low-income area schools. In the President's report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the Commission reports:

> The teaching of disadvantaged children requires special skills and capabilities. Teachers possessing these qualifications are in short supply. We need a national effort to attract to the teaching profession well qualified and highly motivated young people and to equip them to work effectively with disadvantaged students.

Furthermore, the Commission goes on to say that as a means of removing financial barriers to higher education increasing opportunities for disadvantaged students to seek and obtain higher education "can be amplified by providing incentives for college trained public service personnel needed to work in poverty areas. This might be accomplished by including a forgiveness feature in programs providing financial assistance in the form of loans to college and graduate students. This feature, like that now included under the National Defense Education Act loan program, would provide for the cancellation of loans at a reasonable annual rate, if the recipient works in a low-income area."

Mr. President, the problem of overcrowded classrooms coupled with a scarcity of teachers especially concerned with problems of these areas is a critical one. Education is one of the Nation's strongest weapons in the struggle for a better future for the less fortunate, yet the Republican Coordinating Committee on Urban Education has noted:

> In urban areas today because of numerous difficulties the quality of teaching and the pupil-teacher relationship frequently do not meet the needs of the disadvantaged child.

Encouraging teachers to work in low-income areas by use of the cancellation provisions may go a long way in helping to meet the needs of the underprivileged. Furthermore, the cancellation provision could be especially attractive to men with families and might serve as an additional reason for male teachers to go to low-income-area schools where the need for them is critical. Teaching salaries in many low-income areas are not high and the prospect of trying to raise a family and pay off a large loan on a minimal income appeals to very few. Because the need for dedicated teachers in low income areas is so great, prompt action is needed to ease the shortage. I firmly believe that this bill will have the effect of further encouraging larger numbers of service minded graduates to lend their efforts in the great struggle to break the vicious cycle of poverty and ignorance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3352) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to increase the rate at which loans made pursuant to such act may be canceled for service in certain schools and to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for payments for such service on loans insured or made pursuant to agreements under such act, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3354—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN HONOR OF REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BROOKE, CLARK, LAUSCHE, PROUTY, HATFIELD, and GRUENING, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in recognition of the outstanding services of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to the cause of the individual rights and the equality of men.

The loss of Dr. King leaves a great void in our society, but we all know that he will never be forgotten. He stood for the highest of American ideals and fought for them until he drew his last breath on earth. He fought for jobs; he fought for housing; and he fought for education. More importantly, though, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was relentless in his pursuit of equality for all men, black and white.

America has memorialized its heroes throughout history. Our Nation's Capital bears the name of our first President. Even our currency bears the likenesses of our early leaders. Upon the tragic death of John F. Kennedy, our Nation responded in many ways, one of which was the issuance of the half dollar that now bears his likeness. It is only one way to commemorate our fallen leaders, because it assures that their names will live on in history in the hearts and minds of all Americans.

Dr. King's untimely and tragic death has stained the pages of history. Whatever we do now can never bring this great man back to us. But we must remember him, and we must not forget the principles for which he stood. In true fashion, the concerned citizens of America have responded to the call. The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Fund has been established at Morehouse College in Atlanta, Ga. Its purpose is to aid those less fortunate individuals who desire to further their education—a goal,

incidentally, that was one of Dr. King's highest. This fund must be perpetuated, and with the introduction of my bill today, I hope to do just that.

My bill will provide for the striking of 1 million commemorative half-dollars to be sold at par value to the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Fund. The fund, in turn, will resell the coins, the profits from which are to be used for the stated purposes of the fund. The profile of Dr. King will appear on one side of the coin, with the dates "1929–68." On the reverse side there will be the seal of Morehouse College.

We must be certain that what this man died for did not die with him. We must be certain that what he fought for will not now be lost. It is my deepest hope that we will not forget him or his principles. Our action on this matter can insure that we are taking a step in the right direction.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3354) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in recognition of the outstanding services of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to the cause of the individual rights and the equality of men introduced by Mr. SCOTT, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE I OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 704

Mr. ELLENDER proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment, when proposed by Mr. ELLENDER, which appears under a separate heading.)

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 22, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 234. An act for the relief of James W. Adams and others;

S. 375. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to obscene or harassing telephone calls in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 1664. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; and

S. 2912. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes.

ELIJAH P. LOVEJOY, DEFENDER OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, combining an important historical event, a story of a man who aided the preservation of freedom of speech, and a new project in my State of Illinois, in the Alton area, I invite the attention of Senators to the efforts that are being made by Pride, Inc., to establish the Lovejoy Hall of Fame. I ask unanimous consent that the account of the project as given to me by Steven A. Cousley, chairman, Lovejoy Hall of Fame Committee, Pride, Inc., be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY STEVEN A. COUSLEY, CHAIRMAN, LOVEJOY HALL OF FAME COMMITTEE, PRIDE, INC.

Abolitionist editor, Elijah P. Lovejoy, was slain by a shotgun blast 130 years ago November 9 in Alton, Illinois, as he was defending his fourth printing press from a mob.

He became America's first newsman to give his life for Freedom of the Press.

Devotion to the memory of Lovejoy has resulted in a vigorous crusade by local historians, journalists, and an Alton beautification group called Pride, Incorporated.

Lovejoy was a staunch defender of not only press freedom, but freedom of speech and the dignity of man. He gave his life for those ideals.

With Pride acting as a catalyst, an intense local effort has been initiated with the target date for the first phase set in June, 1968—the Illinois Sesquicentennial year.

Weeds and trees had grown wild all but hiding the 90-foot moonument to Lovejoy from public view. However, through Pride a spark was generated to give the memorial to Lovejoy a facelifting.

Pride stimulated the East End Businessmen's Association to finance a $7,000 project on Monument Avenue, a two-block street leading up to the monument from Broadway, Alton's main thoroughfare.

A new total planning and planting plan was initiated by the City Cemetery Board on its property surrounding the Lovejoy Monument and including the Lovejoy Gravesite, in the heart of the cemetery.

The State of Illinois was contacted by a local delegation in regard to tuckpointing, sandblasting, lighting, and a general cleanup with the result of a promise for action during 1968.

The Lovejoy Memorial Association, a group of Negroes including the trustee of the gravesite, stimulated backing for cleanup and beautification of the gravesite, with assistance from local donors.

The Alton High Student Council adopted a tree planting project on a steep hillside at the cemetery.

Veterans' groups are to be solicited for adopting a planting plan to beautify the National Cemetery and adjacent grounds on still another site of the Cemetery Complex.

Pride's head, Dr. Gordon Moore, a local surgeon, also president of the Park Board, is overseeing development of an overlook park at the east end of Fifth Street which runs in front of the Monument site. Through Pride, he is pursuing goals of complete neighborhood rehabilitation through a tree planting and block captain program stimulated by the Home Owners and Renters Committee.

The Hall of Fame Committee is seeking to crystallize a format such as a foundation with educational objectives, a hall of fame, scholarship programming for prospective journalists, relief funds for newspaper editors who have exhibited exemplary courage and have suffered as a result of it.

It all stems from Lovejoy's death by a mob in defense of his press. His death presents today's newspapermen with a challenge to remain free and protect the cause of human dignity and freedom throughout the world.

SIERRA CLUB OF TEXAS SUPPORTS BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK WITH FINE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the February 1968 "The Lone Star Sierran," newsletter, volume III, No. 2, published by the Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club, the executive committee of the chapter took a bold and forthright stand for a genuine Big Thicket National Park, a national park worthy of the people, a national park worthy of the Nation.

There have been proposals that there be only a national monument at the Big Thicket, with but only about 35,000 acres. As so ably pointed out in the February issue of the Lone Star Sierran, 35,000 acres is entirely inadequate to protect enough of the Big Thicket to make it a meaningful saving of this unusual flora in the southeast portion of east Texas, with its heavy and startling and interesting growth of trees, shrubs, and clinging vines of water plants, grasses, and the amazing and rare combination of record-size trees in two different species, and many exotic plants.

The time for action is now on my proposed Big Thicket National Park bill, now pending before the proper committee.

Mr. President, I agree with all the recommendations made by the Lone Star Sierran and congratulate the members of the Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club on their forthright stand. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BIG THICKET

The Sierra Club will make the establishment of a Big Thicket national park or national monument one of its major projects during the coming months. Articles on the Big Thicket will be published in the Sierra Club *Bulletin*, and a full-scale campaign will be undertaken.

In their preliminary study, in 1965, the National Park Service envisioned a nine-unit national monument of 35,000 acres using the "string of pearls" concept, as follows:

1. The Big Thicket profile unit of 18,180 acres in the heart of the original Thicket.
2. Beech Creek unit, 6,100 acres, with its virgin beech forest.
3. Neches Bottom unit, 3,040 acres.
4. Tanner Bayou unit, 4,800 acres, on the Trinity River.
5. Beaumont unit, 1,700 acres, containing an entirely untouched cypress swamp.
6. Little Cypress unit, 860 acres.
7. Hickory Creek savannah, 220 acres, insect-eating plants.
8. Loblolly unit, 550 acres, largest (and almost the last) stand of virgin pine in Texas.
9. Clear Fork bog, 50 acres.

The conservation committee of the Lone Star Chapter has studied the above and feels 35,000 acres, scattered as it is, is too small a token designation to be effective in preserving the area. It recommends certain changes and additions (summarized here; more complete details will appear in the *Bulletin*):

1. Extend the Big Thicket profile unit southward and eastward down both sides of Pine Island Bayou to its confluence with the Neches River. No "motorized nature road," such as has been suggested, should cut this long narrow profile strip.

2. The Neches Bottom unit should be extended to include the area from the river west to US 92 and 96, and from the river east to cover a strip from FM 1746, just below Dam B, down to its confluence with Pine Island Bayou. The ivory-billed woodpecker is found here.

3. Include a Village Creek unit.

4. Incorporate a squarish area of at least

20,000 acres so that larger species, such as black bear, puma, and red wolf, may survive there.

5. Connect the major units with corridors at least one-half mile wide, with a hiking trail along each corridor, but without new public roads cutting any forest. A portion of Menard Creek and the entire watershed of Rush Creek would be excellent corridors.

These additions would form a connected, two-looped green belt of more than 100,000 acres through which wildlife and people could move along a continuous circle of more than a hundred miles.

LET'S HAVE FAITH IN AMERICA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Congress and the country owe much to our veterans organizations. Their interests go beyond a concern for needy and disabled veterans, widows, and orphans. These organizations are pillars of strength in almost every good cause that means so much to our country.

The American Legion is a fine organization. It has a long record of devoted service to our country. It has had many outstanding national commanders but none abler or more dedicated or more effective than the present national commander, Hon. William E. Galbraith.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Have Faith in America!" written by Commander Galbraith, and published in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for April.

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

LET'S HAVE FAITH IN AMERICA!

(By Hon. William E. Galbraith)

Faith, we are told, is the force of life.

Truly, faith has been a sustaining power of our great Nation since the Declaration of Independence. In fact, that historical document even today radiates the strong faith of the brave men who affixed their signatures to it. And so it has been, time after time during the short span of history that our Nation has been in existence, the faith of its free people has been a redeeming factor.

We can be proud that our country was founded on religious principles. Our faith in a living God and our belief in and support of religious freedom for all mankind have been beacons of hope for oppressed people throughout the world. As conceived by our Founding Fathers "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence," the United States has grown and prospered.

My roots are deeply embedded in the farmlands of Nebraska. It was there that I was taught to love God, to love my country, and to respect law and order and the rights of my fellow man. It was in Nebraska that I first learned of the great heritage of America and of the priceless freedom which is ours and which was bought with the blood of our forefathers. And it was from my farm home in Nebraska that I left to join the U.S. Navy during World War II—my country's fight was my fight.

In subsequent years in connection with my work in The American Legion, I have traveled extensively throughout the country. I never cease to marvel at its vast growth, development, and progress. To me, it is truly a tribute to the vision of our forefathers—a Nation of free people living under a government of law which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. Certainly, we can all be proud that we are Americans.

DISTURBING EVENTS

I would be less than candid, however, unless I stated that within the past few years I have become increasingly disturbed by many things I see and hear in our country. I know, too, that many of these happenings are of concern to a growing number of citizens. Crime is rampant in most communities. Growing disrespect for law and order is reaching intolerable proportions. It threatens every home. Its symptoms are visible on every street corner in the smallest of hamlets and in the largest of cities. We see it in the alarming volume of obscene material deluging our country, in the mounting traffic in illicit drugs, in campus riots, and in spiraling teenage arrests. We see it in the contemptible and open manner in which lords of the underworld and organized crime prey on the public, knowing full well that the odds on their being brought to justice are extremely small. And, we see it in the public's attitude toward police and in the reluctance of citizens to become involved in preserving law and order.

A good example of this dangerous trend is the shallow thinking of the civil disobedience advocates. To them, the law is a matter of whim. If they disagree with a certain law, they feel justified in breaking it. While this may seem to be a fast solution to an immediate problem, its overall implications are frightening. Such a concept is wholly inconsistent with our democratic processes. Regardless of the worthiness of a cause or goal, our society cannot exist if each person chooses the laws which he will obey and those which he will break.

We have already seen some results of this foolhardy doctrine. Civil disobedience first emerged on a minor scale involving small groups or individuals who trespassed or blocked entrances of business establishments in defiance of the law to emphasize their complaints. These initial outbreaks seemed rather harmless until they went unpunished and until they were sanctioned and encouraged by some well-meaning but misguided leaders and authorities. The consequences are well known. Official tolerance of seemingly insignificant misdemeanors committed by demonstrators has created contempt for all law and order and made lawbreaking a "respectable" pastime. Civil disobedience has grown from scattered altercations into major riots with burning, looting, sniping, and killing in scores of cities.

Any rational person must agree that civil disobedience is the wrong "means" to any "end." Dispassionate justice for all citizens and a full share of the rights and liberties guaranteed under our system of government are not achieved by taking the law into our own hands. Regardless of how else it may be interpreted, the rise of civil disobedience is now a direct and serious challenge to the rule of law and due process.

I strongly urge all patriotic and lawabiding Americans to reject civil disobedience in any form. We must demand a return to respect for law and order. We must make our position known to Congress and to local and State authorities so that there can be no misunderstanding of our intent to uphold and support the rule of law. We must make it clear that we expect lawbreakers, whoever they are, to be held accountable for their unlawful acts. This is our duty.

Further, we cannot overlook the announced plans for demonstrations in certain major cities with the expressed intentions of bringing operations of the Federal Government to a grinding halt. First of all, such schemes are completely irresponsible. They denote leadership which is low in mental acumen but high in self-aggrandizement and hunger for power. Secondly, even the planning of such a staged disorder is undoubtedly a conspiracy to break the law in the strict legal sense. And finally, if insurrectional fiascoes of this type do in fact occur and functions of the Federal Government are interrupted and the rights of others denied, the public will have an opportunity to judge whether the rule of law applies to all people or whether some are above the law.

FREEDOM IS NOT FREE

Under our system of government, the rights, privileges, and opportunities available to the people place a corresponding obligation on the citizenry. Millions of Americans know from personal experience and sacrifice that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Vigilance, among other things, means responsibility, individually and collectively. Freedom, therefore, comes at a costly price. We pay an installment on freedom every day. It is not free.

This brings me to a point I want to mention briefly concerning the patriotic efforts of the splendid organization I am privileged to represent. The American Legion has chosen for its theme this year the meaningful and succinct truism—"Freedom Is Not Free." More than 2½ million Legionnaires and over 1 million members of The American Legion Auxiliary are working diligently every day to remind all Americans that on the voyage of freedom there is an oar for each passenger. When all oars are stroked in unison, our vessel cuts proudly through the troubled waters, straight and on course. But when the oars are allowed to drag, we begin to flounder. At this crucial time, every citizen should man an oar and do his bit to preserve our way of life. We in The American Legion join millions of other Americans who believe that the preservation of liberty and freedom is a full-time job and is the responsibility of all. We urge all citizens to remember that "Freedom Is Not Free."

Americans today are restless and uncertain. There are serious problems at home and abroad. However, some of our hardships are self-made and stem from sheer laziness and lack of pride. Many people seem to think that their personal welfare and well-being are solely the responsibility of others. They have no inclination to be self-sustaining and to move forward on their own initiative. Rather, they prefer to seek sympathy and demand "something for nothing." The lack of individual drive and personal ambition is the mark of a decaying society. We cannot let this happen to our great Republic. Our Nation was built on self-respect and determination, not on self-pity.

We need in America today a rebirth of pride, energy, and intestinal fortitude. We need to renew our vigor and courage. We need to redirect the thinking of some who would establish a welfare state and stifle the true spirit of democracy and free enterprise. We must promote a positive program of progress and eliminate the pitfalls of permissiveness, self-pity, and greed. We must encourage all citizens to share in the responsibility of preserving our liberty against enemies within and without.

Undoubtedly, crime is our number one internal problem. It influences our lives, directly and indirectly. There are, of course, many factors affecting the criminal problem. The identity of each and its significance in the overall crime picture depend, to some degree, on who does the analyzing. However, to my mind, there is one point which has a tremendous bearing on rapidly rising crime rates. It is the maudlin sympathy heaped upon the criminal to such an extent that the law-abiding citizen is short-changed at the bar of justice. This is deplorable. Many young people, seeing greedy, ruthless criminals freed to return to their illegal pursuits and to live lavishly from the fruits of their crimes, ask, "Where is the advantage of being law-abiding?" No wonder they begin to scoff at the old maxim that "crime does not pay."

Many courts have gone too far in restricting the efforts of law enforcement against the criminal forces. They have narrowed the difference between liberty and license. They are taking much of the risk out of criminality by granting new rights to guilty individuals at the expense of the rights of all people. Law enforcement officers, confronted with long hours, inadequate pay, false "police brutality" charges, rising physical assaults when

walking their beats or making arrests, and public apathy, together with confusing and ever-narrowing judicial rulings, must necessarily face each day with a great deal of perplexity.

Here is the way the Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, put it in discussing these issues recently:

"Consider the plight of the law enforcement officer whose responsibility it is to prevent crime and protect lives and property. His effectiveness is being diluted by judicial gymnastics and turnstile justice which all but drop a legal curtain around hardened, unreformed criminals. In addition, law enforcement in the United States is subjected to more criticism by outside theorists and pressure groups than any other profession. I am continually amazed at the number of 'enlightened' groups and 'freedom-loving' individuals who are so anxious to promote justice by attacking law and order."

Mr. Hoover went on to say:

"Experience shows that swift and impartial justice is one of the most effective deterrents to crime. Yet, swift justice, with all the technical loopholes and unwarranted delays in the law, is almost passe in several jurisdictions, and the rights of peaceful citizens are taking a terrific beating from the 'impartial justice' meted out in some courts."

No right-thinking person would quarrel with the argument that all people, regardless of their station in life, should receive equal treatment under the law. Neither poverty nor wealth should have any bearing on the degree of justice received in courts. However, in a society which professes to live by the rule of law, every person, not just the accused, has a right to full protection of the law. Citizens who cannot follow their daily pursuits because of fear of criminal attacks against their person or property are not receiving their full measure of protection.

COMMONSENSE AND REALISM

In light of the harassing and perplexing problems heaped upon law enforcement, it is surprising that more laws do not go unenforced. We can understand why veteran officers desire to retire, why young officers look for other employment, and why outstanding applicants turn elsewhere for career opportunities.

We need to inject more common sense and realism in the fight against crime. Neither society nor law enforcement is responsible for each and every misdeed of the lawbreaker. Let us hold each individual responsible for his own conduct. When he violates the law—especially when he does so willfully and knowingly—and is found guilty, let him know that punishment will be prompt, certain, and substantial.

In discussing crime problems with law enforcement officials and community leaders, I am told in almost every instance that the shortage of enforcement officers is critical. Some of the reasons given for this situation include inadequate pay, long hours and hazardous working conditions, public apathy, false charges of "police brutality," and unrealistic court decisions which place an impossible burden on investigating officers. Because of these conditions, many communities are losing outstanding officers to other fields. Consequently, department after department is facing a spiraling crime rate with an undermanned force whose morale, for the most part, is very low.

DWINDLING MANPOWER

The January 1968 issue of "The Reader's Digest," in a special article on dwindling police manpower, reported that a survey of 36 major police departments "from Boston to Honolulu discloses that not one is up to authorized strength." In addition, the nationwide shortage is estimated to be 50,000 men. The Digest lays much of the blame on low salaries. Noting that the Office of Economic Opportunity places the poverty level for family income at $3,200 annually, the article cites a number of towns which have a beginning wage for officers at less than this figure, one as low as $2,400 per year.

"Salaries in larger cities, while higher, are nonetheless disgraceful," the Digest explains. "In Seattle, cable splicers earn $375 a month more than policemen; Chicago electricians receive $1.85 an hour more than the officer on the beat; carpenters in New York command 50 percent more per hour than patrolmen."

This is a brief picture of some of the critical needs of law enforcement which cannot be ignored. If our citizens are to be reasonably safe in their homes and on the streets, then they must be willing to pay an adequate wage to qualified officers to enforce the law, and they must be willing to fully support police in this responsibility.

When we think of the assets of our Nation, we naturally think of the wonderful young people who distinguish themselves in numerous fields of endeavor. Their ability and determination to excel in the highly competitive challenges of life are encouraging. We can be deeply proud of the overwhelming majority of our young men and women who show by their courage and hard work that they are eager to perpetuate the ideals of our great Republic and to serve mankind wherever their skills are needed.

SIGNIFICANT SERVICE

Particularly significant, I feel, is the role of the thousands and thousands of young men and women who serve in our armed forces. Certainly, no greater contribution could be made to one's country than to answer its call to military duty in times of need. This is a distinct honor when viewed in its true sense—the protection of democracy as we know it and the defense of the right of all men to live in dignity and freedom.

In these troubled times, military duty is a part of the price of freedom, and a very necessary part. But it is a duty which a small segment of dissidents shirk. They choose to denounce our government for maintaining military strength to prevent communist enslavement of the world. And of course, those who protest by words and acts are exercising a freedom which, along with others they enjoy, would be destroyed if they had their way. This, they cannot seem to understand.

Such distorted reasoning, championed by the so-called "New Left" and similar groups, continues to crop up with amazing regularity. So much so in fact that the true motives of those who espouse such illogical and irrational arguments are suspect. We must question their motives because we find that time after time their objectives and causes are the same as those of the Communist Party, USA, or the numerous subversive front groups. Thus, it could reasonably be concluded that they either feel an allegiance to the evil forces which seek to destroy our Nation or they are so naive as to be duped and exploited by such forces.

Fortunately, these fomenters of dissent are small in number. Unfortunately, while their devious conduct should be exposed, they receive a far greater share of publicity and news media attention than their dishonorable actions merit. This, of course, is one facet of our free society which they do not find objectionable. And it also gives an over-blown picture of their true strength and influence.

It disturbs me, however, to see an increasing number of our young people align themselves with unlawful, militant elements. And it saddens me to see young men pose before news cameras while touching a torch to their selective service cards, violating the law and serving a deceitful cause which they surely do not understand. Such rebellious action appeals to some restless, misguided young men and women. Our enemies know this, and they miss no opportunity to capitalize on it.

We often hear the cry that today's adults cannot "identify" with young people, do not understand them, and, therefore, will not listen to their complaints or wishes. Such a charge needs clarification.

Actually, the American people have not turned a deaf ear to the true voice of today's young America. Let the record show that the groups of rebellious youth who defy law and order, agitate and participate in riots, and resist all authority for the mere sake of opposition do NOT speak for American youth. Rather, they speak a language of nihilism, chaos, and despair. They do not offer one single constructive idea relating to peace, prosperity, and justice for all. The American people know that the fires of destruction and violence are not the answer to any of our problems.

SERVE, NOT BE SERVED

Let the "New Left" and its followers, and all other malcontents who claim to speak for young Americans, know that we do indeed hear them, but so far they have said nothing. Let them know that patriotic Americans, including all but a minimal portion of our young people, are moving forward in unison to build a better and safer America and a better and safer world. If they want to be a part of this great adventure, then let them shoulder some of the responsibility, serve instead of expecting to be served, and show faith, not distrust, in the ideals and principles which have served our Nation so well in times of distress in the past. Otherwise, we have no choice but to "tune them out."

REQUIRES WORK

One of the great truths that Americans, young and old, need to acknowledge today is that a working freedom requires work. We cannot enjoy freedom without sacrifice. We cannot have rights without responsibilities. And we shall reap no rewards without effort.

When we dissent, let us not resist with force. When we assemble, let us not illegally trespass. And when we negotiate, let us not resort to mob violence. One is the way to liberty under the rule of law; the other is the road of license to anarchy. I have strong faith that the people of our great Nation will always choose the right way.

"Let us have faith," said Lincoln, "that right makes might; and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Such faith is indeed the force of life.

BACKGROUND OF THE U.S. MILITARY ESCALATION IN VIETNAM—L. B. J. AND THE WAR—AND CAN PRESIDENTIAL POWER BE LIMITED?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the eminent columnist, Mr. Tom Wicker, Washington bureau chief of the New York Times, has written a perceptive and penetrating analysis of the role played by President Johnson and his advisers in escalating the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

Mr. Wicker's article, entitled "The Wrong Rubicon," and published in the Atlantic for May 1968, analyzes President Johnson's reactions to events in Vietnam both before and after the presidential elections of 1964 in the light of President Johnson's character, background, and experiences.

In discussing the decision to bomb North Vietnam and the publicly stated reasons for doing so, Mr. Wicker concludes:

The bombing began because Lyndon Johnson in the ebullience of his power and in the fatal grip of an irrelevant experience, wanted

to strike and thought he needed to strike and found in the rationale of retaliation the political stance required to fit his lifelong method of operation. The result was the fourth bloodiest war in American history.

Mr. Wicker's article should be "must" reading for all who are concerned with our system of government and with determining why the system of checks and balances established by the Founding Fathers to permit the legislative branch of the Government to balance and check actions by the executive branch has failed so miserably with respect to U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

The question raised by Mr. Wicker's article is: Is Congress or the people capable of curbing the exercise of almost unlimited power by the executive branch of the Federal Government?

In the light of the promises of nonintervention by U.S. Armed Forces in Asia made by President Johnson during the 1964 presidential campaign, it is important that the American people address themselves to this question in this presidential election year of 1968.

In a clearly thought out article entitled "Can We Limit Presidential Power?" published in the New Republic for April 6, 1968, noted historian Henry Steele Commager addresses himself to this problem. He shows how the claimed possession of power by the executive branch soon leads to the seeking of uses for such power. Professor Commager also shows the claim of unlimited power on the part of the Executive stems in part from the misconceptions of administrative officials and the American people of the commitments of the United States in the world. Professor Commager states:

In the long run, then, the abuse of the executive power cannot be separated from the abuse of national power. If we subvert world order and destroy world peace we must inevitably subvert and destroy our own political institutions first. This we are now in the process of doing.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WRONG RUBICON: L. B. J. AND THE WAR

(By Tom Wicker)

(NOTE.—On March 31, 1968, Lyndon B. Johnson, 36th President of the United States, became a casualty of the war in Vietnam, a war that started years before he became President but which, in his time of leadership, grew in intensity and threatened to disrupt this republic. How the fate of L. B. J. and the course of the Vietnam war became interlocked is the subject of this study by the Washington columnist and bureau chief of the New York Times. It is taken from Mr. Wickers' new book, "J. F. K. and L. B. J.: A Study of the Influence of Personality on Politics," to be published later this month by Morrow.)

When Lyndon B. Johnson became President he was something of a throwback to another time. He was a decade older than John F. Kennedy—just enough older to identify him with an earlier generation and its somewhat different view of the world. He was not a product of the Ivy League and the East; he had not come under much influence from the liberal intellectuals who had surrounded Kennedy; unlike them, he had not chafed on the sidelines during the cold war years of the Eisenhower Administration. But it was these liberal intellectuals who had come to power in 1961, while Johnson's obscurity in the vice presidency had kept him out of the main channels of Kennedy Administration talk, thought, and outlook. His view of the world had been shaped neither academically nor in Kennedy's service but while he was the Senate Majority Leader in the fifties, in the full chill of the cold war, when he had been frequently summoned to the White House for briefings by Eisenhower and Foster Dulles. In "responsible" bipartisan fashion he generally supported their foreign policy objectives in Congress.

Johnson was a middle-aged man of small-town America, both a Westerner and a Southerner, and except where politics had demonstrably forced his growth—as on the question of civil rights—he functioned, like most men, as a product of his background. There is little to suggest that at this time he saw the world moving away from the stereotype he had accepted in the fifties—the notion of the "Communist bloc" monolithically seeking to bury "the free world." Like any Rotarian or state legislator and many members of Congress, he saw this world conflict in terms of good and evil, and if he was by no means a right-winger who spied a Communist under every bed and believed in holy war against them, he still was at the time of his accession to the presidency one of those millions of Americans who were nationalist almost to the point of nativism, impressed by the lesson of World War II that aggression unchecked was aggression unleashed, and whose years of greatest activity had coincided with the frustrations and passions of the cold war. Thus his kind of "internationalism" was in many ways only the reverse coin of the old isolationism of the thirties; both were based on a self-righteousness sense of American superiority, on a sort of "higher morality" that derived from pride in democracy, free enterprise, and material success. And in Johnson's case it would never be entirely free from the attitudes of the hard-scrabble Texas hill country in which he had grown up, amid dust, poverty, and struggle.

"I know these Latin Americans," he remarked privately to a group of reporters, not long after becoming President. "I grew up with Mexicans. They'll come right into your yard and take it over if you let them. And the next day they'll be right up on your porch, barefoot and weighing one hundred and thirty pounds and they'll take that too. But if you say to 'em right at the start, 'Hold on, just wait a minute,' they'll know they're dealing with somebody who'll stand up. And after that you can get along fine."

If there was a suggestion here that despite his genuine concern for the poor and downtrodden, Johnson thought somewhat in terms of a "white man's burden" to do something useful for other races without yielding much to them, he was more explicit, early in 1964, about his attitude toward Communists. He didn't agree, he said in another private conversation, with the liberals who thought that "fat Communists" were better than lean and hungry ones. Communists were all alike, he went on, and he believed in keeping them off balance and worried. "The more trouble they have the better for us," he said.

Johnson had not presided over disaster at the Bay of Pigs, nor necessarily drawn Kennedy's conclusions about the dangers of relying upon so-called "experts" rather than upon his own judgment or that of men he knew to be sound and trustworthy whether or not "expert." He had not personally suffered the frustrations, anguish, and political dangers of that debacle or undergone the "somber" experience of Khrushchev's polemics at Vienna, or found himself and his government unprepared and embarrassed by the Berlin Wall. With the military, Johnson's primary experience had been in congressional committees and then more as an ally against the traditional enemy, the executive branch politicians, than as a critic or judge.

Significantly, Johnson came into office with considerable confidence in Secretary Rusk, who had been of declining influence in the Kennedy Administration, and in Secretary McNamara. Rusk had been the official deputed by Kennedy to keep the touchy Vice President Johnson informed on world affairs; with his bureaucrat's scrupulous attention to detail and possibility, Rusk had carried out the assignment generously, and Johnson took to the White House with him no little gratitude as well as the impression that the Secretary was a man who appreciated him and with whom he could work. Since, in more influential circumstances than the Kennedy Administration had accorded him, Rusk would reveal himself as the hardest of the "hard-liners" on Asian Communism, this relationship was of profound importance for the future. Of McNamara, with whom he had at that time no such special relationship, Johnson was nonetheless admiring. A month after becoming President, Johnson said flatly: "I think McNamara is the ablest man I ever met."

Johnson, for sound political and diplomatic reasons, had chosen "continuity" as the theme of his new Administration; on November 27, he would say to Congress: "Let us continue." Already, he had asked Kennedy's Cabinet and staff to stay with him. His personal belief in the Secretaries of State and Defense also meant that continuity in foreign policy was not likely to be a quick pose for political effect but would be a fact for some time to come.

Rusk and McNamara were closely identified with the Kennedy Administration's policy in Vietnam. They had a vested interest in its success, on which largely depended their own reputations. They were not likely to recommend its abandonment or fundamental alteration, and as long as Johnson wanted them to remain in office and retained his own real admiration for them, continuity in Vietnam—more of the same—was very nearly certain. And Kennedy, at his death, was not moving openly toward ending the war.

A good deal, moreover, is known of Johnson's own views on Southeast Asia at the time of his accession to the presidency. In May, 1961, under instructions from Kennedy, he had visited Southeast Asia on an official mission, stopping in South Vietnam Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, India, and Pakistan. Among other things, Johnson reached an agreement with Ngo Dinh Diem—whom he incautiously called "the Churchill of today"—for increased American military assistance. According to news reports of the Johnson tour, he also discussed the possible stationing of American troops in both Thailand and South Vietnam.

Johnson also effected an increased military assistance agreement with Thailand. In South Vietnam, he laid heavy stress on combating "Communism's allies"—the poverty and misery he saw in the native villages. Upon his return to Washington, his public statements were concentrated on this aspect of his finding—the need for the United States to do its part in the economic and social development of Southeast Asia as a major means of keeping that area in "the free world."

At a news conference immediately after his return, however, Johnson was asked about the need for sending American troops to the countries he had visited. There was no plan or need for such a step at that time, he replied, and no promises had been given. But, he added: "I would not want to forever foreclose the possibility of America *protecting her interests* wherever it might be." (Emphasis added.)

And, he said, he had been "disturbed" that "so many Asian leaders should express doubt as to United States intentions."

In his private report to Kennedy, Johnson stressed the need for economic and social de-

velopment but bore down much more heavily on the military problem that he had done in his public remarks:

"Our mission arrested the decline of confidence in the United States. It did not—"in my judgment—restore any confidence already lost. . . .

"I cannot stress too strongly the extreme importance of following up this mission with other measures, other actions, and other efforts. . . ."

The report presented an almost classic statement of so-called "domino theory":

The battle against Communism must be joined in Southeast Asia with strength and determination to achieve success there—or the United States, inevitably, must surrender the Pacific and take up our defenses on our own shores. Asian Communism is compromised and contained by the maintenance of free nations on the subcontinent. Without this inhibitory influence, the island outposts—Philippines, Japan, Taiwan—have no security and the vast Pacific becomes a Red Sea."

The "key to what is done by Asians in defense of Southeast Asian freedom," Johnson wrote the President, "is confidence in the United States. There is no alternative to United States leadership in Southeast Asia . . . SEATO is not now and probably never will be the answer because of British and French unwillingness to support decisive action."

Of course, "these nations cannot be saved by United States help alone." They had to help themselves, particularly in fighting ignorance, poverty, and disease. Nevertheless:

"We must decide whether to help these countries to the best of our ability or throw in the towel in the area and pull back our defenses to San Francisco and a "Fortress America" concept. More important, we would say to the world in this case that we don't live up to treaties and don't stand by our friends . . . I recommend that we move forward promptly with a major effort to help these countries defend themselves . . .

"This decision must be made in a full realization of the very heavy and continuing costs involved in terms of money, of effort and of United States prestige. It must be made with the knowledge that at some point we may be faced with the further decision of whether we commit major United States forces to the area or cut our losses and withdraw should our other efforts fail. We must remain master of this decision."

This is an important Johnsonian document. It shows, first, a full acceptance of the Eisenhower-Dulles "domino theory," which in itself is an expression of an *American interest:* maintaining the frontier in Asia, keeping the battle away from American shores, and holding the "vast Pacific" as part of the "free world" rather than seeing it become a "Red Sea." Johnson's report, moreover, is couched throughout in terms of American interest—enlightened interest, it may be, but American nonetheless; and that is the context in which he spoke to the press about the possible use of American troops in Southeast Asia.

By May, 1961, when there were only a few hundred American advisers and technicians in South Vietnam, Johnson, so seeing the American interest, laid down to Kennedy what was to become a blueprint of the policy he himself would follow in years to come, *including the risk of committing "major United States forces to the area."* Since the term "major" is an imprecise catchall, it is debatable whether Kennedy ever went that far; at his death, U.S. forces in South Vietnam numbered only about 25,000, which no one could have believed was sufficient for the purpose of which Johnson had written. Johnson ultimately raised this number to well over a half million, and there is no doubt that this makes up a "major" force.

This was a significant switch by the Vice President—had it been generally known—because in 1954, during the Dienbienphu campaign, Johnson and Senator Richard Russell of Georgia—the Democratic leader in the Senate and the chairman of the Armed Forces Committee—had been the loudest and strongest opponents of the Eisenhower Administration's tentative plan to go to the aid of the French; both argued strongly the lesson of the Korean War, that the United States never again should become "bogged down" in a land war on the Asian mainland, with its teeming millions, its human waves of soldiers. By early 1961, however, Johnson could already think of putting "major United States forces" into Southeast Asia in pursuit of the *American interest* as expressed in the "domino theory."

Following the overthrow of the Diem government and the murder of Diem and his brother, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge was ordered home for consultations. He was to have had lunch with President Kennedy at his new Virginia country place on Rattlesnake Mountain on Sunday.

Lodge was at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco when he heard the news of Kennedy's assassination. Even in the excitement and panic of that weekend, however, he was told to come on to Washington since the new President would be even more in need of consultations than the old.

Lodge arrived on Saturday, visited the East Room of the White House where Kennedy's body lay in state, and early on Sunday afternoon met with the new President in Johnson's high-ceilinged and roomy old vice presidential suite in the Executive Office Building. Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, McGeorge Bundy, John McCone, the CIA director, and George Ball, the Undersecretary of State, met with Johnson and Lodge. Rusk, McNamara, Lodge, and Bundy all had taken part a few days earlier—before the assassination—in a general political-military review of Vietnam that had been held in Honolulu.

Lodge's report was bleak, although he made no specific requests for Johnson to decide upon. In the wake of Diem's removal, the ambassador said, the new government of South Vietnam was shaky and ineffective, political rivalries were sprouting in and out of it, and the various forces set free by the end of Diem's repression were threatening political chaos. The Viet Cong, already powerful enough, seemed to be redoubling their efforts to take military advantage of what amounted to a divided and leaderless nation. The South Vietnamese Army had managed the coup, but otherwise it was corrupt and inefficient and lacked a real will to fight as well as the leadership to succeed in such battles as it could not avoid.

In short, Lodge, an old friend of Johnson's from their Senate days, whom Johnson once had recommended to Eisenhower for Secretary of Defense, and who was thus close enough to the new President to speak his mind (Lodge is not a man to mince words, anyway), told the emotionally drained Texan that if Vietnam was to be saved, hard decisions would have to be made.

"Unfortunately, Mr. President," Lodge said, "you will have to make them."

The new President, as recalled by one who was present, scarcely hesitated. "I am not going to lose Vietnam," he said. "I am not going to be the President who saw Southeast Asia go the way China went."

"What kind of political support will you have?" Lodge, the experienced politician, asked his old friend and vice presidential opponent.

"I don't think Congress wants us to let the Communists take over South Vietnam," Johnson said.

So the tragedy of Lyndon Johnson—for it may well be that—was set in motion, barely forty-eight hours after he had taken the oath on the plane at Dallas. The moment, if it was there at all, would pass—that moment when, with Diem gone, there might have been the faint possibility of some initial reconciliation between Saigon and the National Liberation Front, and the history of the 1960s might have been changed. All that would follow—the bombing of the North, the half million young Americans trudging the roads and hills and through the jungles of Vietnam, the huge expenditures, the political divisions at home, the decline abroad, the sapping of a Great Society then unborn, the collapse of the consensus yet to be constructed—had been determined in that hour of political decision.

It *was* a political decision, made by a political man, in political circumstances that left him no real choice. For the first but not the last time Lyndon Johnson's cherished "options" were foreclosed; and even if he had been a different person of different experience, even if he had not chosen continuity and clung to Kennedy's men, even then he could have said nothing else.

Because he was, after all and above all, a new President; he was virtually unknown; he was not universally trusted, and he was even less understood. Throughout the Kennedy years, the people had been narrowly divided; nothing in American politics then was certain—nothing but that a President who failed to pursue a strong line against "Communists" would be vulnerable to political opponents at home and to ambitious adversaries abroad. Even Kennedy, in 1960, had been forced to abandon his "soft" line on such unimportant matters as Quemoy and Matsu; his willingness to apologize to Khrushchev for the U–2 incident had been a major liability, exploited in preconvention days by none other than Lyndon B. Johnson.

Adversaries at home and abroad were watching the new man. Both would measure his responses, his politics, his attitudes, probing for any weaknesses. Above all other things that dreary November Sunday, Lyndon Johnson had to be strong, which is to say that, at the minimum, he had to *appear* to be strong; in his own words, he, no less than the nation he now must lead, had to convince the world "not to tread on us."

It is a necessity any new President feels, and not merely as an ambitious politician. That a nation should be respected for its strength as well as its purpose and its past is essential for its security and its ideals, let alone for international leadership. It may well be argued that the greatest respect of mankind should flow to moral rather than military strength, and it is certainly true that there are times when retreat is more to be admired than attack, and when the frank confession of error is more courageous than persistence in it. It ought even to be true that, in Wilson's phrase, there is such a thing as a nation being too proud to fight—or even too moral.

Unfortunately, it cannot be true because in the world of men that strength which unerringly gains the most respect is armed strength; and if might does not truly make right, who can say that it does not rule most of the affairs of men? Thus, political leaders, no matter how beneficial their purposes, tend always to grid up their good intentions with ample armament. "We arm to parley," Churchill said, and in his inaugural address President Kennedy declared ringingly: "Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

This instinct may be regrettable, but it is based on a sure knowledge of man, a predatory animal who does not in practice often turn the other cheek. Thus, armed strength and the willingness to use it are the first requisites of international power, and if this fact is sometimes blamed on political leaders, the righteous who make the charge should ask themselves which came first, men or politicians?

After the Bay of Pigs and after the Khrushchev confrontation, as an example, John

Kennedy was in something near despair because he sensed that Khrushchev thought he was inexperienced and weak; James Reston saw Kennedy before he left Vienna, and Kennedy told him he feared that he could never negotiate or deal with the Soviet leader as an equal until he had shown strength and convinced the world of his steadfastness. It is instructive that it was not until the Cuban crisis over a year later, when he threatened to use nuclear weapons on Moscow, that Kennedy finally achieved that goal.

In the meantime, one of the actions he took in pursuit of it may have been his fateful first escalation of the American commitment in Vietnam during the fall of 1961. In his conference with Lodge in November, 1963, President Johnson, under the same pressing necessity, for much the same reason, had taken the second step that would lead to so great a war that none of the distinguished men in the room with him could possibly have imagined it. *"I am not going to be the President who saw Southeast Asia go the way China went."*

A whole lifetime of political and human experience was distilled in that sentence; the deepest meaning of the endless adventure is to be found in the circumstances that impelled it. Still, it is doubtful that anyone that day, even Johnson himself, thought about the confidential report he had written in 1961 on his return from Southeast Asia. Nor is there anything to suggest that even in the harsh echoes of Lodge's summary anyone foresaw that terrible decision of which the new President once had written "we must remain the master."

The first significant public statement Johnson made about Vietnam as President came on February 21, 1964. He was so new to office that he actually was keeping an appointment made by President Kennedy when, at Charter Day observances at the University of California at Los Angeles, he said:

"The contest in which South Vietnam is now engaged is first and foremost a contest to be won by the government and the people of that country for themselves. [But] those engaged in external direction and supply [of the war in Vietnam] would do well to be reminded and to remember that this type of aggression is a deeply dangerous game."

It may be that the first of these sentences was the most significant in the long run. At the time, however, both the President and the public were more interested in the second sentence.

There is no doubt that Johnson intended this passage as a warning to the North Vietnamese and perhaps to the Chinese that the armed intervention he had been willing to think about in May, 1961, was still a possibility in his own mind. Just to dispel any doubt, Pierre Salinger, the White House Press Secretary, saw to it that White House reporters traveling with the President understood how important Johnson considered the statement.

Those who not only disagree with Johnson's policy in Vietnam as it has developed, but also feel that he duped them during the campaign and later betrayed their hopes, may be right on the facts, but it is a little too much to allow them to have it both ways. In fact, the protests of domestic doves following the Los Angeles speech were so great that Secretary Rusk called a news conference and denied any implication that the United States was planning to escalate the war. Even so, he carefully repeated that external support of the Viet Cong was a "serious business," but insisted: "Whatever happens in the north, there is a large problem in South Vietnam to be dealt with. . . . No miracle in the north is going to suddenly transform or eliminate the problem in South Vietnam."

Johnson himself let the impression get around that he did not understand how the press could have interpreted the UCLA speech as a threat to escalate. I spent an hour with him in his office four days after the speech and asked specifically for the Presidents' own interpretation, and here are the notes taken on the response:

"Asked him [LBJ] for his version of meaning of passage in UCLA speech. Never got it in so many words but did get long lecture on Vietnam. LBJ started by saying if Gen. Eisenhower had tried to invade Normandy the way we have tried to run the Vietnamese war, the Nazis would be in Paris today. Describes our situation in Vietnam as 'new' because Lodge now has new general, new chief of mission, new CIA man, complete authority from LBJ. McN [McNamara] to look into new Lodge request, for more pay for the [Vietnamese] troops. So in position to get something done. The policy there is to train Vietnamese troops to win their own war. Notes we already pulled out 1,000 men no longer needed. Says more can be pulled out as more Vietnamese get training. Praised Kanh [the latest general to have taken over in Saigon, Nguyen Kanh] as young, vigorous. Used analogy of somebody coming into my yard, burning my trees, killing my mother. Wouldn't that be a "deeply dangerous game?" But no suggestion in itself of expanding the war or enlarging American commitment. Implied criticism of Kennedy because we have mess on our hands over there."

The political situation in which Johnson found himself in February, 1964, was clearly not conducive to frank talk about a wider war in Vietnam. Even then, Goldwater was "pooping around" snow-covered New Hampshire, beginning the process of making himself an open and irresistible target for a "prudent" candidate, while horrifying much of the old-line Republican Party. Whatever Johnson may have been thinking privately, whatever the actual situation in Vietnam, the demands of politics—which is to say, the demands of men and circumstance—dictated that Johnson disclaim the intention, if not the possibility, of "going north." Just as Goldwater's campaign was being shaped in New Hampshire, so was Johnson's in the response to his Los Angeles speech.

On June 28, however, Johnson gingerly warned again of the possibility of escalation. As more than fifty thousand people attending the *Svenskarnas Dag* (Swedes' Day) picnic listened in Minnehaha Park in Minneapolis, he said the United States, "when necessary," would not hesitate to "risk war" to preserve peace. This was a last-minute alteration of a prepared text which had declared that the United States "would use the force necessary" to maintain South Vietnam's freedom; some reporters already had filed stories based on the first text and all called attention to the change. The altered wording showed how politically delicate the matter was, but also that Johnson had not fundamentally changed the views he brought home from Southeast Asia in 1961.

The nation was "strong enough to protect ourselves and our allies," Johnson said, but it also was committed to "restraint in the use of power." It would never intervene in "honest clashes or belief or goals." But, he warned, "we seek neither dominion or conquest but where it exists we must work to dispel it." Both the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations had portrayed the war in Vietnam as, at least partially, an effort at "dominion or conquest" from the North, and thus the *Svenskarnas Dag* speech was essentially a repetition of the UCLA warning.

Up to this point, a nice ambiguity had been achieved about Vietnam; Johnson had promised to support Saigon but had not made clear how far he was prepared to go militarily. But in August, with Goldwater nominated and campaigning against what he called the Administration's "no win" policy, with Johnson ready for his own anointment at Atlantic City, a startling development caused the President to make his attitude even clearer.

North Vietnamese gunboats attacked an American destroyer in the Gulf of Tonkin on August 2 without success. Johnson ordered American ships to destroy such attackers in the future. On August 4, new gunboat attacks were reported in the Gulf, and the President went even further. He ordered retaliatory air raids directly against North Vietnam. Explaining this action in a late-night television appearance on August 4, Johnson called the air raids a "positive reply" but said "we will seek no wider war." The next day, in a speech at Syracuse University, he added:

"To any who may be tempted to support or to widen the present aggression, I say this: there is no threat to any peaceful power from the United States of America. But there can be no peace by aggression and *no immunity from reply.* And that is what is meant by the actions that we took yesterday." [Italics added.]

Whether there would be no immunity for whatever Johnson defined as aggression or just for attacks directly on the American flag, like those in the Tonkin Gulf, the President did not make clear—which, with Hanoi presumably listening, he could hardly have been expected to do. But the operative words *no immunity* were still another way of saying the same thing that had been said at Los Angeles and Minneapolis.

Johnson also seized the moment of the Tonkin crisis to send substantial new forces to Southeast Asia; these were primarily air and sea units, and their presence in the area was to play a large role in the future. Finally, he also used the episode to drive through Congress the celebrated resolution that gave him congressional authorization "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and *to prevent future aggression.*" (Italics added.)

In one stroke, Johnson had been able both to flex his muscles and prudently to limit what could have been a war-provoking crisis. One of his aides said later that one of the President's purposes had been "to win Republicans and conservatives with a responsible show of force. He already had the Left."

But the cost was high. The Tonkin crisis, however it seemed at the time, ultimately produced for Johnson two of his major difficulties. No doubt he handled it superbly; yet it would return again and again to haunt him because the circumstances that apply one day may be, usually will be, entirely different on another. And particularly in politics, what one does to achieve success may prove more important and lasting than the success itself.

With the resolution that the President maneuvered through Congress, and with the deception or guile—whatever description one chooses—that he used to keep it intact and his freedom of action unhampered, the most astute congressional strategist of our time planted the seeds of distrust and suspicion in that body. He alienated not just Senator Fulbright; in both houses, an undetermined but significant number of members came to look back upon the episode of the Tonkin Resolution as a ruthless power play and a betrayal of the congressional-executive trust.

The success of his response in the Tonkin Gulf would guide Johnson straight into an even more damaging mistake than his congressional tactics on behalf of the resolution. For the fact was that, having shown his strength, having diminished Goldwater's ability to charge him with a "no win" policy and with soft-headedness toward Communism, having established his own "restraint," Johnson seemed free to do what came so naturally to so political a creature. With every rattle of the Goldwater sword, every reference to the use of nuclear weapons by

the Air Force general on the Republican ticket, every provocative remark about bombing the North from the avid jet pilot who was his opponent, Johnson was lured by politics into the profitably contrasting position of deploring—even forbidding—war, escalation, and nuclear brinkmanship. The Tonkin Gulf was the background against which he seemed able to do so safely; in the long run, it was the birthplace of the credibility gap.

All the evidence visible at the time, and much testimony gathered since, suggests that in 1964 Johnson was not deeply concerned about Vietnam. The excellent Rusk and McNamara, as well as Lodge's competent "new team," were on hand to handle it, and anyway, the "issue polls" Johnson studied with as much care as he gave to CIA reports showed that Vietnam, then, was the major concern of only a small proportion of the voters. There was no real fear in the White House that the war would become the central issue of the years ahead, that every word spoken now would have its later impact, and not always the one intended.

But if the war was not a matter of night-and-day care, the election was. For eminently practical political reasons, Johnson wanted to win a landslide. Believing as he did in his Populist, politician's heart that the best politics was to deliver "something for the folks," with his Great Society program already being drawn up, Johnson recognized that he had the chance to break the decade-long deadlock of American politics; he could win the overwhelming mandate Kennedy had never had, swing Congress decisively as Eisenhower had never done, and deal with the backlog of urgent domestic business that had been piling up since the fifties. Then, like his idol, FDR, he could go on to break new ground.

Goldwater, in short, offered almost unlimited opportunity to a politician who had proved his skill in domestic affairs (the Kennedy tax and civil rights bills had been moved, the long-threatened railroad strike had been settled) and demonstrated both his strength and his restraint abroad; few men, certainly not hungry, mercurial Lyndon Johnson, could have resisted the openings offered, with Vietnam and peace in many ways the greatest of them. The President knew he had Goldwater on the ropes, knew he could be champion, perhaps the greatest of champions, when for so many years it had seemed impossible; and it was just not in him to stop punching or to pace his attack carefully. Thus, on September 25, Johnson declared:

"We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. We don't want to get involved in a nation with 700 million people and get tied down in a land war in Asia."

And on September 28, with enthusiasm rising:

"We are not going north and drop bombs at this stage of the game, and we are not going south and run out. . . . We are going . . . to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men. . . ."

And a little later, with Goldwater clearly in mind:

"Sometimes our folks get a little impatient. Sometimes they rattle their rockets some, and bluff about their bombs. But we are not about to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves. . . . There is only one road to peace and that is to work at it patiently, deliberately, wisely, step by step, year by year, never to become reckless, never to become weary of the journey and irritated with folks who may not agree with you the first time you talk to them."

In the fall of 1964, Lyndon Johnson may or may not have known that he was not going to deliver on his promises that he would not "go north." He told the reliable Charles Roberts of *Newsweek* that he had decided to bomb North Vietnam as early as October, 1964. He told me in 1965 that as early as October, 1964, the targets had been chosen for attack, if bombing was ever decided upon. Given Johnson's obfuscation of his own motives and actions, and his occasional bombast, he may have been saying the same thing to both of us, in different ways. Contingency plans for bombing the North had been in existence for years; planes were readily available, as the Gulf of Tonkin had demonstrated; as early as 1961, Walt W. Rostow had been an ardent advocate of bombing, and his proposals and justifications had been brought to Johnson's attention. General Taylor, who had succeeded Lodge as Ambassador to Saigon in 1965, advocated bombing strikes in October, 1964, after earlier opposition.

During the campaign, however it may have diverted his attention, Johnson—or any President—could not have failed to know that the situation in Vietnam was deteriorating. Nothing anywhere suggests that Johnson himself had fundamentally changed the view he had expressed in 1961—that a "free" South Vietnam was vital to American interests and that, if necessary, "major American forces" would have to be committed to keep it "free." Given everything, it is fair to say that if he did not know that he could not keep his promises not to "go north," he certainly did not know that he could keep them.

In his search for personal vindication, for consensus, and for the power consensus would bring him, therefore, he had gone a step too far. He had transgressed the acceptable limits of his political reach. If he had not actually made up his mind what to do in South Vietnam, he had no way of knowing what might be required of a President who believed protecting it so vital to American interests. Yet, he could say: "As far as I am concerned, I want to be very cautious and careful, and use it only as a last resort, when I start dropping bombs around that are likely to involve American boys in a war in Asia with seven hundred million Chinese."

But he was not that "cautious and careful" in what he said in his campaign, or in how he said it. And this would be what was remembered.

The drama of the confrontation with Goldwater, the monstrous outpouring of crowds, the posturing television images, the insistent words, the ever mounting ebullience of Lyndon Johnson, the souring, vaguely omnious tone of his opponent—all these combined to produce an enormous impact on the public, as a presidential campaign usually does. In that impact, the earlier warnings, the carefully maintained ambiguity of policy for the sake of consensus, the clear suggestions of what might have to be done, all were forgotten by President and public alike. Lyndon Johnson was promising peace, and Barry Goldwater was promising war; the President had shoved in all his stack; that was the effect on men, and in the endless adventure it is not the fact, so much as the impression, that controls.

"It seems," Lyndon Johnson told reporters on election night at the LBJ Ranch, near where he had grown up in the dust and poverty of the hill country, "that I have spent my life getting ready for this moment." And as the returns poured in, state after state falling into his column, the electoral total mounting, the great sweep developing, governors, senators, congressmen, members of legislatures riding in on his coattails, that long wait seemed eminently worthwhile. Everything seemed justified because it was the greatest election victory in history. The deadlock was smashed; the consensus was built; the Great Society was on the way; and Lyndon Johnson, the accidental President, would belong to the ages.

But history played a demonic joke upon Lyndon Johnson and, therefore, upon us all. Once, in 1964, he had told some reporters he had invited for lunch that he did not intend to make the mistake that he believed had ruined Franklin Roosevelt's second term. "Roosevelt was never President after 1937 until the war came along," he said. Lyndon Johnson would not forget the limits of power; he would not carelessly throw away the fruits of his great victory for some unattainable goal, as Roosevelt had done in trying to pack the Supreme Court.

But he did.

Hanoi and Saigon, of course, had heard the campaign oratory too. By the time the election was over, South Vietnam was in deep political and military trouble and its American advisers were nearing despair. A succession of coups in Saigon had resulted neither in political progress toward needed reforms and stability nor in military advances. Diem had been followed by chaos. Neither the Viet Cong nor the North Vietnamese had failed to take advantage of this situation.

Militarily, the Viet Cong were mounting ever bigger and more successful battles, and the evidence suggested that they were getting more and more help from North Vietnam. Deliveries of weapons and supplies apparently had increased, although there are no reliable figures to suggest by how much. So, apparently, had the infiltration of North Vietnamese fighting men, although here again the figures are fuzzy. On July 10, 1967, the Defense Department gave the following infiltration figures for the period.

November 1964	800
December 1964	800
Total 1964	12,500
January 1965	2,000
Total 1965	26,000

Whether or not these figures are precise, there is little reason to doubt that they give a fairly accurate picture of increasing infiltration, which was getting to be a serious matter by the beginning of 1965. The United States itself had put in an additional five to six thousand troops in August, 1964, though not ostensibly for purposes of combat, and as the war seemed to be moving toward a showdown, the North Vietnamese would have had every reason to increase the military pressure in the South, and the NLF to welcome the assistance.

Two days before the American election, Viet Cong mortars had destroyed six B–57 bombers and killed five Americans in a surprise attack on the South Vietnamese air base at Bienhoa. Lyndon Johnson had done nothing—not surprisingly, from an American point of view, because as the campaign had developed it might have been a bad risk for him to have launched even limited reprisal air raids that close to Election Day; his image as a "man of prudence" might have been shaken, and although the election surely could not have been lost, Johnson was by then in no mood to jeopardize even one vote. He wanted them all.

But it is also not surprising if Hanoi and the NLF drew their own conclusions. Bienhoa was a more costly attack than the one in the Tonkin Gulf—a Communist victory, in fact, resulting in dismaying American losses. Since it was generally believed that the American bombers were at Bienhoa to impress the North Vietnamese with the potential of American air power, and since they had been placed there as part of the response to the Tonkin Gulf crisis, the mortar attack could have been nothing but a direct challenge to the United States—the sort of thing Johnson had said would be accorded "no immunity." American men were killed, and that made it surely the kind of attack on American forces that the Tonkin Resolution had authorized him to "take all necessary steps" to repel. But he did not act.

These events, taken with the general tone

of Johnson's campaigning in the final months against Goldwater, can have had no other effect in Hanoi except to convince Ho Chi Minh's government that it could step up the level of its military effort to a final push in 1965 without danger of major American intervention. A mortar attack directly on an American billet in Saigon just before Christmas also drew no American response; Johnson is reported to have been reluctant to shatter the Christmas season with warlike acts, or to dispel the general good feeling of his pre-inaugural period; but again, the North Vietnamese were unlikely to take such considerations into account. It is no wonder that in January, according to the figures quoted above, the first big increase in infiltration into the South could be counted, or that General Taylor's intelligence agents had detected whole North Vietnamese units gathering for the kill. Hanoi had decided it had the green light.

This interpretation is supported by events in Saigon and elsewhere. As 1964 turned to 1965, seldom if ever had there been such unrest and turmoil in that unhappy capital. It is not part of this narrative to trace the bewildering successions of governments, uprisings, riots, resignations, statements, and outside influences at work, but in sum, a powerful anti-American, neutralist sentiment was visible, with Buddhist street mobs its most dramatic instrument; a strong South Vietnamese anti-Communist military bloc opposed it; and insofar as the outside world could judge, there seemed to be a climactic struggle between these elements for power. Some Americans in Saigon actively feared the emergence of a Buddhist-neutralist government that would seek peace with the NLF.

In the world at large, both De Gaulle of France and U Thant of the United Nations were seeking negotiated peace, and it even appeared to some that the Soviet Union was in the same mood; *Izvestia* called for a Johnson-Kosygin meeting, and Peking was alarmed enough to accuse the new Soviet leaders of practicing "Khrushchevism without Khrushchev." Both in Saigon and elsewhere, it was apparently believed that Johnson, as he had seemed to say in the campaign, would countenance no "wider war" and that peace, therefore, was the realistic alternative.

At home, too, involvement in Vietnam was not popular. The Gallup poll for November 29, 1964, reported that 50 percent of the respondents believed the United States had handled Vietnam badly; in January, Lou Harris showed that 23 percent wanted to "negotiate and get out," and another 40 percent were *willing to do* no more than "hold the line." A few respected Senate voices—Mike Monroney of Oklahoma and John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky, for instance—were expressing public doubts.

On its face, it might therefore seem that here was a second moment, somewhat comparable with that following the fall of Diem, when peace could have been had in Vietnam.

Johnson, it well may be, could have found a reasonable excuse for disengagement. He could have pointed out that there was evidently in Saigon neither sufficient will to win the war nor anything resembling the free government and free people for whose benefit both he and Kennedy had maintained the war was being fought. Following the theme Kennedy had insisted upon, and which Johnson had sounded fervently in the closing stages of his campaign, he could have said that it was a war for Asian boys to win; that the United States was willing to lend technical and material support, but since the Asian boys and their leaders displayed too little concern whether they won or not, the United States thought it the better part of good policy not to send good money—much less men—after bad. It is even possible, considering the state of things in Saigon and how the United States had influenced events at the time of the Diem overthrow, that a government could have been nudged into power that would have announced peace aims and made further United States participation a moot question.

Johnson not only had this on-scene situation within which to operate in the weeks following his election; he also had a solid domestic position to cover any retreat. He could have extricated himself from the war with less difficulty, probably, than De Gaulle had had during the Algerian disengagement. The Texan had won the most enormous political victory any President ever had; his mandate was unchallenged. He had spared the country Goldwater, and the collective sigh of relief was as audible as any political sentiment of this century. The response to Johnson's "peace" statements on Vietnam during the campaign, while not universal, were as near an expression of solid public support as most Presidents ever get. The Republicans and the Southern Democrats, the only conceivable organized political powers that could have objected, had been shattered in the one case and badly shaken in the other. Never again would Lyndon Johnson have anything approaching the "free hand" that the 1964 elections gave him in the opening months of 1965.

In his State of the Union Message that January, Johnson himself made it clear where he wanted to go. He propounded a sweeping program of domestic reform, and, as he later would do in his Inaugural, called for rapproachement and a pooling of energies with the Soviet Union for peaceful purposes. A major war in Vietnam could do little to advance—it would actively pervert—both his domestic and his international purposes, particularly his desire to end the cold war and cooperate with the Soviets. Given the activities of U Thant, France, and the Soviet Union, it is likely that a strong Johnson move toward a negotiated settlement would have met some international cooperation that might have borne fruit; U Thant, for one, is convinced that it would have.

There probably had been no other point in the Vietnamese involvement, as we have seen, when the American effort seemed so near to abject failure. Political chaos in Saigon; apathy toward the war evident among the South Vietnamese populace; corruption everywhere; an aggressive Viet Cong pushing its sanguinary efforts in the countryside; tough North Vietnamese units and replacements arriving in force to help the insurgents; and the South Vietnamese Army badly, if not criminally, led by an inept, closed, and politically divided officer corps: these facts meant that a major defeat was at hand unless something was done, soon, and in Washington. And more than a year earlier, that grim November afternoon in the Executive Office Building, Lyndon Johnson had told Cabot Lodge, *"I am not going to be the President who saw Southeast Asia go the way China went."*

Lyndon Johnson was personally and politically committed. Steeped in and shaped by the cold war era of American history, a devout believer in the "domino theory" and the evil intentions of Communism, he was not looking for a way out; he was looking for a way to win, or at least to get the terms he believed were necessary.

The important thing, therefore, was that Johnson had no bargaining position whatever in Vietnam. In early 1965, he was on the edge of defeat and toppling over, and Ho Chi Minh knew it as well as he did. Given a little more strength, a little better field position, it might have been possible even for sincere anti-Communists like Johnson and Rusk to have made a pragmatic settlement, as the best of a bad bargain, on which the face of victory might have been painted. But the only way Lyndon Johnson or any other President could have negotiated his way out of Vietnam early in 1965 was by the virtual surrender of the anti-Communist government in Saigon and the abandonment of the American commitment to it.

Political negotiations, after all, do not create new situations; they only ratify power relationships that already exist. A negotiated settlement of any controversy is a ratification of the status quo (unless one side or the other foolishly gives away its position). In early 1965, the power relationship that existed was that North Vietnam and the NLF had all but won their war; they were in general control of South Vietnam outside Saigon, and any conceivable negotiation would inevitably give that status quo legal as well as de facto standing. Lyndon Johnson not only knew that better than anyone; he believed that to permit such a conclusion to the Vietnamese affair would be disastrous abroad and politically explosive at home.

Johnson was confronting the new Soviet regime of B-ezhnev and Kosygin, and he wanted them to be under no illusions about the strength and determination of the man in the White House, just as Kennedy, after Vienna, had desperately wanted to prove his steadfastness and nerve to Khrushchev. This concern on the part of Johnson was neither idle nor vain. To the extent that power is a determining force in the affairs of men—and who would deny that that is a great extent?—one of the essential ingredients of power is its credibility. Power has no meaning if it will not or cannot be used, and not all of America's might would have impressed the Soviet leaders had they believed Johnson feared or had not the political ability to use it.

After the long campaign of 1964, with Johnson in the role of peace candidate, there might well have been a question in Moscow on that point. It was sound diplomacy, as Johnson saw it, to remove any doubt about his willingness to stand fast when challenged. Moreover, it was characteristic of his whole experience in politics that, having established in his campaign a position of moderation and restraint on the war, he then faced the other way and set about proving his readiness and ability to use his power when he had to.

But Johnson was not concerned merely with his own position, important as that was in the world, and particularly in the eyes of his Soviet counterparts. On October 16, 1964, as he and Goldwater drew near the end of their one-sided contest, the Chinese Communists had exploded a nuclear device in the interior of Asia; the increased power and prestige that immediately accrued to Peking were a new factor in the balance of forces in Asia. Believing, as Johnson did, in the threat of Asian or any kind of Communism, he could only have seen an American withdrawal from, or compromise in, Vietnam as a further, and unacceptable, gain for the Chinese.

As he had in 1961, he saw the containment of Communist expansion and influence in Southeast Asia as a necessity of American national security, and he saw South Vietnam also as the key "domino," not only in Asia but in the whole string of American commitments upon the credibility of which—so Johnson and Dean Rusk believed—world peace depended. If he pulled out of Vietnam, he believed, Communism, seen almost as a mystic force rather than as a policy of national states, would in swift progression outflank Thailand, menace the Malaysian peninsula and Indonesia, surround India, and throw the American line of influence, perhaps even defense, back somewhere into the Pacific. Wars of liberation, vindicated as a technique, would spring up like bonfires throughout the underdeveloped world. Even Europe might be in difficulties because the American commitment

to defend it, and particularly West Berlin, was a key factor in its security; and Johnson believed that if he pulled out of Vietnam ignominiously, no one, least of all Brezhnev and Kosygin, would believe that he would honor a commitment anywhere.

Johnson played it safe as he began his full term. There would be as little break with the Kennedy image as possible. That meant not only that the "commitment" of Eisenhower and Kennedy to South Vietnam had to be honored—one might find a way to escape that kind of entanglement—but it meant also that Rusk and McNamara and Bundy and Maxwell Taylor, and ultimately, even Cabot Lodge, would still be there. The architects of the Vietnamese involvement would be Johnson's advisers in the new circumstances created by his landslide, just as they had been Kennedy's in the fall of 1961 and Johnson's in November, 1963.

Among Johnson's high-level advisers, only Undersecretary of State George Ball openly took the negative on Vietnam. In October, 1964, he had sent the President a hundred-page memorandum advocating a withdrawal from the "gluepot" of Indochina; or, if that could not be done, at least a concentration upon the ground war in South Vietnam itself rather than "going north" with air power. Ball's memo thus confirms the fact that even before the election, while Johnson was still assuring the voters that he did not want to "start dropping bombs around" in an Asian war, an air attack against North Vietnam was considered likely enough by a sub-Cabinet officer to get up a major argument against it.

But Ball was only one among many, and Johnson's decision to retain the Kennedy Cabinet deprived him, practically speaking, of much of the political freedom a landslide election in his own right had provided. He might talk to reporters about "keeping his options open," but he already had limited them severely for the sake of political continuity. The men with the greatest vested interest in winning the war, and in demonstrating its rightness, would continue to be his principal advisers—advocates as well as judges, fact-finders as well as fact-weighers—on war policy.

Several officials who were close to Johnson at that time also recall the sheer ebullience of the moment. One of them had also served Kennedy and remembers the same sense of omnipotence in the White House in early 1961. "Everything had always worked out for us," he said. "The primaries, the convention, the debates with Nixon, the confrontation with the Houston ministers, the election itself. We thought we had the golden touch. It was just like that with Johnson after 'sixty-four'."

In Kennedy's case, the sense of the golden touch vanished at the Bay of Pigs, never really to return. But by January, 1965, Lyndon Johnson had even more reason for sheer confidence in his ability to make things come right. He had maintained the government in an hour of crisis, taken over the Democratic Party from the Kennedys, pushed through the legislation John Kennedy couldn't (as Johnson saw it), crushed Goldwater, and won the White House with the biggest vote margain in history.

People who have known Johnson the longest maintain without exception that he is at his best when the going is toughest—as, for instance, when he had a Democratic majority of only one senator in 1957, or just after he succeeded Kennedy in the White House. Richard Nixon put it another way during the campaign of 1964. He was working as hard for Goldwater as he could, he said privately, because as a political realist he was most afraid of a Johnson landslide. He had observed Johnson over many years in the Senate, and he agreed with Johnson's friends. When the going was hardest, when there were practical restraints on him, Johnson was an exceptionally able leader; but when he was powerful enough to have a free hand, Johnson lost his otherwise sure touch, and his vanity and mercurial temperment were likely to take charge of him.

If Johnson nevertheless maintained most of his habitual political caution as 1965 opened, that had little to do with his attitude on military operations in Vietnam. He might worry about Republicans being able to charge him with softness, but he had no fear that Americans would condemn a fight against Communism, or that their soldiers could not win a war.

It would be too much to suggest, in the light of the Korean War and of the French experience in Indochina (not to mention the American experience to that point in South Vietnam), that Johnson or his advisers thought the war could be easily or quickly won by an American intervention. But the history of the war, one of these men has said in retrospect, is "a search for the quick fix." It has been one effort after another to force a quick end to a situation that cannot even be sharply defined, much less circumscribed. Men in Washington now understand, a great deal more clearly than they did in early 1965, that the war in Vietnam is neither as simple as a rebellion nor as clear as an aggression. It is an immensely complicated struggle, with historical and social as well as political and economic roots, a terribly total, but curiously limited, war in which military power is only one of the weapons needed. Even in its strictly military aspects, it is not necessarily a war in which firepower and sophisticated equipment and tons of supplies (in all of which twentieth-century American armies specialize) can be decisive.

But how could Lyndon Johnson, in his moment of triumph, with his sense of the golden touch, doubt that his superbly equipped forces, representing all the technological and industrial genius of America, organized by the incomparable McNamara, with his modern administrator's skills, trained and led by the impressive generals and admirals with whom Johnson had conspired politically in his congressional days, backed by the most powerful industrial capacity and the most impressive economy in history—how could he doubt that this juggernaut could deal with a few ill-clad guerrillas, if necessary with the old-fashioned Chinese-style infantry divisions of Vo Nguyen Giap, with an enemy who had to steal his weapons, bring in his supplies on bicycles and the backs of old women, and whose soldiers were regimented Communist slaves without the incentives of freedom and democracy to make them fight well?

As for the political aspect of the thing, was not Lyndon Johnson the man who had brought the R.E.A. to Texas? He knew how to deliver the political goods to the people. And once America brought its famous know-how to the task of raising the Vietnamese standard of living, the Saigon government ought to have no more difficulty winning the loyalties of the people than LBJ had had in getting elected to Congress down in the hill country.

And there is something else, too, something that must be discussed delicately, but discussed nevertheless. Lyndon Johnson was not then, and is not now, a racist, or even an imperialist. He was and is, however, a fervently nativist American who still, in the White House, could remember and recite his childhood oration from George Frisbie Hoare, the famous encomium to the colors that includes the phrase ". . . the fairest vision on which these eyes ever looked was the flag of my country in a foreign land," and whose patriotism and conviction of his country's superior virtues were passionate and instinctive.

He was and is a man of the South in whom the heritage of Ol' Massa has been overcome but not forgotten, as it never can be by any Southerner. He was and is a child, too, of Texas and Colonel Colt, influences just as powerful. He was and is a man, therefore, of power and pride, and the latter will not brook much hindrance of the former, particularly from men who, though not perhaps inferior, still have to be reminded from time to time of the realities of things:

"They'll come right into your yard and take it over if you let them. And the next day they'll be right up on your porch, barefoot and weighing one hundred and thirty pounds and they'll take that too. But if you say to 'em right at the start, 'hold on, just wait a minute,' they'll know they're dealing with somebody who'll stand up. And after that you can get along fine."

The enemy in Vietnam was barefoot and weighed one hundred and thirty pounds. He was the kind of man who might be fine in his place, who could be a useful citizen and a good friend if he let you train him right and help him a little, but who would take over your front porch if you didn't stand up to him. Lyndon Johnson was not about to let little brown men who skulked in the jungle do that to him and to the United States of America, and he was not capable of believing that the barefoot guerrillas might try to take the front porch anyway, even if told to "hold on, just wait a minute." The French had had no helicopters and no aircraft carriers and no political backing at home, and Ho Chi Minh could deal with *them*, all right. But when it came to the full might of the U.S.A.—when God's country struck with the righteous wrath of freedom aroused—surely then it would be Glory, Glory Hallelujah, as it had been in every war in American history. And that symbolic flag of George Frisbie Hoare's fervent oratory again would be "terrible as a meteor."

It seemed then that it might not even be necessary to send in American troops, although Ball, dissenting as usual, had argued that if there was to be an intervention, it ought to be on the ground in the South, where he thought the war would be won or lost. But that would guarantee ugly casualty lists, for one thing. For another, a generation of Americans had been brought up on the proposition that never again should their troops get embroiled in a land war on the continent of Asia, as they had been in the stalemate in Korea.

Air power was cheaper. It was what the South Vietnamese officers wanted. It was most acceptable in Congress, where for years airmen had lobbied assiduously and well. It would engage a Navy impatient for a piece of the action, with its carriers already steaming in the Tokin Gulf. Air and sea power, after all, were the great American assets in the Pacific area; why not fight one's own war rather than Giap's?

Kept away from sensitive areas along the Yunnan border, moreover, air raids also were less likely than a troop commitment to alarm the enigmatic Chinese into the kind of massive retaliation they had launched when Americans forces in Korea had approached the Yalu River in 1950.

Besides, the enemy in North Vietnam had not yet felt the sting of war. It cost Hanoi little to sponsor and support terrorism and guerrilla action in the South. If the scourge of war could be carried to Ho Chi Minh and the zealots of his government, not just to their troops and agents far off in the South, they would get a clear and painful idea of what their ambitions could cost. There would be "no sanctuary" in North Vietnam, and that would make it an entirely different war.

All in all, air power appeared on its face to be the quickest way to meet the main need of the moment, which was bolstering the morale and prestige of the anti-neutralist South Vietnamese Army and government factions and keeping them in control in Saigon. This was necessary if the war was even to be continued, let alone concluded advantageously.

Still, Inauguration Day passed, and John-

son had made only a characteristically limited commitment to the air power advocates. But at some point during these turn-of-the-year months, he had agreed with his military advisers that deliberate attacks on Americans (as distinguished from attacks on South Vietnamese which might incidentally kill Americans) would be answered with air strikes against the North. That was no more than implementing the pledge of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, and the action would be modeled on the Tonkin Gulf retaliation, which had pleased the President with its blending of power and restraint.

This limited commitment again was predictable, given Lyndon Johnson's political *modus operandi*. He was under military pressure to bomb; he was under political pressure for restraint; every instinct derived from his lifelong war of political survival told him to alienate neither force but to placate both with half a loaf for each. In his retaliation decision, he found the middle ground, that comfortable territory on which he saw no reason not to stand in Vietnam, as he had always stood in Texas and in the Senate.

A more sweeping policy of bombing the North, in general punishment for what it was supposed to be doing in the South, had long been advocated by Walt W. Rostow, among others. The President, although deeply concerned at the possibility of a South Vietnamese collapse, was not willing, as February began, to undertake such a portentous campaign. McGeorge Bundy was in Saigon, however, on a mission partially designed to determine whether general air attacks as recommended by Rostow ought to be launched.

The question was never answered. On February 7, vicious Viet Cong mortar fire came down on the American Special Forces camp at Pleiku, and Viet Cong infiltrators breached the South Vietnamese security perimeter to blow up several aircraft. Eight Americans were killed, and 108 others were injured. This case fitted the circumstances under which Johnson had decided to retaliate against North Vietnam enough so that, on the same day, with Bundy urging him on by overseas telephone, air strikes were launched by forty-nine carrier planes against staging areas and base camps around Donghoi in North Vietnam, just above the Demilitarized Zone. A second wave of South Vietnamese planes, escorted by American jets, struck the Vinhlinh communications center, even nearer the DMZ, on February 8.

These raids against the North, according to the official White House statement, were "in response to provocations ordered and directed by the Hanoi regime," which had been reported by American intelligence as ordering "a more aggressive course of action against both South Vietnamese and American installations."

The statement also contained the official rationale for attacking the North Vietnamese in response to Viet Cong attacks in the South: "These attacks were only made possible by the continuing infiltration of personnel and equipment from North Vietnam. This infiltration markedly increased during 1964 and continues to increase."

Official after official, in public and in private testimony, explained at the time that the Pleiku raids had been an open and direct challenge of American will and purpose, ordered by Hanoi and carried out on Hanoi's orders; the resulting air raids had been a "limited and fitting response." Even George Ball, no doubt reflecting sadly on his hundred-page memorandum of October, 1964, testified loyally at a news conference that the Administration had had no choice but to respond, so that Hanoi could not mistake American intentions, so that American lives could be protected.

"Secret intelligence," of course, was adduced to prove that Hanoi had planned and precipitated this test. Nevertheless, Charles Mohr, a reporter who had spent enough time in Vietnam to have a sense of its complexity and who was, in February, 1965, the White House correspondent of the New York *Times* (later, he returned to Saigon), analyzed the Administration explanation skeptically in a *Times* article on February 8:

"The Administration contention clearly is that North Vietnam made possible the attack on Pleiku. But the questions about the incident grow out of the apparent fact that a small Vietcong unit, armed with captured [American] weapons and protected by a lack of field intelligence on the part of the South Vietnamese Army, succeeded in creeping onto the American base and dealing a bloody blow.

"Thus the final question is how much of the responsibility for Pleiku can be laid not just to Hanoi but to a failure to prosecute the antiguerrilla war in South Vietnam itself in a more vigorous and successful way."

And one Administration official, asked why Pleiku had been considered more of a North Vietnamese challenge than Bienhoa (two days before the election), replied: "There's a limit to America's patience. When the attack was repeated, and repeated under those circumstances, there was no alternative."

Another official put it more bluntly. "They were hitting us," he said, "and we asked ourselves, 'Why the hell don't we hit them one?' "

Still, there was something ambiguous about this first attack on the North. There was unquestionably an element of retaliation about it, just as advertised. The attack on Pleiku was certainly the latest of a series, and the usually imperturbable McGeorge Bundy, who was on the scene shortly after the night battle, gave an emotional report on the carnage; weeks later, in his White House office, he could still speak to me with obvious feeling of the President's right and duty to protect American boys against being butchered in their tents. Soviet Premier Kosygin also was in Hanoi at the time, and there were those in the Administration who believed that to suffer the Pleiku attack without response would only permit Hanoi to argue to him that American power in Southeast Asia was a paper tiger; hence Kosygin might be more inclined to help along the Communist war effort, scornful of American response and moving *ipso facto* nearer Peking in the process.

The rationale of retaliation, however, was subject to serious doubt from the start. For one thing, only twelve hours elapsed between the beginning of the Pleiku attack and the American strike on Donghoi; many critics doubted whether a policy determination as well as a combat operation could have been put together so quickly.

These doubts have been greatly strengthened in many minds by subsequent events. One February 14, for instance, while the headlines still glared, General Taylor said in an interview on CBS television that future attacks on the North would be determined "by the behavior of the Hanoi government." Adlai Stevenson had already said, in a letter to the United Nations Security Council president, Roger Seydoux of France, that despite the retaliatory attacks the United States had no intention of carrying on a general air war over North Vietnam.

Yet, writing for his book, published two years later, in February, 1967, General Taylor never mentioned retaliation. Explaining the origins of the bombing, he wrote:

"The first reason was to let the people of South Vietnam feel that for the first time, after eleven years of bitter warfare, they were striking back against the source of all their troubles. . . . The second reason for our use of our air power was a military one. It was to utilize superiority in the air to strike military targets which, if destroyed, would have the effect of restraining or making more difficult the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. . . . The third reason for the air campaign . . . was to remind the leadership in Hanoi, the men who were directing the war in the South, that little by little through the progressive, restrained application of force by bombing, they would pay an ever-increasing price for a continuation of their aggression in the South."

And when a member of the White House staff later in 1965 asked McGeorge Bundy for a guidance memo on why the bombing of the North was necessary, Bundy's reply cited the first two reasons advanced by Taylor in his book, and added another—to convince Hanoi that the United States intended to make good its commitment to South Vietnam.

By the spring of 1965, moreover, there were plenty of officials in the Administration who would confide that the *real* value of the bombing was as a "bargaining card"; that is, they said, it was something that could be traded at the proper time for value received. The destruction being wrought on North Vietnam could be used in a negotiation to offset the military superiority then enjoyed by Communist forces in the South. Barely three months after the Pleiku response—on May 13—President Johnson ordered the first "pause" in the bombing, an obviously diplomatic move; nothing happened, and the bombers went back to work on May 19.

There was a glaring weakness, in fact, in the Administration's own statement about retaliation for direct attacks on American troops. McNamara inadvertently made that weakness public on February 7 when, in response to a news-conference questioner who asked how the Viet Cong had been able to penetrate the base defenses at Pleiku, he said he did not believe "it will ever be possible to protect our forces against sneak attacks of that kind."

The hard-hitting Viet Cong quickly confirmed this. On February 10, three days after the Pleiku attack and the first wave of "retaliatory" raids against Donghoi, the guerrillas launched another assault, this time against American barracks at Quinhon. They blew up the barracks, killed nineteen Americans, wounded thirteen, and got away.

The next day, 160 American and South Vietnamese planes bombed barracks and staging areas in Chanhoa and Chaple, North Vietnam, again in "retaliation." The essential absurdity of the scheme could not have been made plainer. McNamara had pointed out that there could be no base security in the South while the guerrillas were free to operate; yet, once retaliation had been publicly pledged after Pleiku, for every attack on Americans there would have to be a response directly against North Vietnam. If that were not so, whatever deterrent value, whatever credibility for American determination, whatever boost for South Vietnamese morale had been gained at Pleiku would have been dissipated, and in effect, a gigantic American bluff would have been called with impunity. Such a paper-tiger effect would surely generate even more attacks against Americans.

On the other hand, to strike back only when struck was ridiculous and impossible. It handed the enemy the initiative. It made the lives of American boys a sort of trigger for American air raids. It gave over to the Viet Cong the decision whether an American air raid could be launched against North Vietnam. Retaliation was simply untenable, and even the word could be justified only if it were a "cover," a sugar coating, for the launching of a general air bombardment of North Vietnam; and only then if that bombardment could ultimately be shown to be a justified, logical, and feasible military strategy designed to bring the war to a close.

But the bombing was not that, either. The Pleiku raids were neither purely spontaneous retaliation, as the Administration at first fatuously insisted; nor were they, as this lack of candor suggested to so many critics,

the first step in a long-planned, carefully conceived air campaign against North Vietnam, a campaign the launching of which had only awaited some such pretext as Pleiku.

The truth is characteristically Johnsonian; it lies somewhere between these poles. Johnson *had* decided that air strikes were needed primarily to boost South Vietnamese morale and confound the neutralists, secondarily to protect American troops, and incidentally to make life and war more difficult for Ho Chi Minh and his government. But with a wary eye on public opinion in the United States and a healthy respect for the potency of peace as a political issue, in his established pattern of going two ways at once, as a man of restraint as well as power, he had not been willing by the time of Pleiku to order a general air bombardment—to order the bombing of the North, in a phrase Richard Nixon was then using, "day by day, and for that matter, night by night" until its collapse.

The raids, then, were both agreed upon in advance *and* retaliatory; just as Stevenson wrote Seydoux, Johnson then had not ordered continuing overall aerial warfare. In his first great test as a war President, he was relying upon his tried and true method. He would bomb, all right, but he would not really turn the bombers loose. He would retaliate, but he would not initiate. He would show his muscle but only suggest how tough he could be if he really tried; as Taylor said in his February 14 broadcast, the raids were "deliberately planned . . . to suggest the possibility of other and bigger forms of reaction."

Wars are not elections in Texas, however, and what suffices in one theater will not necessarily do in the other. A former official who participated in the post-Pleiku discussions has privately described what happened on February 7, 1965:

"We began the bombing with no philosophy of what we were doing. We didn't necessarily even intend to start a campaign. We ignored the difficulty of halting the natural growth of something once started, and we considered the whole thing too much in terms of immediate effect and not enough in terms of long-range problems."

A policy, by definition, is a course of action intended to produce a desired end at an acceptable cost. Bombing the North might have formed such a policy had it been believed in the Johnson Administration, however erroneously, that the assault eventually would cause Hanoi to sue for peace on terms advantageous to the United States; but *that* policy would have required the difficult, dangerous, and repugnant decision to launch the "strategic bombing" of populations and cities, as well as the tactical bombing of "military targets."

Bombing might also have been a policy, in the true sense, had it been aimed at interdicting every route from the North into the South—stopping at the border or beyond every man and ounce of material coming down in aid of the NLF, sealing off the indigenous part of the war from any outside aid and sponsorship. But the bombing was never so aimed, and no military man was foolish enough to maintain that air power could close mountain and jungle trails to men carrying mortar shells on their backs or to old women trotting under chogi sticks loaded at both ends with sacks of ammunition, much less to battalions of determined, hardy soldiers slipping one by one through the hills to a prearranged rendezvous in the South. McNamara, for one, never contended that air power could cause any worthwhile reduction in the amount of supplies and the number of men being sent from North to South; he said only that it would make it more difficult and costly to get them there, and no doubt it has.

In either case, however, the bombing would have been aimed at ending the war at an acceptable cost, and that would have been a policy, however bloody or futile it might have proved. So would Ball's alternative suggestion of a commitment of combat troops to help the South Vietnamese Army. Control of the South Vietnamese populace, after all, was what the war was about. Johnson might have taken a real step forward in that struggle by making a troop commitment before the full weight of the North Vietnamese intervention cited by Taylor could have been brought to bear. He might even have staved off a major part of the ultimate infiltration of North Vietnamese troop units, by giving Hanoi a clear signal of his determination to fight, and by getting superior forces on the scene "fustest with the mostest." A troop commitment at that time, moreover, might have been defended against adverse American and world opinion; the troops would have been fighting *in the South*, in defense, against men who could be clearly pictured as invaders.

If North Vietnam actually was responsible for the war in the South—and with the political campaign over, the Administration insisted that Hanoi was responsible—it perhaps made some sense to "raise the price of aggression" to Ho Chi Minh. But to punish him for what he was supposed to be doing would not necessarily make him stop it, unless the punishment was total; and vengeance is not a worthy or sensible reason for making war.

Moreover, meting out punishment in this world of sin and sadness demands an Olympian regard for one's own purity that bodes ill for one's judgment; and it is a dubious psychological proposition, anyway. A nation assaulted by another, with whatever justification, is likely to feel aggrieved, particularly an underdeveloped, formerly colonized, often invaded, Communist, Asian country bombed from the air by a powerful, capitalist, white, Western, occasionally imperialist nation. It could just as well have been argued that bombing the North would create a fierce will to fight on and win in a people who had borne the worst of the nationalist struggle against the French and who, almost alone among Asians, had mounted to an underground resistance against the Japanese occupation in World War II.

Finally, bombing the North in any systematic, planned way was seen, even in 1965 and by many high in the Johnson Administration, as a largely irrelevant war, what McNamara would later describe to me as a "diversionary effort" that would only nibble at the edge of the fundamental problem of coping with the guerrillas in the South. McGeorge Bundy, returning from Saigon and Pleiku just after the retaliatory raids, reminded reporters that "the primary contest is in South Vietnam."

So no bombing campaign to bring the North to its knees was planned or intentionally started. The bombing began because Lyndon Johnson, in the ebullience of his power and in the fatal grip of an irrelevant experience, wanted to strike and thought he needed to strike and found in the rationale of retaliation the political stance required to fit his lifelong method of operation. The result was the fourth bloodiest war in American history.

Can We Limit Presidential Power?

(By Henry Steele Commager)

(Note.—Henry Steele Commager is professor of history at Amherst College whose many writings include "Majority Rule and Minority Rights," "The Era of the Reform," and "Nature and Problems of History.")

Under the skillful prodding of Senator Fulbright, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has recommended for adoption a resolution designed to restrain the authority of the President in the use of armed forces outside the United States. Undersecretary Katzenbach, in turn, has informed the committee that its resolution is irrelevant and futile and that the President will, in effect, recognize no limits on his conduct of foreign relations other than those imposed by his own judgment. Senator Fulbright warns us of an erosion of the congressional power which will, if not arrested, permanently alter the balance of power contrived by the framers of the Constitution; presidential spokesmen reply that the balance has already been shattered, and that nothing can be done now to put it back together again.

It is an old problem, as old as Washington's neutrality proclamation and as recent as Secretary Rusk's refusal to commit the President to consulting the Senate about sending perhaps as many as another 200,000 troops to Vietnam. It is rooted in the ambiguity of the constitutional provision for the Presidency: "The executive power shall be vested in a President," and it has not been clarified by miscellaneous Supreme Court decisions, from *Martin* v *Mott* in 1828 to the Youngstown Steel decision of 1952.

The current crisis has new ingredients, not found in earlier assertions of executive authority by Monroe, Polk, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt and Wilson; ingredients which have enormously aggravated the familiar problem of reconciling the imperative of a strong President in the realm of foreign affairs with the constitutional arrangements for separation of powers and limitations on powers. These new ingredients go far to justify the use of terms like "erosion" and "aggrandizement."

First, unlimited executive power in foreign relations and war is no longer justified as emergency, but as normal and almost routine. In raising armies without congressional sanction, in the suspension of the *habeas corpus*, in the emancipation proclamation, Lincoln pushed his powers to the outward limits of what was constitutionally permissible, but he said, with humility, that the emergency required him to do this and that Congress would doubtless give retroactive approval to what he had done. No such humility characterizes what we may call the Johnson-Katzenbach theory of executive authority.

Second, our current presidential commitments are global rather than, as with Lincoln, domestic, or, as with Polk, Cleveland and Wilson, limited to the Western hemisphere and rationalized, or justified, by the Monroe Doctrine.

Third, the new executive commitments are not, as commonly in the past, *ad hoc* and practical, but general and ideological. We do not now take arms because "American blood has been shed on American soil," nor does the President respond to an inescapable emergency such as the attack on Ft. Sumter. Now our President acts to "contain communism," to frustrate an "international conspiracy," to protect something vaguely called "vital interests" in far corners of the globe. Thus Secretary Rusk's notorious assertion of 1966 that "no would-be aggressor should suppose that the absence of a defense treaty, congressional declaration, or U.S. military presence, grants immunity to aggression." The key words are, of course, "absence of treaty" and "congressional declaration."

Fourth, for the first time in our history we are members of an international organization which is responsible for preserving the peace and arbitrating dangerous controversies; indeed in a sense it is *our* organization, imagined by Woodrow Wilson, brought into being by Franklin Roosevelt. Yet our formal declarations of what the President is prepared to do throughout the globe (and, it must be confessed, declarations of what the Congress is prepared to support) effectively by-pass the United Nations. There are occasional gestures toward involving the United Nations in the war in Vietnam, but these are indeed gestures rather than genuine efforts. Certainly we did not even pretend to invoke or involve the UN in our original attack on

North Vietnam, nor, for that matter, in our adventures in Guatemala, Cuba and Santo Domingo, nor did we even involve the Organization of American States in these ventures until we could confront it was a *fait accompli*. And whatever might have been said for the conduct of a Polk or a Theodore Roosevelt in justification of unilateral action, can no longer be said for the conduct of President Johnson, for we are committed now, as we were not earlier, to procedures established by the UN Charter and by the Organization of American States.

A fifth new ingredient is philosophically as ancient as the precept that power corrupts. It is that the possession of power encourages and even creates conditions which seem to require its use, and that the greater and more conclusive the power the stronger the argument for its use. Those who possess authority want to exercise it: children, teachers, bosses, bureaucrats, even soldiers and statesmen. Just the other day General Mark Clark, speaking with exquisite appropriateness at a memorial service for a leading Catholic churchman, argued that if the going got tough in Vietnam we should not hesitate to use "tactical" nuclear weapons. Men who possess power think it a shame to let power go to waste and sometimes, perhaps unconsciously, they manufacture situations in which it must be used—as in Santo Domingo, for example. All this was dangerous but not intolerable in the pre-atomic age; it is no longer tolerable.

The problem of the unauthorized use of the executive power in situations that might result in war is complicated by the obsolescence of old and conventional terminology. Thus the once traditional argument that, in his capacity of Commander-in-Chief, the President is authorized to take "defensive" but not "offensive" action has little meaning today, for now all military action is defensive. Even Hitler claimed that his assault on Poland was "defensive." That we ourselves are not backward is clear from the wording of the Tonkin Gulf resolution that "the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President to repel armed attack . . . and to prevent further aggression." You could not hope to have a clearer statement of the purely defensive nature of this war than that, nor a more alarming picture of the aggression which President Johnson is now heroically resisting!

So, too, with the once fairly simple notion of what is national territory or what are territorial waters. It was Franklin Roosevelt, after all, who said that the American frontier was on the Rhine, and Roosevelt, too, who officially extended American territorial waters 300 miles off the Atlantic coast. What would our government say, today, if China should adopt the Roosevelt principle that her territorial waters extended 300 miles out from her coast, and if she should issue a "shoot at sight" order to Chinese ships?

Or there is the relatively new concept of "vital interests"—a concept with no standing in international law and no understanding even in politics. When in 1957 Congress authorized President Eisenhower to protect the "vital interests" of the United States in the Middle East, the President in effect repudiated that particular justification, and dispatched 14,000 American soldiers to Lebanon "to protect American lives and property." But "vital interest" has now become the official rationale of our presence in Vietnam. What that vital interest is, or what our interest in Vietnam is vital to, remains opaque.

It is not only concepts like "defensive" and "offensive" warfare, or "vital interests" or "territorial waters" that are outmoded; Undersecretary Katzenbach has now formally asserted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that declarations of war are equally outmoded, thus neatly repealing a clause in the Constitution without the bother of congressional and state action. The Tonkin Gulf resolution—which senators now say they did not understand—together with the SEATO treaty, which no one understands, constitute, said Mr. Katzenbach, the "functional equivalent to a declaration of war."

The argument for latitude in the exercise of presidential power draws great strength from a recognition that in a nuclear age emergencies may require instantaneous action. Four times in the past seven years Presidents have mounted major military interventions without congressional authority, on the plea of emergency: the Bay of Pigs, the missile crisis, Santo Domingo, and Vietnam. Only one of these—the missile crisis—could claim to be a genuine emergency, and, in a larger sense, even this was an emergency of our own making, for it is arguable that the whole Cuban muddle was a product of our miscalculations about Batista and Castro. If the Bay of Pigs situation and the Santo Domingo election dispute represented emergencies so imperative that there was no time to consult Congress, then anything whatsoever can be twisted into an emergency and the traditional requirement of consultation of the Congress is a thing of the past.

Can anything, then, be done to protect the use but avoid the misuse of presidential powers?

Not, it must be confessed, very much.

There are, of course, obvious and official solutions. The Senate might repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution; the House might cut off appropriations; Congress might impeach the President. (When Senator Fulbright merely listed this as one of the constitutional safeguards, he was resoundingly rebuked by Senator Lausche who apparently thought the Constitution un-American!)

None of these remedies is available. The Senate is quite as belligerent as the President; the House has never yet refused appropriations to conduct a war; no President has been impeached. Furthermore, if the Congress did try to restrain the President in the conduct of war he could as Commander-in-Chief still commit troops—as indeed President Johnson has in both Vietnam and Santo Domingo—or he could act in secrecy, as President Kennedy did at the time of the missile crisis, and present the nation with a *fait accompli*. Furthermore, public opinion almost always supports the President against Congress, and is against anything that can be called "retreat" or "surrender." Even if public opinion should turn against President Johnson, there is little chance of any change of policy, for has he not himself said that if his support (in the polls!) should drop to one percent he would still persist in his program?

Can the Fulbright resolution do what other constitutional and political restrictions have failed to do?

"It is the sense of the Senate," so reads the resolution, "that a national commitment by the United States to a foreign power, necessarily and exclusively results from affirmative action taken by the executive and legislative branches of the United States government through means of a treaty, convention or other legislative instrumentality specifically intended to give effect to such commitment."

Admirable as it is, this resolution holds out little hope of effectiveness. If it had been on the statute books at the time of the Tonkin Gulf episode or at the inception of our bombing of North Vietnam, would it have prevented or mitigated these actions? Surely not, for the Administration would have cited—as it does tirelessly—the "obligations" of the SEATO treaty, or it would have invoked the amorphous concept of "vital interest."

Would the resolution have avoided the Cuban missile crisis? No, because action at that time was not alleged to be based on a national "commitment," but on presidential responsibility to defend the United States against attack.

Would it have stayed Eisenhower's intervention in Lebanon or the Pescadores? No, because these had Senate endorsement, after a fashion. Would it have avoided intervention in Guatemala in the early fifties, or the more notorious intervention in Santo Domingo in 1965? Probably not, for intervention in Santo Domingo—like that in Lebanon—was justified on the argument that American lives were in peril, while our Guatemalan adventures was so private that to this day the Congress seems unacquainted with it.

Are there, then, any practical measures that we might devise that would have any likelihood of adoption by the Congress and acceptance by the President—two very different things?

The Senate might give effect to the constitutional provisions for participating in the conduct of foreign affairs by providing that the Foreign Relations Committee, or a quorum of it, should remain permanently in Washington, instructed to consult with the President on any matter of foreign policy thought important.

Would the President in fact consult with the committee? Secretary Rusk's evidence before that committee makes this prospect highly improbable.

An entirely different approach suggests itself only to retreat in confusion: that the United States take seriously its obligations under the United Nations, and invoke, and abide by, decisions of the UN on all controversies in which it is involved. How much easier and safer if our President would hand over to the UN the difficult problems of Guatemala, Santo Domingo, Lebanon, Vietnam, Cuba and now Korea. There is no reason in law, or in logic why this could not happen; the reasons why it does not, and will not, happen are political and psychological.

These proposals, like that of the Fulbright committee, or Professor Carl Kaysen's proposal that no money appropriated by Congress might be used to support soldiers outside the continental United States without prior approval by the Congress, offer little likelihood of effective restraint.

Where then do we turn?

When there is no response to "What is the answer?" it is useful to ask "What is the question?" Perhaps here, as elsewhere, we are asking the wrong question. If there are no solutions to this intransigent problem of the abuse of presidential power we will do well to go back and start over again and reconsider the nature of the problem itself.

If we consider those exercises of presidential power in the past two decades that bypass the Congress—and perhaps the Constitution; if we contemplate the Truman doctrine, the Korean war, the Pescadores crisis, the Laotian imbroglio, participation in the Vietnam war even before 1956, the Lebanon doctrine, intervention in Guatemala, Santo Domingo and Cuba, the missile crisis, the activities of the CIA in some 60 countries, large-scale intervention in Vietnam and Thailand, and the newly erupted quarrel with North Korea—we detect that they have one common denominator. All are inspired by and directed to communist threats, real or imagined. All are skirmishes or battles in the cold war. All are functions of our obsession with communism, and of our notion that we have been chosen by providence to contain communism, everywhere on the globe. Furthermore, almost all of the attitudes and gestures which distinguish the current claims for the outmost reach of the presidential power have, on closer examination, the same common denominator: namely that when a threat of communist conspiracy or communist subversion is implicit or explicit in any situation, no limit can be or will be put on the executive power necessary to dispose of that threat.

If the pattern is clear, so too is its mean-

ing. Until we can rid ourselves of our delusions of universalism and our obsessions with communism, and other ideological threats—which are, in last analysis, the inspiration for our war in Vietnam—we will not and cannot abate presidential abuse of power in foreign affairs.

The misuse of executive power where communism is, or appears to be, involved is not a phenomenon of the Presidency, or of individual Presidents. After all, when we trace a harmonious pattern of the use of the executive power in Franklin Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson we are forced to conclude that what we have is not a manifestation of personal or even official ambition, but something inherent in the Presidency and in the age in which these Presidents serve.

Nor have Presidents been alone, or even idiosycratic, in their illusions about total power, or in their obsessions with communism. If they were, that would indeed be cause to tremble for the Republic, for then it might be said that the fears of the Founding Fathers about the innate corruption of men in power, were about to be realized. But presidential advisers, from Acheson to Rostow, share these obsessions; congressmen declaim them; a substantial segment of the American people confess them.

The creation of this national paranoia is a responsibility which almost all of us share: political parties and leaders, the press, the church, the school and the Academy. And as most, or all, of these have some responsibility for creating or permitting the situation which now provides the logic for the abuse of presidential power, all share responsibility for reeducating Presidents, congressmen, editors, and the American people about the dangers implicit in the arrogance of power and the danger of ideological obsessions. Until the forces, motives and fears which underlie the exercise and the rationale of excessive presidential power are dissipated, we will not abate that power.

This is a hard job and may be an impossible one. But is it really harder to wean the American people from their obsessions and educate them to the realities of world politics than it is to cut back on presidential powers by constitutional or political means?

Abuse of power by Presidents is a reflection, and perhaps a consequence, of abuse of power by the American people and nation. For almost two decades now we have misused our vast power. We misused our economic power, not least in associating economic with military assistance and military with economic support, and in imposing economic sanctions against nations who did not see eye to eye with us about trade with our "enemies." We misused our political power by trying to force neutrals onto our side in the cold war and by bringing pressure on the nations of Latin America to support our shortsighted policy of excluding China from the United Nations. We have grossly misused our political power—if it may be called that—by planting the CIA in some 60 countries to carry on its work of subversion. We have misused our military power in forcing our weapons on scores of nations around the globe, maintaining military organizations and alliances like NATO and SEATO—the first of which has outlived its usefulness, the second of which never had any usefulness to begin with. And we are now engaged in a monstrous misuse of power in waging war on a distant people that does not accept our ideology. We have even misused our moral power, by bringing pressure on former allies and associates to join us in the cold war against the Soviet Union and China; and history may yet find the United States chiefly responsible for exacerbating the disunity of Germany and the division between East and West by exploiting Germany for cold war purposes. That seems to be the de Gaulle interpretation of our role in Europe, and de Gaulle is more often right than wrong.

As we have greater power than any other nation, so we should display greater moderation in using it and greater humility in justifying it. We display neither moderation nor humility, but immoderation and that arrogance of power which Senator Fulbright has so eloquently denounced.

In the long run, then, the abuse of the executive power cannot be separated from the abuse of national power. If we subvert world order and destroy world peace we must inevitably subvert and destroy our own political institutions first. This we are now in the process of doing.

MICHIGAN INDUSTRY SELLS TO WORLD MARKETS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on January 1, President Johnson announced a comprehensive program aimed at bringing our international balance of payments into equilibrium. Most of the public attention has centered on the proposed travel limitations, and on the mandatory foreign-investment controls. One vital element of the program has been somewhat overlooked—the expansion of American exports throughout the world. Michigan companies have long recognized that exports not only help our balance of payments, they also generate jobs and profits. For example, last summer, the U.S. Department of Commerce sponsored a trade show in Mexico City for American manufacturers. Ex-Cello-O Corp., a Detroit manufacturing firm, exhibited its milk-packing machine. On-the-spot sales amounted to $87,000, and the company has estimated that in the 12 months following the show additional export sales of $400,000 will be realized as a direct result of participation in the Mexico City show. In another case, two Michigan firms went into the Fourth International Engineering Show, held in Melbourne, Australia, last August. American participation in the exhibition was arranged by the Commerce Department. Electro Arc Manufacturing Co., of Ann Arbor, is a small business, and was new to the Australian market. Twelve-month estimates for sales following the show come to $120,000 for this company, with floor sales of $13,000. Perhaps equally important, the company was able to select three business agents to handle its line of products in Australia. The other Michigan company that went to the Australia show was Jiffy Tool Supply Co., Inc., of Royal Oak. This small business was also entering the Australian market for the first time. Floor sales amounted to $4,000 and 12-month projections come to $50,000 as a result of the company's participation in the engineering show. The success of these Michigan firms competing in world markets is a tribute to both Michigan businessmen and Michigan workers, and I congratulate the three companies on their fine showing in the field of exports.

SECRETARIES WEEK

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I am sure that it is not necessary for me to remind my colleagues of the importance of an efficient secretary, as each of us is fully aware of how much we rely on our secretaries. As I was once a secretary, I can claim great empathy with the secretaries of today for I, too, realize the difference between being a good secretary, who has the qualities of loyalty, initiative, and accuracy, and the secretary who is just earning a living.

I would, therefore, like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention the fact that Secretaries Week, sponsored by the National Secretaries Association International, is being observed for the 17th consecutive year from April 21 through April 27, with April 24 highlighted as Secretaries Day.

AMERICANS ARE DESTROYING AMERICA—ADDRESS BY HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, an address earlier this month by Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, former Secretary of Agriculture, at the general conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Salt Lake City, Utah, forcefully and eloquently discusses the serious dangers which are threatening this Nation from within.

Mr. Benson emphasizes and warns against the grave perils that arise when Government condones the breakdown of law and order, and he explains many forces which work against the proper functioning of law enforcement agencies.

One especially grievous commentary refers to a decline of U.S. morals and predicts the consequences of national complaisance. It reads as follows:

> I do not believe that the greatest threat to our future is from bombs or guided missiles. I do not think our civilization will die that way. I think it will die when we no longer care—when the spiritual forces that make us wish to be right and noble die in the hearts of men, when we disregard the importance of law and order.

That, Mr. President, explains and gives ample justification for the title of his stirring and timely address, "Americans Are Destroying America." If we lose our freedom, if our Nation is destroyed, it will be because of internal forces of fiscal irresponsibility, subversion, and lawlessness, rather than by conquest or assault from an enemy from without. These internal forces are today challenging and weakening the vitality, stamina, and tenacity of our national will and resolve.

I believe there is in former Secretary Benson's remarks an important message for every citizen in our Nation, for we must remember that only by upholding and sustaining the moral principles upon which our Republic was founded can we expect our Nation to remain strong and retain its position of world leadership. Unless we can preserve law and order and maintain a safe society, we cannot survive—our liberties will perish.

Another peril to our internal security lies in unsound and extravagant fiscal policies—the habit of deficit spending by the Federal Government. It is highly imperative for our future security and welfare that this Nation return to and consistently pursue fiscal policies that are sound and sane. With regular annual programs of deficit spending, and with a

continually unfavorable balance of payments that is shaking world confidence in the soundness of the dollar, our Government, in its fiscal policies, is traveling down a dangerous road—one that can easily lead to economic disaster.

Mr. President, I regard Mr. Benson's speech as both provocative and profound. I believe it should be read by every American citizen and I hope the central truth it conveys that Americans, by their lack of self-discipline, by their apathy and indifference, and by their lack of will and resolve can succeed in destroying America.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the address of the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

AMERICANS ARE DESTROYING AMERICA

(An address by Ezra Taft Benson, at the 138th Annual General Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, April 6, 1968, Mormon Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, Utah)

We live in a time of crisis. Never since the period of the Civil War has this nation faced such critical days. Americans are destroying America.

Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—the Mormon Church—believe that:

". . . governments were instituted of God for the benefit of man; and that he holds men accountable for their acts in relation to them, both in making laws and administering them, for the good and safety of society.

". . . that no government can exist in peace, except such laws are framed and held inviolate as will secure to each individual the free exercise of conscience, the right and control of property, and the protection of life.

". . . that all governments necessarily require civil officers and magistrates to enforce the laws of the same; and that such as will administer the law in equity and justice should be sought for and upheld by the voice of the people . . .

". . . and that all men are bound to sustain and uphold the respective governments in which they reside, while protected in their inherent and inalienable rights by the laws of such governments; and that *sedition and rebellion* are unbecoming every citizen thus protected, and *should be punished accordingly;* . . ." (D&C 134:1, 2, 3, 5)

No people can maintain freedom unless their political institutions are founded upon faith in God and belief in the existence of moral law. God has endowed men with certain unalienable rights and no legislature and no majority, however great, may morally limit or destroy these. The function of government is to protect life, liberty and property and anything more or less than this is usurpation and oppression.

The Constitution of the United States was prepared and adopted by courageous men acting under inspiration from the Almighty. It is a solemn contract between the peoples of the States of this Nation which all officers of government are under duty to obey. The eternal moral laws expressed therein must be adhered to or individual liberty will perish. It is the responsibility of government to punish crime and provide for the administration of justice and to protect the right and control of property.

But today these basic principles and concepts are being flaunted, disregarded and challenged, even by men in high places. Through the exercise of political expediency the government is condoning the breakdown of law and order.

Law enforcement in America is at the point of crisis. A recent Life Line broadcast warned that:

"In Chicago, 64 men quit the police force in one month. Baltimore has 360 police vacancies. Washington D.C. is 230 men short of its authorized complement. And cities all over the country are desperately seeking recruits.

"Police aren't striking; they're quitting and it is understandable. They're being demoralized by the hostile attitudes of the politically-minded Supreme Court. They're being demoralized by a weird penal system which frees hardened criminals almost as fast as they're arrested . . . Policemen are demoralized by slanted news reporting, distorted facts which show police activities from the criminal's side. And they're being demoralized by an avalanche of new laws which are making it even harder to convict the guilty.

"San Diego Police Chief Wesley B. Sharp warns that: 'If there isn't a change, the increase in crime will lead to anarchy and criminals will control the nation.'" (*Life Line Freedom Talk* No. 53, 2-22-68).

Edmund Burke, the great English statesman, explained that:

"Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites,—in proportion as their love of justice is above their rapacity,—in proportion as their soundness and sobriety of understanding is above their vanity and presumption,—in proportion as they are more disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and good, in preference to the flattery of knaves. Society cannot exist, unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters." (*Works* 4:51-2, *P.P.N.S.*, p. 33).

I do not believe the greatest threat to our future is from bombs or guided missiles. I do not think our civilization will die that way. I think it will die when we no longer care—when the spiritual forces that make us wish to be right and noble die in the hearts of men, when we disregard the importance of law and order.

If American freedom is lost—if America is destroyed—if our blood-bought freedom is surrendered—it will be because of Americans. What's more, it will probably not be only the work of subversive and criminal Americans. The Benedict Arnolds will not be the only ones to forfeit our freedom.

"At what point, then, is the approach of danger to be expected?" asked Abraham Lincoln, and answered, "if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher; as a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide." (Springfield, Ill., Jan. 27, 1837; *P.P.N.S.*, p. 62).

If America is destroyed, it may be by Americans who salute the flag, sing the National Anthem, march in patriotic parades, cheer Fourth of July speakers—normally good Americans, but Americans who fail to comprehend what is required to keep our country strong and free—Americans who have been lulled away into a false security.

Great nations are never conquered from outside unless they are rotten inside. Our greatest national problem today is erosion, not the erosion of the soil but erosion of the national morality—erosion of traditional enforcement of law and order.

Theodore Roosevelt said: "The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life." (*The Red Carpet*, p. 315)

In this blessed land we have exalted security, comfort and ease above freedom. If we dwelled at length on the many things that are disturbing in the life of America today we might well become discouraged. I mention only a few of the reported startling evidences of our national illness—our moral erosion.

There is a decline of U.S. morals and moral fibre, a turning to pleasure and away from hard work and high standards of the past.

There is a growing worry in our universities over cheating in examinations.

Nation-wide juvenile delinquencies show an 8-fold increase since 1950.

There is a 500-million dollar smut industry in this country causing youngsters to wrestle with standards of value.

America is the biggest market for narcotics.

Although we consider ourselves a people who believe in law and order, we have seen much evidence of the passion of the mob.

Riots have occurred in 137 different cities and towns in 33 months resulting in 120 deaths, including 12 police officers slain; 3,623 other persons injured; 28,932 arrested and hundreds of millions of dollars property damage.

Crime in U.S. is up 88% in seven years—rising nearly nine times faster than population—up 16% per year according to the FBI. Crime costs some $20 billion a year and less than 21% of reported crimes result in arrests and less than ⅓ of those in convictions.

In the midst of a cold war and preparation for a possible shooting war of survival, we have faced 651 strikes at missile bases in six years.

The U.S. Government has racked up a shameful record of 31 Treasury deficits in the past 35 years.

The sky-rocketing cost of the welfare state increased in 8 years from 6.9 billion to 20.3 billion dollars in 1961 and stood at 87 billion 578 million in 1966.

There are over 7,700,000 people on relief in federal, state, and local programs.

During the past 33 years our budget has increased 20 times over, and our national debt has increased from $16 billion to an admitted $324 billion—adding accrued liabilities payable in the future, our real indebtedness exceeds $1 trillion or an average indebtedness of $5,200 for every man, woman and child in the United States.

Our present federal debt is equal to a first mortgage of $10,000 on all owned homes in the country and is reported to exceed the combined debt of all countries of the world. Annual interest on the soaring national debt is over $15 billion—only defense and welfare are higher.

American currencies are weaker than those of Germany and Japan who were defeated in World War II.

Inflation has struck a serious blow to the value of the American dollar.

We continue to move in the direction of more federal intervention, more concentration of power, more spending, more taxing, more paternalism, more state-ism. (*U.S. News and World Report*, February 5, 1968; An address by Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, BYU, April 21, 1966; *Whither America*, Senator Everett Dirksen, Dec. 15, 1967; Dr. James C. Dolley, University of Texas).

The present shocking situation was summed up succinctly by J. Edgar Hoover in the April 1967 F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin in these words:

"Morality, integrity, *law and order*, and other cherished principles of our great heritage are battling for survival in many communities today. They are under constant attack from degrading and corrupting influences which, if not halted, will sweep away every vestige of decency and order remaining in our society."

A recent issue of the well-known and highly respected, *Babson's Washington Forecast Letter,* carried a four-page *Special Supplement* which concluded as follows:

"Whom are we to indict for sparking this chaos in America? Are the prime defendants the Stokely Carmichaels, the H. Rap Browns, the hippies, the draft-card burners, the peaceniks, the juvenile delinquents, the rabble rousers, the Commies who have gained respectability as 'honest dissenters'? Certainly, most of these could be brought before the bar of justice to answer charges of law violations . . . and they should be.

"However, there is a stronger, truer bill of indictment which may be drawn against those who have invited the bloody blackmail of America by permitting, even encouraging, mounting civil disobedience . . ."

And then the article names names of men of national prominence and continues, "These men of power, prestige, and great influence in the political structure of America have permitted the concept of 'freedom of speech' to be expanded to include subversion, intimidation, sedition, and incitement to riot; they have condoned the distortion of 'academic freedom' to encompass the adulteration of young minds with Communist doctrine and the disintegration of a well-disciplined educational system; they have allowed 'freedom of assembly' to mushroom into disruption of peaceful activity, mob rule, riot, and insurrection.

"Unless those in authority in the United States can be influenced to abandon the suicidal course on which they have embarked—or unless they can be replaced by men who will—we cannot hope to restore in our nation the kind of domestic peace and order which has made our many generations proud to be Americans . . . living in a land of freedom, security, opportunity, and justice under law.

"The crisis we now face is the most serious, the most dangerous, in the history of our country. Each of us must diligently employ our influence and our effort—in speech, letters, and at the ballot box—to help set straight the way."

The facts are clear. Our problem centers in Washington, D.C. And this applies to the administration of both political parties. In the words of James Madison, "Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power, than by violent and sudden usurpations." (*Elliot's Debates* 3:87; *P.P.N.S.,* p. 104)

If America is to withstand these influences and trends, there must be a renewal of the spirit of our forefathers, an appreciation of the American Way of Life, a strengthening of muscle and sinew and the character of the nation. America needs guts as well as guns. National character is the core of national defense.

Could many of our ills today have resulted from our failure to train a strong citizenry from the only source we have—the boys and girls of each community? Have they grown up to believe in politics without principle, pleasure without conscience, knowledge without effort, wealth without work, business without morality, science without humanity, worship without sacrifice.

In recent months a nationwide survey of high school and college students has been conducted. The U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce reveals that:

41 percent believe that freedom of the press should be cancelled.

53 percent believe in government ownership of banks, railroads, and steel companies.

62 percent said that the government had the responsibility to provide jobs.

62 percent thought a worker should not produce all that he can.

61 percent rejected the profit incentive as necessary to the survival of free enterprise.

84 percent denied that patriotism is vital and plays an important part in our lives. (*Bookmailer News,* Vol. 10, Nov. 1, 1965)

Letters which come to my desk from worried parents, deeply concerned by what is being taught to their children in the schools, is shocking to say the least.

We can never survive unless our young people understand and appreciate our American system which has given more of the good things of life than any other system in the world—unless they have a dedication that exceeds the dedication of the enemy. Character must become important in this country again. The old essentials of honesty, self-respect, loyalty, support for law and order, *must* be taught the younger generation.

I appeal to people everywhere, young and old, to heed these words of Dean Alfange:

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon. I seek opportunity to develop whatever talents God gave me—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any earthly master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud and unafraid; to think and act myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations and to face the world boldly and say—'This, with God's help, I have done.' All this is what it means to be an American."

Those of us conscious of the seriousness of the situation must *act* and act now. It has been said that it takes something spectacular to get folks excited, like a burning house. Nobody notices one that is simply decaying. But in America today we not only have decaying but burning before our very eyes. How much we need hearts today who will respond to the inspiring words of the poet, John Greenleaf Whittier:

"Where's the manly spirit
Of the true-hearted and the unshackled gone?
Sons of old freemen, do we but inherit their name alone?
Is the old Pilgrim spirit quench'd within us?
Stoops the proud manhood of our souls so low,
That Mammon's lure or Party's wile can win us to silence now?
Now, when our land to ruin's brink is verging,
In God's name let us speak while there is time;
Now, when the padlocks for our lips are forging,
Silence is a Crime."
(*The Freeman,* July 1967, p. 413).

Our priceless heritage is threatened today as never before in our lifetime: from without by the forces of Godless communism and at home by our complacency and by the insidious forces of the socialist-communist conspiracy with the help of those who would abandon the ancient landmarks set by our fathers, and take us down the road to destruction. It was Alexander Hamilton who warned that: "Nothing is more common than for a free people, in times of heat and violence, to gratify momentary passions, by letting into the government, principles and precedents which afterwards prove fatal to themselves." (*Alexander Hamilton and the Founding of the Nation,* p. 462, *P.P.N.S.,* p. 21)

Serious and concerned citizens everywhere are asking, "Can we cope with these threatening realities?" Yes we can. If we would allow the local police to do their job they could handle the rioting and looting. *Yes, we can,* if we have the courage and the wisdom to return to basic concepts, to recall the spirit of the founding fathers and accept wholeheartedly these words of Thomas Paine whose writings helped so much to stir people to action during the days of the American Revolution when he said:

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; 'tis dearness only that gives everything its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed, if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated." (*The Political Works of Thomas Paine,* p. 55)

As American citizens who love freedom, we must return to a respect for national morality—respect for law and order. There is no other way of safety for us and our posterity. The hour is late, the time is short. We must begin now, in earnest, and invite God's blessings on our efforts.

The United States should be a bastian of real freedom. We should not support the world's greatest evil, the Godless, socialist-communist conspiracy that seeks to destroy all we hold dear as a great Christian nation and to promote insidiously the breakdown of law and order and the erosion of our morality.

With God's help we must return to those basic concepts, those eternal verities, the rule of law and order upon which this nation was established. With an aroused citizenry and the help of Almighty God it can be accomplished. God grant it may be so, I humbly pray.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am delighted that the local law enforcement officers' compensation bill, which I cosponsored, has been signed into law. It provides compensation to any local policeman who is disabled, or to his survivors if he is killed, while apprehending persons suspected of having committed a Federal crime.

The measure is one of simple justice. I worked for its passage in both the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, and the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member. Local law enforcement officers often supplement the activities of Federal law enforcement personnel, which lessens the need for a larger Federal force. In performing this duty, local officers are sometimes severely injured or killed.

This is reason enough for the Federal Government to assume some responsibility toward the local agencies, which very often are able to maintain only minimal compensation programs. It is appropriate recognition of the contributions made by local police forces in the Nation's fight against crime.

VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the following items: an editorial published in the New York Times on April 22, 1968; an article

by Max Frankel, published in the New York Times of April 21; and the text of a speech delivered by the Honorable Walter L. Gordon, of Canada, entitled "The War in Vietnam."

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1968]

HAGGLING OVER WHERE TO TALK

Much of the tragedy of the Vietnam war stems from the tendency on both sides to invest relatively minor differences with such cosmic significance that compromise becomes almost impossible without loss of face or even sacrifice of national honor. This tendency to magnify what should be simple issues into extremely troublesome ones is currently stalling selection of a site for preliminary peace talks.

Both Hanoi and Washington still seem more interested in vindicating their own positions on where talks shall be held than in cooperating on a choice that will create the most promising environment for an approach to the peace table.

It would be disturbing enough if the rancor on this issue were merely an index of how hard it will be to get anywhere in resolving the intricate problems of substance that will require discussion once negotiations get under way. But the outlook is made much worse by the imputations of bad faith that now dominate the public statements exchanged by both sides.

The suspicion in Washington is that North Vietnam, by its insistence on American acceptance of Pnompenh or Warsaw as the meeting site, is trying to establish a pattern of United States surrender for the negotiations themselves.

Substantial as are some of the grounds for this fear, the vehemence of President Johnson's past offers to go "anywhere" in search of peace makes it easy now for Hanoi to deride as duplicity the quite valid objections Washington raises to both proposed sites.

Some of the ten alternative sites put forward by Secretary Rusk are obviously propaganda suggestions, open from the Communist view to precisely the reservations Washington has voiced about use of the Cambodian or Polish capitals. It is time for this kind of gamesmanship to end—in Washington and in Hanoi. There are several places in Europe or Asia where talks could be held without humiliation to either of the chief belligerents or their allies.

The apprehension the tug-of-war over a site has brought to hundreds of millions of people in every nation was reflected in Pope Paul's warning yesterday that peace was being blocked by "so many questions of prestige and by an insufficient sense of human brotherhood."

All the considerations that lent urgency to the combatants' decision a fortnight ago to try to find a way to the conference table gain urgency with each upward surge in the casualty lists, military and civilian. It is the ultimate tragedy to prolong the killing because stubborn men in both camps cannot agree where to meet, let alone what to do after they get there.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1968]

JOHNSON PLAYS A SHOWDOWN HAND

(By Max Frankel)

AUSTIN, TEX.—The tides of the Pacific Ocean have drawn Lyndon Johnson ever westward over the last three years. They have affected everything he has done as President, claiming much of his attention and resources. Some would argue that more than anything else, they finally dragged him down. Thus, after disclosing his withdrawal from the Presidential race three weeks ago, Mr. Johnson immediately scheduled yet another journey across his fateful ocean—his fifth in 26 months—to demonstrate yet again his conviction that his Pacific course was true, faithful to the needs and traditions of American policy and unaltered by the partisan storms at home.

Mr. Johnson made the journey last week, flying to Hawaii for talks with his Pacific military commanders at Camp Smith, high over the Pearl Harbor base that remains for him the symbol of his country's awakening to the dangers on the Asian front.

He met with President Chung Hee Park of South Korea, that distant little country that remains for him both the inspiration and the vindication of American military intervention on behalf of Asian friends.

But Mr. Johnson's real purpose was to address a much wider audience and he revealed that purpose an hour before he climbed aboard his jetborne White House for the flight back to his Texas ranch.

The President went to a reception honoring Mr. Park and there, in mid-Pacific, he spoke simultaneously to the Asian and American shores—to the Japanese and South Vietnamese and Thais and Australians, who have been nervously asking what his scheduled retirement meant for them, and to his critics at home, who have been celebrating the effectiveness of their opposition to his policies and anticipating a major withdrawal, perhaps even before Mr. Johnson leaves the White House.

"As we face now in Vietnam, hopefully, a movement from war to peace," the President said with considerable passion, "I wish to tell all of you, my fellow citizens, and you, my friend, President Park, what I deeply believe:

"I deeply believe that this nation will continue to play its part in helping to protect and to develop the new Asia.

"I deeply believe that my successor, whoever he may be, will act in ways that will reflect America's abiding interest in Asia's freedom and in Asia's security."

ASSURES THE ALLIES

To the Koreans, who have committed 50,000 troops to Vietnam and have become persuaded that they themselves are again under Communist challenge, to the Japanese, who have prospered behind an American shield, to the Thais, who have committed themselves wholeheartedly to the American side, to the Australians and New Zealanders, who feel that Americans in the Pacific are their only link to the security and culture of the "West"—to all these and others Mr. Johnson was trying to explain that his effort to reduce the level of violence in Vietnam was tactical, not strategic, and that his own withdrawal from politics would lead to an adjustment, not abandonment of his nation's Asian posture.

Mr. Johnson thus discussed American politics with President Park and even in public offered a fervent rebuttal to those who have tried to persuade him that backward and corrupt Asian societies were not worthy of American blood and that policies devised successfully in Europe were being ill-applied in the mire of the Asian mainland.

"The commitments of America in Europe and Asia, all made by Congresses and Presidents before my Administration, are color blind," he said.

"They run with the security of the nation and with our basic human values. They will remain firm in the years ahead.

"The days are long gone when Americans could say that Asians are not our kind of people.

"People who love peace and freedom, whatever their color or national origin, are our kind of people. The fight against racism and bigotry knows no International Dateline."

Mr. Johnson's critics and countrymen had best not underrate this Pacific peroration. Not just rhetorical, it testifies to his faith in eventual vindication. It states succinctly his sense of justification. It foreshadows his objectives in the power that still belongs to his administration.

He was withdrawn from Presidential politics, it seems clear now, to save his policy from erosion at home, not to abandon it abroad. He has sparred doggedly with Hanoi over a site for peace talks to prove that his interest in negotiation does not flow from desperation.

He told his military commanders in Hawaii that he would not be duped into one-sided tactical concessions at the conference table. Through President Park, he assured his allies that their interests and counsel would guide him at that table.

The Korean leader, to be sure, had other concerns as well. He was troubled by the docile American response to the North Koreans' seizure of the spy ship Pueblo. He fears an irrational North Korean adventure against his country. He was not certain that the United States was prepared or able to help him repel future attacks.

But Mr. Johnson, with his words and very presence in Hawaii, tried to suggest that America had proved her mettle in the Pacific, at enormous cost and pain.

"These ties, these memories" of battle, he said, "are important. They are as much a part of our history as they are of Korea's."

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

I would like to speak to you today about the war in Vietnam—not as an expert who presumes to know what should be done to end it nor as a member of the Government responsible for foreign policy—but just as an ordinary Canadian who is deeply troubled by what is going on. I share this concern with a great many others in this country including the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Members of Parliament on all sides of the House, university teachers and people in every walk of life.

This same concern is felt by people in other countries including U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations and His Holiness the Pope. It is shared by many highly placed Americans who have had the courage to speak out or to demonstrate against the present policies of their government. I am thinking of Senator William Fulbright, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, retired generals James M. Gavin and Matthew B. Ridgway, Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, Walter Lippmann and Martin Luther King, as well as by a galaxy of university teachers and many others.

I am told that the great mass of Canadians are not really interested in this war in far off Asia; that they feel safe and comfortable and are looking forward to visiting Expo and to the Centennial celebrations. If this be true then surely it is the duty of their leaders in every field and especially of those in politics to bring home to them the inherent danger to all of us what is going on in Vietnam. That is what I propose to try to do today.

No Canadian likes to criticize the United States or the policies of its government. The Americans are our friends and neighbours and our relationships with them are warm, varied and extensive. Moreover, we would be wholly dependent on our American allies if there should be an attack on North America. This was brought home to us with shocking clarity in October, 1962, when the late President John F. Kennedy insisted that the Russian dismantle the nuclear bases they were establishing in Cuba.

We know also that the United States did not seek her present awesome responsibilities as the leader of the Western World. She now finds herself in a position where her government is forced to make decisions

quickly and often without adequate information. Sometimes mistakes are made and when this happens the U.S. becomes committed to policies that seem to go from bad to worse. Governments, like individuals, do not like to confess to errors or to change policies once embarked upon. When this happens one can always hope that something will turn up which will justify the original decision.

But where does this leave the individual who is convinced that present policies are wrong, morally and in every other way? As I have said, many distinguished Americans have had the courage to speak out against the war in Vietnam. Should Canadians, who are just as horrified by what is going on as these Americans, speak out as well? Or should we keep silent on the grounds that it is not our affair; that we are not involved in any direct way ourselves—except, of course, as members of the International Control Commission; that it could be dangerous for us as a nation or as individuals to criticize the U.S. Government; that in Canada's dependent or semi-satellite position vis-a-vis the U.S., the better part of wisdom would be silence?

I suppose the answer to these queries depends upon our individual consciences and our concept about the kind of world we live in. It was the general reaction against old fashioned views of colonialism and imperialism which left France without support in her war in Indo-China in the late forties and early fifties.

It was the feeling that governments should not any longer act unilaterally that caused so much criticism of Britain and France over the Suez affair in 1956 and of the Russian intervention in Hungary in the same year. The U.S. was on the side of the angels then.

Perhaps it is similar feelings which more recently have provoked criticism of U.S. policies in Santo Domingo and Vietnam. Whatever the reasons I believe all of us have a duty to record our concern—our growing horror if you will—over what is going on in Vietnam. If the present policy ends in disaster—the extermination of millions of unfortunate Vietnamese, or possibly a global nuclear war—our failure to speak out against what is happening will always remain on our consciences—if by chance we happen to survive—and so it should.

Dr. Blake, as reported in the *New York Times* of April 27, recently put this far more eloquently than I can:

"It is increasingly a unilateral policy and less and less supported by the peoples and governments who have been our allies in resisting Communist aggression. Our course has all the elements of high tragedy. More like Hamlet or King Lear than Macbeth or Julius Caesar, unable to distinguish friend from foe, caught in a dilemma which makes any decision increasingly difficult, the United States seems to be stumbling on towards final disaster.

"Our high ideals more and more suspected by our best friends among the nations, we find our position successfully attacked by our enemies and we find ourselves more and more isolated from our friends.

"Even those governments who share our fear of Communist aggression dare not fully and publicly support us because of the almost hysterical fears of their people of what we will do next.

"In the second place our Vietnam policy is wrong because we cannot win. By this I do not mean we cannot obliterate Vietnam, north and south. We have the military power to do just that. But when the swamps of the Mekong delta are filled up with dead Vietnamese and when the flower of our youth lies dead with them, what victory will have been won?

"Force cannot obliterate ideas. The more force we use the weaker become our best ideals. The picture of a great and wealthy nation mobilizing each month more and more of its unparalleled technological might to bring a tiny, long suffering, dark skinned nation to capitulation means clearly that the more we win the more we lose and each American soldier dead or wounded is a useless sacrifice."

To me it seems that U.S. policy in the Far East has been a succession of unhappy errors beginning with a gross misconception of the weakness and corruption of the Chiang Kai-shek regime in China and then failure to appreciate the relative strength of Mao Tse-tung's Communist government which took power in 1949.

I paid my first visit to the Far East in 1954. The late Carroll Binder, a well known American publicist and the Editor of the *Minneapolis Tribune,* was on the same trip and on his return recorded his opinions in his newspaper.

He had this to say about U.S. policy:

"I cannot recall one informed person with whom I talked during hundreds of conversations who personally accepted the underlying premise of United States policy towards China—that the present regime is a transient one which in due course will be replaced by one with which the United States can treat.

"Regardless of the position that is taken officially and despite personal antipathy towards Red China, every person with whom I have talked during the past five weeks takes it for granted that the present regime will endure a long time."

And again:

"The present United States policy of acting as though the Red regime is a transient one and of supporting Chiang's feeble but provocative sallies against the Red regime is regarded as amateurish and potentially dangerous by virtually everyone I met on this journey.

"It is believed to be based on short-sighted domestic political considerations instead of the long term interest of the United States and other free nations. The United States is poorly situated to influence the course of world affairs at a critical juncture of history so long as a large part of the free world has so little confidence in its attitude towards China and China's neighbours."

I remember quoting Mr. Binder in a speech some twelve years ago and then remarking:

"All I can say is that, like Mr. Binder, I did not meet one person in the Far East who agreed with present United States policy. They all thought the present Communist government would remain in power in China for a long time. And accordingly that present United States policy is wrong. Most of the people we talked with were sensible enough to agree that no nation as important as the United States can be expected to reverse her policies overnight. Changes, if they are to come, must come gradually as and when public opinion becomes prepared for them. And certainly the recent series of provocative acts by the Chinese Communists makes it more difficult for the United States to modify her Far Eastern policy—even if her principal leaders were disposed to do so. (I might add that many of the people we talked with thought the present foreign policy of Communist China is deplorable. They blame this largely on the ignorance of the Communist leaders about the rest of the world.)"

Since that time U.S. policy towards Red China has hardened steadily. The same is true—even more true perhaps—of Red China's attitude towards the United States. At the official level the leaders of both nations seem to have reached an almost pathological stage in their reactions to each other.

At the same time the Chinese have become engaged in an ideological conflict with the Soviet Union, formerly their principal ally, and in what appears to be serious upheavals at home. The U.S., for its part, has become enmeshed in a bloody civil war in Vietnam which cannot be justified on either moral or strategic grounds.

Senator George McGovern made a speech in the U.S. Senate recently about U.S. policy in Vietnam, parts of which were reported by the New York Times as follows:

"Our deepening involvement in Vietnam represents the most tragic diplomatic and moral failure in our national experience. The mightiest nation in history—a nation with a glorious democratic tradition based on the dignity and brotherhood of man—is with allegedly good motives devastating an impoverished little state and ravishing the people whose freedom we would protect.

"In the process we are sacrificing many of our bravest young men, wasting valuable resources, and threatening the peace of the world. We are being pulled step by step into a jungle quicksand that may claim our sons and the sons of Asia for years to come—a fearful path which our ablest generals have warned against for decades. 'Anyone who commits American forces to a land war in Asia,' said the late General Douglas MacArthur, 'ought to have his head examined.'"

Senator McGovern went on to say:

"Communism is a force hostile to American ideals, but we do not meet its challenge by forcing an American solution on a people still in search of their own national identity. Mao Tse-tung may have claimed that 'power grows out of the barrel of a gun,' but that has not been the chief source of American power in the world, and it does not answer the basic yearning of the people of Asia. After all the dead are counted—American and Vietnamese—and the countryside is laid waste, we will have accomplished nothing. Having sown the wind, we shall reap the whirlwind.

"We fight in Vietnam not for any enduring objective; rather, we fight because of a highly questionable notion that this is the only honorable course. Implicit in our Vietnam involvement is an assumption that we may be ordained to play God in Asia by settling the struggle and determining the ideology of the people of that continent."

In the May issue of *The Progressive,* the Senator wrote in the same vein:

"We seem bent upon saving the Vietnamese from Ho Chi Minh even if we have to kill them and demolish their country to do it."

And again—

"Many of the Senate's most influential members, including the chairmen of powerful committees, have believed for years that the United States made a serious mistake in intervening in Vietnam—first by trying to defeat the Vietnamese independence struggle led by Ho Chi Minh against imperial France, and second, by fostering a divided Vietnam leading to civil conflict after the expulsion of the French."

Vietnam is a country of some 30 million people who have been resisting external aggression for centuries. First it was the Chinese. Then about one hundred years ago the French established control over the country. The Japanese took over for a short time during World War II and then the French again. Since the expulsion of the French in 1954 there has been civil war and more recently ever increasing intervention by the United States.

There are said to be about three million Catholics and about twelve million Buddhists in the South. There is no way of telling how many actual Communists there are (i.e. members of the party) under Ho Chi Minh in the North or in the Vietcong. But there can be little question that the Vietnamese are intensely nationalistic and wish to retain their independence.

If left to the Vietnamese themselves it is questionable whether the civil war could be settled without more bloodshed. These people have a reputation for toughness and they have been fighting continually throughout

the lives of several generations. However it might not be any worse for the Vietnamese to be allowed to fight things out among themselves than it is to be bombed, burned and exterminated by a foreign power.

As a Westerner, as a citizen of a country that has such close and friendly connections with the United States—military alliances as well as trade, financial, cultural and social ties—I feel sick at heart at what is going on.

One is constantly reminded of the bombing, the use of napalm, the policy of defoliation and the effect this must have, not only on the lives, but on the thinking of the local population.

It would be quite unfair to blame American troops for what is happening. They are obeying orders, as is their duty. Unfortunately, in a war like this, there are bound to be acts of barbarism on both sides.

In this war, the strongest nation in the world has taken sides in a savage civil struggle and is using its tremendous power to force the other side to quit. If the escalation of the war continues, as seems probable, and the North Vietnamese do not give up soon, one may wonder if the United States will be driven to use nuclear bombs or to spread germs of exterminating chemicals.

You may think this is exaggerated. If so would it be too much to ask the President of the United States to give a categorical undertaking that the U.S. will not use nuclear bombs or germs or life destroying chemicals under any circumstances?

From Canada's standpoint the grave dangers in the present situation are fourfold:

1. The present conflict may reinforce a natural distrust of all Westerners and of all white people on the part of millions of nonwhites throughout the world. We may know that in their hearts, ordinary Americans are good, generous and kindly. But after what is happening in Vietnam, how can we expect Asians or Africans to believe this? And how can we expect them to differentiate between one white nation and another?

2. The second danger is that Russia and China may become reconciled as a result of their opposition to U.S. action in Vietnam. Senator Robert Kennedy, a critic of U.S. policy is quoted in the *New York Times* of April 26 in this connection:

"Senator Kennedy backed the warnings of Senators McGovern and Fulbright about the effect of expansion of the war, saying:

" 'I had a visitor, a rather important visitor, from the Soviet Union during the last week, and he spoke about the Berlin crisis of 1961 and the Cuban crisis of 1962. He admitted quite frankly that those two efforts by the Soviet Union had driven the allies and NATO countries—France, Germany, the United States and England and other countries—very closely together in a way that they had not been in the past.

'He said that is what is happening in Southeast Asia today. He said: "Through the efforts of the United States, you are accomplishing what we thought impossible, because you are bringing Communist China and Russia back together again' ".

3. The third danger that could result from a further escalation of the war is the direct involvement of Red China. If it seemed likely that North Vietnam was going to be defeated, it is quite possible that China might decide to intervene. Apart from everything else, this might be one way in which the Chinese leaders could suppress the present uprisings in their own country which may include the possibility of civil war at home.

Probably the U.S. could defeat Red China with the use of nuclear weapons if the Russians did not come to China's rescue—but what then? Having achieved victory, how could the U.S. police a nation of seven or eight hundred million people? And quite apart from that, would not all civilized people be revolted by a nuclear conflict which might involve a hundred million casualties?

4. Finally, there is the gravest danger that if the United States used nuclear weapons, the Russians would retaliate immediately. That is something which no thinking person dares to contemplate.

What should be done in present circumstances? I have read the suggestions put forward by U Thant, by our own Prime Minister, by the Honourable Paul Martin, by General Gavin, and by other thoughtful and informed Americans. They do not differ in essentials. Let me quote what Senator McGovern proposed in the speech previously referred to:

"I recommend now as I have in the past, but with a new urgency and a deeper concern, that we:

"Stop the bombing, North and South, end the 'search and destroy' offensive sweeps, and confine our military action to holding operations on the ground. . . . A defensive holding action in the South as advocated by Generals (James M.) Gavin and (Matthew B.) Ridgway could be pursued while determined efforts are being made to negotiate a cease-fire. It is the bombing of North Vietnam that presents the greatest obstacle to a settlement and the greatest danger of involving Russia or China in the war.

"We should clearly state our willingness to negotiate directly with the Vietcong with some recognition that they will play a significant role in any provisional government resulting from a cease-fire and a negotiated settlement.

"We should use what influence we have to encourage a more broadly based civilian government in Saigon. A government willing to start discussions with the other side looking toward arrangements to end the war.

"We should advocate an international presence to police a cease-fire, supervise elections, provide an umbrella for the resettlement of Vietnamese concerned about their safety, and arrange for the withdrawal of all outside forces and the conversion of military bases to peacetime uses."

There can be no certainty that a course along these lines would work out satisfactorily. Hanoi might be suspicious of any new proposals and refuse to negotiate on any terms. The U.S. military commanders, on the other hand have argued that cessation of the bombing will give the North Vietnamese opportunities to re-establish their communications and to bring up supplies. But surely it would be preferable to face these very real difficulties than to continue on a course that is so fraught with danger.

I hope Canadians in all walks of life and in all political parties—including especially Mr. Pearson and Mr Martin—will continue to do everything in their power to press the Americans to stop the bombing. If we fail to do this, we must be prepared to share the responsibility of those whose policies and actions are destroying a poor but determined people. We must share the responsibility of those whose policies involve the gravest risks for all mankind.

AFRICAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, last year I was fortunate enough to be able to travel to the sprawling continent of Africa and meet with some of her outstanding leaders. It soon became apparent that Africans face an incredible set of obstacles on their road to national development and economic self-sufficiency.

One of these obstacles is a lack of well-developed markets. These countries are handicapped by a lack of adequate transportation facilities and skilled workers, of course. But they are also hampered by the fact that their small size often prohibits the creation of large industries which can produce goods cheaply because of the economies that can be achieved through mass production.

The European colonial powers fixed the borders of African countries arbitrarily when they conquered the continent and divided the spoils. It is imperative that the independent African States of today to seek to transcend these artificial barriers to development by creating regional economic unions along the lines of the Central American Common Market, for example. Just as the Latin Americans have come to realize that a measure of political sovereignty must be surrendered if they are to achieve more rapid economic development, so too must the Africans.

Mr. President, my visit there convinced me that responsible African leaders have recognized this need and have begun to move to meet it rather decisively, and in an incredibly short time. When one stops to think that the Latin American States had been independent for over 100 years before attempting such a close economic union, the performance of some of the more progressive African States less than 10 years after achieving their independence is nothing short of remarkable.

Last December the East African community was launched with headquarters in Arusha, Tanzania. During my stay in Arusha last year I was most impressed by the enthusiasm and determination expressed by the community's officials to succeed in their attempt to create basic infrastructure for the participating countries of Tanzania, Kenya, and Uganda.

And now word has arrived of yet another start in Africa's gradual movement toward economic integration. The Congo, Chad, and the Central African Republic have signed a charter creating the Union of Central African States. This document calls for mutual assistance in case of foreign aggression and for harmony in the members' policies on development, industrialization, transport, and telecommunications.

Mr. President, I have spoken often on the need to multilateralize our foreign assistance programs and to place new emphasis on the creation of regional economic arrangements in the underdeveloped areas of the world. The bold step taken recently by the Congo, Chad, and the Central African Republic is consonant with this approach to economic development and, though many difficulties will undoubtedly arise, it deserves our heartiest commendation and support.

THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in 1966, at hearings before the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I met for the first time Judge Talbot Smith, of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. Through these and subsequent hearings, I came to know Judge Smith as a forceful and stimulating advocate of needed judicial reforms. His wisdom is exceeded only by his diligence and wit. As an attorney, law

professor, judge of the Supreme Court of Michigan, and U.S. district judge, he has earned the respect and admiration of the legal profession.

Recently, Judge Smith wrote an article entitled "The Hearsay Rule and the Docket Crisis: The Futile Search for Paradise," which was published in the American Bar Association Journal. The article bears witness to Judge Smith's thoughtful concern about the status of our Federal judicial system.

Anyone interested in the Federal courts will be alarmed by some of Judge Smith's findings. His article documents well his belief that many efforts to achieve judicial perfection are attempted through "cheap and easy" means. There must be some real concern about our national priorities when, as Judge Smith points out:

The total appropriation for the judiciary (in fiscal year 1967) was some $88 million, as compared to the expenditure of ". . . some $95 million on fertilizer exports in fiscal year 1966. . . ."

Judge Smith makes an important point:

The Federal judiciary must have help, assistance and assistants, beyond our pre-World War II staffing lest a creeping paralysis now affecting our judicial system ultimately reach our vital organs.

Anyone interested in the Federal courts will read with interest Judge Smith's important article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE HEARSAY RULE AND THE DOCKET CRISIS: THE FUTILE SEARCH FOR PARADISE

(By Talbot Smith)

Have the times, indeed, passed us by? Are the common law courts in truth following the path of the dinosaur as the backlogs climb with hardly a pause to ever higher levels? The Chief Justice points with alarm to the increasing length of federal dockets and pleads for a solution. The *American Bar Association Journal* periodically warns, with supporting figures, of the gravity of the situation. Distinguished judges, writing in other professional journals, call for remedial action. The Administrative Office of the United States Courts dispatches assistants to the hard-pressed districts that are falling behind in their disposition of cases, asking, in effect, "For heaven's sake, what's the matter?"

The "matter" is both external and internal. On the external side we are the repository of a grab-bag of jurisdictions, as the Congress has responded haphazardly to a succession of economic and sociological ills, pressures and crises. Moreover, as our society has grown more complex, its problems have grown in complexity and the ensuing litigation has grown. Labor-management relations and civil rights acts may well serve as examples. Much of the expanding litigation is in the crisis category, requiring immediate injunctive consideration at notable length to the detriment of other matters pending that are of at least equal importance and that may have been awaiting trial for months. Actually, our jurisdiction encompasses matters from the trivial to treason, and it is to me a sad state of affairs that a judge of the experience (and with the docket load) of Sherrill Halbert of the Northern District of California should be spending his time on such matters as the seizure of five wild ducks in a trapper's shack.[1] (Did probable cause exist for seizure when the ducks were seen through an open door?) The carefully drafted bill of the Tydings Committee,[2] the Federal Magistrates Act,[3] will put a stop to much of this sort of abuse of a busy judge's time. It has passed the Senate and is before the House Judiciary Committee. Its passage in the House should be a matter of personal concern to each of us of the legal profession.

But internally (in the sense that we are, properly, constantly modifying our own procedures) we have run into a law of nature, the law of diminishing returns. It will not go away, and we must either adjust to it or it will break us. It concerns the time, the effort and the expense involved in reaching perfection. An analogy may be helpful. Simply to double the accuracy of a fine chronometer does not merely double the price. It multiplies it many-fold. The same is true of reaching those elusive top (or bottom) cycles in a high-fidelity speaker. The cost of attaining perfection in any field involves geometrical—not arithmetical—progressions of cost, time and effort. This is true as well in the law, something we seem to have forgotten.

At a period not very far back, a trial began with the empanelling of the jury and ended with the verdict. Now we have a vast array of pretrial and posttrial procedures. We have the investigation into financial status with respect to assignment of counsel, with forms in quadruplicate to be made out, conferences over assignment of counsel, the hearing (or hearings, plus opinion) on bail, also with forms in quadruplicate, the preliminary or warm-up trial on search and seizure, the law as to which is now so complicated as to be almost a specialty of its own,[4] and then the trial. When the verdict is returned, if guilty, the litigation is far from over. In fact, the show is just getting on the road. Motions with respect to the sentence imposed may now be heard. (The most extensive time I ever spent on a sentence, involving motions, hearing and argument, petitions for rehearing and all the rest, really came about, it ultimately appeared, not because of any disproportion in the sentence but because the convicted defendant wanted out in time for his daughter's wedding the following August.) The appeal (at government expense) is next, often regardless of merit, following which come the 2255's, the writs and the civil actions for damages against those connected with the case.

The recent statutory measures of improvement and reform deserve and get our unqualified support. But we seem to have ignored in drafting them the time problems of the judges who must make them work. The Criminal Justice Act[5] is a statute in point. It contains no provision whatever for any person or any report to assist the judge in his determination of whether or not the defendant's financial status entitles him to counsel at the taxpayers' expense. It contains no criteria for determining what "investigative, expert, or other services [are] necessary to an adequate defense",[6] this being left to the discretion of the judge. The time spent on this detail alone may be (for me, it has been) substantial. And, in addition, there is the hazy and time-consuming matter of determining counsel fees. As to none of these matters is there a provision for administrative help for the trial court. Consequently, I thoroughly agree with Chief Judge Timbers of the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut that "The volume of paper work, telephone calls, and personal conferences . . . is enormous,"[7] requiring like amounts of the judge's time.

The new Bail Reform Act[8] also may well be cited to my point. At one stage of the newly formulated bail process, the trial judge is required to record an opinion with respect to his bail determination.[9] In a matter of days after the effective date of the act I had to do this with respect to a bank robber who, having (allegedly) robbed three banks initially, and having (allegedly) robbed two more while out on bail, was most insistent that I reduce the high bail set for him on the latter, two-bank indictment so that he could "get out and assist counsel in defending his case". He was apparently well advised as to the objectives of the act. Now, if I had any objections to writing opinions I shouldn't be where I am, but my point is something else—opinions take time, the one commodity I have little of. Incidentally, the day is not far off, I predict, when each sentence will require an opinion, and in my district, where I sentence hundreds in a year, this is going to present a real problem. No, not really a problem. I shall write the opinions, but while I'm writing opinions, I cannot be trying cases, and thus the backlog will mount, and mount again, and more articles will appear and more speeches deploring the situation will be made. How long is this to go on?

NO EASY ROAD TO PERFECTION

I would not be misunderstood at this point. I share, with all of the lawyers and judges I know, an eagerness for the attainment of the highest possible standards of justice and a pride in any progress we make. I join in the hope that we may some day enjoy perfection. But what I protest is our attempt to reach perfection the cheap and easy way, without recognizing that the law of geometrical progression as to time and effort is at work as we attempt to double the accuracy of the chronometer, so to speak, without paying the price.

The trial judge needs help, not so much in the decisional process (which, after all, is his function) but with respect to all of the ancillary matters that he must handle. We should have administrative assistants for the ever-increasing paper work. We should have additional clerks, particularly to aid in the preparation and analysis of postconviction matters. (Should a petition for writ of habeas corpus be granted on the ground of cruel and unusual punishment if the earphones through which a prisoner hears radio programs are taken from him because of his alleged damaging thereof?[10] It all takes time—and an opinion.) The present policy with respect to the use of masters[11] should be reassessed. (I was recently confronted with the problem of determining, without

[1] *United States* v. *Greenhead*, 256 F. Supp. 890 (D.C. Cal. 1966).

[2] The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

[3] S. 3475, 89th Cong., 2d Sess.; S. 945, 90th Cong.

[4] See Davis' recent book, FEDERAL SEARCH AND SEIZURES (1964).

[5] 18 U.S.C. § 3006A (1964).

[6] 18 U.S.C. § 3006A (e) (1964).

[7] *Judicial Perspectives on the Operation of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964*, 42 N.Y.U. L. REV. 54, 65 (1967).

[8] Bail Reform Act of 1966, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3146–3152.

[9] Section 3146 (d), ". . . set forth in writing the reasons for requiring the conditions imposed".

[10] *Haskins* v. *United States*, 292 F. 2d 265 (4th Cir. 1961).

[11] Rule 53(b): "A reference to a master shall be the exception and not the rule. In actions to be tried by a jury, a reference shall be made only when the issues are complicated; in actions to be tried without a jury, save in matters of account, and of difficult computation of damages, a reference shall be made only upon a showing that some exceptional condition requires it."

specific records, the cost of each of several thousand small items of jewelry in an insurance fraud case.)

With knowledge, common throughout the profession, of the deplorable state of our dockets, why haven't these aids been authorized? I'm not high enough in the judicial hierarchy to know. My world comprehends only my courtroom and my library. But I suspect it mostly boils down to budget. Here, we are in an area of relative values. I note some interesting dollar comparisons between the 1966–1967 appropriations for the judiciary [12] and the proposed foreign aid program for fiscal year 1968.[13] We of the judiciary are constantly (and properly) admonished to keep down our juror expense, and we give it much thought and effort. Using care, we kept our total juror (and commissioner) appropriations for the entire nation down to $7,700,000, the exact amount, I note, of our highway loan to Afghanistan.[14] Our Supreme Court salaries appropriation was $2,000,000, almost the same (about $2.1 million) as a grant for the repair of coastal embankments in East Pakistan.[15] Indeed, the total appropriation for the judiciary was some 88 million dollars, as compared with the expenditure of ". . . some $95 million on fertilizer exports in fiscal 1966 . . .".[16]

The lesson from this is not for me to draw. I am from America's heartland, the Midwest, with much of Oelwein, Iowa, and Central City, Nebraska, and Pocatello, Idaho, in my past and in my thinking. Thus I am not unaware of the value of good roads, whether in Afghanistan or Iowa, of high-water control whether in Ohio or East Pakistan, and surely I need not be persuaded of the value of fertilizer in the alleviation of the world's hunger. But this also I know—that the federal judiciary must have help, assistance and assistants, beyond our pre-World War II staffing lest the creeping paralysis now infecting our judicial system ultimately reach our vital organs.

RULES OF EVIDENCE ARE STALE RITUALS

But we of the legal profession are not without fault. We have made great strides in procedural matters, largely because of the discretion entrusted to the trial judge. But as to "rules" of evidence, there is almost a complete lack of discretion. These are rules. Talk to me not of the Medes and Persians. Thus it is that in the trial itself, the point where all our professional problems come to focus, the area peculiarly within our professional *expertise*, stale rituals abound. The wonder is that we have done so well, despite the log jams now existing at all levels. The primary problem at the trial level is basic and fundamental. It may be very simply put. It is the mass of confused, poorly grounded and sometimes contradictory "rules" of evidence. Although the origins of these rules are diverse, they have, I believe with Thayer, Wigmore and Holdsworth, the element of parentage in common. They are "the child of the jury".[17] From the jury's presence—indeed, put bluntly, from our distrust of its acuity—comes a large part of the so-called "rules" of evidence, those volumes of commands, precepts and admonitions as to what a jury will be permitted to hear and what it will not. It is also a factor in the flight to the administrative tribunals. It was Judge Wyzanski, in *United States* v. *United Shoe Machinery Corporation*,[18] who noted that ". . . the original demand for administrative adjudication was traceable, in part at least, to the unwillingness of courts to admit evidence which they allowed administrative agencies to receive and act upon". And President Roosevelt's veto message on the Walter-Logan Bill many years before, was equally in point:

"Litigation has become costly and beyond the ability of the average person to bear. Its technical rules of procedure are often traps for the unwary and technical rules of evidence often prevent commensense determinations on information which would be regarded as adequate for any business decision." [19]

There is danger here of misinterpretation. Let me hasten to say that I think the invention of the jury ranks with the invention of the plow as one of the great steps in the development of the human race. But there is a difference to be observed. While the plow has been improved, the jury has essentially stood still, except in one area where it has probably moved too fast. This illuminates the whole problem. Let me be more specific. Some time ago I tried a case involving a complex theory of valuation. I first put my law clerk to work on it. Fortunately his brother was a C.P.A. Standard treatises were suggested to me and I applied myself to their teachings. Blackboard sessions were held. Ultimately I felt competent to try the case, and in due course I "instructed" the jury. In theory, at any rate, the jury absorbed my instructions, understood them and applied them to the facts found by it. It came back with a verdict of $650,000, although plaintiff's counsel had shortly before turned down a settlement of $800,000, holding out (reasonably, I thought) for an even million. I was uneasy with the result, but mere unease is not yet grounds for a new trial. The verdict was well within the range of the proofs. Yet as I reflected upon the hours I had devoted with a skilled tutor to the Wyzanski, in *United States* v. *United Shoe* grew. Had my instructions been sufficiently clear and accurate? Or was it actually humanly impossible for a jury of housewives and mechanics to absorb and apply them in a few hours? If they did understand, absorb and apply, fine. If not, what are we doing? Is this all a charade, an obeisance to a past long dead?

Thus, we confront this paradox: In our speeches on Law Day USA we attribute to the jury an acuity and an understanding which, we insist with Blackstone, renders it "the glory of the English law". Yet we will not permit it to hear a simple narration without the application of "rules" of evidence, obstructive, time-consuming and witness-choking, all grounded upon the proposition that the jury is not capable of reasonable discernment. "The Courts", said the Supreme Court long ago, "were afraid to trust the intelligence of jurors".[20]

My point is not the validity of the theory that a jury can possibly have the understanding to absorb and follow complex instructions, or even simple instructions as to complex concepts (though this may be a contradiction in terms) or, indeed, that it is within human competence (and I here speak of the judge's task) to frame instructions in words that have the same meaning to twelve persons of varying backgrounds, to say nothing of the justices who will eventually interpret them.[21] (I normally shy away from the statement of absolutes, but I venture this one with some assurance: Any case may be reversed because of "error" in instructions. Human communication is just not that precise, nor can the law be so summarily encapsuled.) Those theories rate articles of their own. My point rather is simply that these two of our current theories of the capabilities of the same jury cannot rationally exist side by side. Yet they do, with the result that (a) as regards instructions (a matter highly technical) the jury is theoretically acute, intelligent and understanding, but (b) as to weighing evidence (a matter of human understanding) it is theoretically gullible and moronic. Thus we have an overtrust in the area where the jury is weakest and an undertrust in the area where it should be strongest. It is to this latter aspect of the problem that I wish to address my primary attention, for it is here that we encounter our most time-consuming problems and sow the seeds for uncounted reversals.

The result of our ancient undertrust in the evidentiary field is that we have a system of so-called "rules" much of which "is archaic, paradoxical and full of compromises and compensations by which an irrational advantage on one side is offset by a poorly reasoned counterprivilege on the other".[22] The Supreme Court is obviously reluctant to act in the premises,[23] "the discordant views of eleven essentially independent courts of appeals" [24] add nothing but confusion and the trial judge is left with a "law of evidence . . . too extensive, too complex, and too uncertain to apply accurately on the spur of the moment".[25] As a matter of actual count (I didn't do it), there were 3,150 rules in Wigmore [26] in 1940. No trial judge, no trial lawyer, knows them all. McCormick, after speaking of the "lush exuberance of doctrines which bloom in the digests and the six-volume treatises on evidence" concluded that "to master these rules so that they could currently be used, to retain them, and to keep abreast of their changing current would be a mammoth task, and one which, as a practical man he [the attorney] believes is not worth the cost".[27] If we were to try to find and apply them in the treatises as the trial progressed we should have lengthy adjournments from time to

---

[12] *Appropriations Estimates, etc., 1966–1967*, S. Doc. No. 129, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. (1967)

[13] AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, SUMMARY PRESENTATION TO THE CONGRESS.

[14] *Id.* at 16: "Before disbursing a $7.7 million highway loan to Afghanistan in 1964, the United States required the Afghan Government to create a national highway maintenance department, as it had become obvious that previous AID-sponsored highway projects had been allowed to deteriorate."

[15] *Id.* at 137.

[16] *Id.* at 27.

[17] THAYER, EVIDENCE 47 (1898). Morgan. *The Jury and the Exclusionary Rules of Evidence*, 4 U. CHI. L. REV. 747 (1937) holds the statement as here used too broad. Possibly so. I would not attempt to resolve their dispute. My own meager contribution is only that in every ruling upon evidence I am keenly aware of the presence of the jury and what they should and should not hear.

[18] 89 F. Supp. 349, 356 (1950).

[19] As quoted in I DAVIS, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW § 1.05 (1958). See also authorities cited in 2 DAVIS, *supra*, § 14.01. The entire area is well-examined in Chapter 11 of ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS, SELECTED WRITINGS ON EVIDENCE AND TRIAL (1957). Note, also, the provisions of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act (1946), 5 U.S.C.A. § 1006(c).

[20] *Benson* v. *United States*, 146 U.S. 325, 336 (1892).

[21] See *Time, Inc.* v. *Hill*, 385 U.S. 374 (1967), particularly those portions of the dissent of Justices Fortas, Clark and Warren relating to the instructions issue.

[22] *Michelson* v. *United States*, 335 U.S. 469, 486 (1948).

[23] *Preliminary Study of the Advisability and Feasibility of Developing Uniform Rules of Evidence for the Federal Courts*, 30 F.R.D. 73, 99 (1962).

[24] Frankfurter, J., in *Sears, Roebuck & Co.* v. *Mackey*, 351 U.S. 427, 444 (1956), in speaking of the interpretation of 28 U.S.C. § 1291.

[25] Estes, *The Need for Uniform Rules of Evidence in the Federal Courts*, 24 F.R.D. 331, 332 (1960).

[26] Britt, *The Rules of Evidence*, 25 CORNELL L. Q. 556, 558 (1940).

[27] *Tomorrow's Law of Evidence*, 24 A.B.A.J. 507, 508 (1938).

time as the rules and their exceptions were explored and tested against the facts presented. Obviously, we can't do it, and we don't do it. Accordingly, I submit that many of our so-called "rules" of evidence are unrealistic. And, moreover, I submit that whenever we apply unrealistic rules to an intensely practical problem, the ascertainment of truth in the trial of a lawsuit, we hamper the exposition of the truth and we sow the seeds of reversal. If trials in the trial courts were final, our docket problems both at the trial and appellate levels would shrink measurably. They cannot, of course, be final, though I am not sure they cannot be more final than they are now. Certainly to the degree that appellate courts re-enunciate the principles to follow as constitutional horizons widen,[28] there cannot and should not be finality at the trial level.

However, I speak at this point not of Constitutional interpretation but of the listening-and-believing problems. I speak of the artificialities under which we live in the courts, the tight-meshed screen through which we strain a story as the witness tries to express himself without involving himself in conclusion, opinion, hearsay and all the rest. Many of the rules of evidence are the products of a simpler age, reflecting conditions long since buried with their casts. To the degree that appellate courts seek to enforce "rules" that are not responsive to the habits of thought, of expression and of judgment of our people there will be a widening gap between what is actually done in the courts and what "ought" to be done according to the rules.

DISTINCTIONS WITHOUT MEANING

Moreover, I note in passing, some of the rules by which we live are so poorly grounded according to modern thought as to subject us to valid criticism by knowledgeable professionals. Thus a trial judge will not normally permit testimony of the witness's prior conviction of a mere misdemeanor to be heard as affecting his credibility. But if the misdemeanor involves "moral turpitude", it may be shown.[29] Now, however simple to our ancestors may have seemed the village idiot, indeed the village monster or the miscreant exhibiting "moral turpitude", today's psychiatry regards them as creatures of the utmost complexity. The current debates respecting the insanity plea are illustrative.[30] Yet today's courts still rule, in less time than it takes to write these words, upon whether or not the misdemeanor so involves moral turpitude that evidence of its commission may be taken. Actually, there is about as much connection between our "finding" of moral turpitude in court and a doctor's finding of such as there is between findings in alchemy and chemistry. So the doctors smile, the judge winces and the defendant may go to prison.

HEARSAY—A CRAZY QUILT

My principal target at this writing is the rule against hearsay, that "old-fashioned crazy quilt".[31] It is with real diffidence that I even approach the topic since so much has been written about it.[32] Yet the very magnitude of the problem warrants unrelenting reexamination. It is, literally, "the" law of evidence. An English student of the subject has pointed out that "nearly one-third of the law of evidence is concerned with complications arising from the admission of hearsay".[33] Somewhere I have read that the rule has thirty-two exceptions, but I doubt this because new ones are being invented daily. Not only in point is Judge Brown's frequently cited newspaper-excerpt case,[34] but even more so the Iowa[35] case in which it was shown that, after release of the chickens from the premises of the defendant, they marched up the road to the chicken house of the complaining witness, where they mounted the roosts and bedded down for the night. The testimony was apparently admitted upon the theory that it is well known that chickens always come home to roost. But I feel that the taking of such testimony was a triumph of common sense over the common law of hearsay for it is beyond question that the chickens were not sworn.

The situation respecting the law of hearsay is reminiscent of the law of Eudoxus, a Greek philosopher who lived in the fourth century before Christ. He sought to explain, among other things, the retrograde motions of the planets. With great ingenuity he constructed a planetary system with the earth at the center, surrounded by twenty-seven concentric spheres. Each rotated on a different axis, and by properly combining the movements of these spheres he could explain the motions of any heavenly body.

Likewise our magnificently complicated hearsay structure, enlisting not Eudoxus's twenty-seven spheres but rather thirty-two equally ingenious inventions. They are, however, as useless to explain what we are really doing in the realm of hearsay as the twenty-seven spheres were to Eudoxus. True, we can invent new spheres to explain retrograde or eccentric motions of the law of hearsay as the need arises, but some day this kind of creation must reach its limit, and the whole structure will simply collapse from its sheer weight. I think that that day is about upon us.

Any rule, I submit, requiring thirty-two exceptions to explain its operation is not a rule at all but a nonexistent Eudoxian universe. The idea behind the hearsay rule is valid enough, and we shall reach it in due course, but the idea is not best expressed or applied as a rule or as a series of rules, each with its exceptions, and exceptions to the exceptions. What actually are we doing?

Here we need some perspective. Let us look at the problem as it is presented in the trial court. We have before us at trial an entire complex, a congeries of facts and circumstances arising in the local climate in which we live. Against this background we see witness after witness taking the stand, some bold and aggressive, some shy and subdued, some brassy with fraud, some sick with remorse.

Into this vast panorama of mixed motives and emotions comes an allegation involving hearsay. Shall we admit it? We ponder. In all but the simplest situations we look (at least I do) at why it is offered, by whom, to what point and from what source. We feel, sometimes with doubt, sometimes with a certainty that defies verbal expression, that it should (or should not) be heard by this jury (farm jury? city jury?) under these circumstances, and thus we rule. It is only later, in the quiet of the library, that the young lawyer writing the brief on appeal (or the justice's clerk) states that what the court really did was to follow (or reject) exception (h), subsection (2)(ii), of the rule against hearsay, and in such terms the appeal is argued, or so the appellate court's opinion is phrased. But my thinking at the trial was not so oriented. The last thing on my mind was exception (h), subsection (2)(ii). I was weighing, in a complex aggregation of facts and circumstances, the offer made in the light of its origin.

Upon closer analysis what actually happened, at the trial level, was this: The judge appraised the situation, the testimony presented and the circumstances under which it was presented. In his own mind, he actually weighed the probability of truth against the probability of deception. In short, he assessed the relative reliability of what was offered, and ascertained whether or not it was testimony reaching a standard of reasonable reliability. In truth, he has employed a standard, not applied a rule. There is a vast difference between the two in actual practice and upon review. (It is interesting to speculate, in passing, what the situation in the law of negligence would be today if it had developed as a multitude of rules of conduct, rather than as involving a standard of care.)

Approached from this point of view, some of our knottiest cases fall in line. Let us review for a moment what the Supreme Court did in the much discussed[36] case of *Palmer* v. *Hoffman*, 318 U.S. 109 (1943). In that case, the Court rejected a railroad's use of its deceased engineer's report of a crossing accident in the teeth of the provisions of the Federal Business Records Act.[37] The reasoning of the Court was that an accident report is not a "record made for the systematic conduct of the business as a business".[38] To many students of the law of evidence and to many trial judges this just doesn't make sense.[39] We at the trial level handle too many such cases to say that accident reports are not a regular part of the railroad's business. Unfortunately, possibly inevitably, they are, and they are necessary

---

[28] *Baker* v. *Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1961); *Townsend* v. *Sain*, 372 U.S. 293 (1963); *Escobedo* v. *Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478 (1964), and *Miranda* v. *Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), come immediately to mind, though the reader's own field of speciality may supply others.

[29] See McCORMICK, EVIDENCE § 43 (1954), and cases there cited.

[30] See, *e.g.*, Judge Irving Kaufman's opinion in *United States* v. *Freeman*, 357 F. 2d 606 (2d Cir. 1966).

[31] Morgan & Maguire, *Looking Backward and Forward at Evidence*, 50 HARV. L. REV. 909, 921 (1937).

[32] The symposium in 46 IOWA L. REV. 207 (1961) is excellent and will lead into the most significant discussions.

[33] Nokes, *The English Jury and the Law of Evidence*, 31 TUL. L. REV. 153, 167 (1956), quoted in Orfield's *The Hearsay Rule in Federal Cases*, 32 FORDHAM L. REV. 499 (1964).

[34] *Dall Company* v. *Commercial Assurance Co., Ltd.*, 286 F. 2d 388 (5th Cir. 1961), wherein the court held, as to a certain newspaper excerpt, "We do not characterize this newspaper as a 'business record', nor as 'an ancient document', nor as any other readily identifiable and happily tagged species of hearsay exception. It is admitted because it is necessary and trustworthy, relevant and material, and its admission is within the trial judge's exercise of discretion in holding hearsay within reasonable bounds.

[35] *Iowa* v. *Wagner*, 207 Ia. 224, 222 N.W. 407 (1928).

[36] 43 COLUM. L. REV. 392; 31 GEO. L. J. 338; 41 MICH. L. REV. 996; 17 SO. CAL. L. REV. 165, among others.

[37] 28 U.S.C. 1732: "(a) In any court of the United States and in any court established by Act of Congress, any writing or record, whether in the form of an entry in a book or otherwise, made as a memorandum or record of any act, transaction, occurrence, or event, shall be admissible as evidence of such act, transaction, occurrence, or event, if made in regular course of any business, and if it was the regular course of such business to make such memorandum or record at the time of such act, transaction, occurrence, or event within a reasonable time thereafter.

"All other circumstances of the making of such writing or record including lack of personal knowledge by the entrant or maker, may be shown to affect its weight, but such circumstances shall not affect its admissibility.

"The term 'business' as used in this section, includes business, profession, occupation, and calling of every kind."

[38] *Id.* at 113.

[39] Morgan, *Evidence 1941–1945*, 59 HARV. L. REV. 481 at 506 (1946); MAGUIRE, EVIDENCE: COMMON SENSE AND COMMON LAW 156 *et seq.* (1947). See McCormick's discussion also in § 287 of his text, EVIDENCE (1954).

as well. So much for the railroad's "business". But if the problem is approached as one of conformity to a standard of reasonable reliability, such a document offered to support the railroad's position might well be rejected out of hand. The report of an accused engineer to his boss may be no more than a monumental whitewash. In the words of Judge Frank, in ruling upon the same case at the circuit level,[40] "the report was dripping with motivations to misrepresent". An explanation along these lines would have saved lawyers and judges countless hours of research, reams of written work, much of it at sixes and sevens, and numerous appeals,[41] for the simple reason, I submit, that it would have explained what was actually done, and in terms that do not affront the senses because it is the kind of evaluation that we at the trial level must make every day.

WHY A STANDARD INSTEAD OF A RULE?

But it may well be asked, what practical difference would it make in the trial of cases whether, when confronted with a hearsay problem, we employed a standard of reasonable reliance rather than a series of specific rules of admissibility in varying fact situations?

The differences are many. Most important, we move from fiction to fact. We describe our process in terms of what we actually do, rather than in terms of what we do not do. We dispel a fog of words and thus see in clearer outline the nature of the problems we confront. The confrontation brings life in the courts into correlation with life in the streets. For we act daily, in the most important of our own affairs, upon hearsay. What we really determine in our everyday lives is not whether a report is hearsay, but whether it is reliable.

The use of a standard of reasonable reliability, so phrased, rather than a series of rules with exceptions has as well a bearing upon that bleeding ulcer of the judicial system, "reversed and remanded for new trial". One of the most difficult lessons for an appellate judge to learn is that it is not enough for reversal merely that he disagree with the trial judge.[42] If a personal reference may be forgiven, I can speak with some authority to the point that arguments over rules of evidence in appellate court conferences tend to become both prolonged and heated in direct ratio to the degree to which the court seeks to apply specific rules rather than to examine a standard of reasonable testimonial reliability. The application of a rule is apt to turn upon a much narrower fact situation than the application of a standard to the various facts comprising the total situation. Discussion of the latter may well comprehend significant policy considerations, for the very reason that it is a standard, not a rule, that is under consideration. Moreover, to reverse for violation of some "rule" is a fairly simple expedient. But to reverse for failure to meet a standard is a far more demanding problem, particularly if the trial judge is given the discretion in evidentiary matters that it is sometimes said he has,[43] although I find very few rulings in which an appellate court has affirmed a trial court's evidentiary rulings on discretionary grounds, particularly in the area here under examination—hearsay.

The problems of the law of evidence go far beyond the segment principally discussed here. Human beings crave certainty, the certainty of the fixed rule, whether it be Wigmore's or those of the Restatements. We are uneasy unless we can reduce concepts, ideas and abstractions to rule and then, to meet difficult situations, create exceptions to the rules. But I question with profound misgivings that the ascertainment of the truth in a myriad of fact situations is capable of precise, formulistic difinition. The best we can do is to enunciate certain standards, of necessity approximations, loaded with ambiguities and then trust our trial judges to apply them with reasonable skill, subject always to some kind of review. When we resort to rules, the refuge is illusory.

In common with all the judges and lawyers I know, I long for the paradise of the measurable and the certain. But we are in the wrong profession for it. The unalterable matter, that platinum rod in the vault in Paris, is not for us. The goal of truth in trial just cannot be reached by following evidentiary rules in the same way that the wayfarer's destination can be reached by following numbered routes.

Let us abandon the primitive attempt and seek to frame standards, not rules. The real question is whether we are up to it, whether it is possible for us to change from within. For we are priests, not prophets. Our whole training makes us turn our faces always to the past. Our impulse is to equate the law of *stare decisis* with the law of gravity. Yet the physicists did it. They moved from a mechanistic ball-bearing atom to a boiling nucleus of energy. And we no less than they are dedicated to the search for truth. But are we, unlike the physicists, prisoners of precedent?

Is there among us another Mansfield? If so, let him come forth. The night is darkening, and we are beset on every side. We are in dire need of a new approach.

[40] 129 F. 2d 976, 991 (2d Cir. 1942).

[41] *England* v. *United States*, 174 F. 2d 466, 468 (5th Cir. 1949); *Gilbert* v. *Gulf Oil Corporation*, 175 F. 2d 705 (4th Cir. 1949); *Clainos* v. *United States*, 163 F. 2d 593 (D.C. Cir. 1947).

[42] The problem of reversal at one of the appellate levels of a trial court's factual findings is enormously complicated and, in my judgment, not fully thought through. On the one hand we should not reduce the trial court to little more than "a whistling post on the highway to an ultimate destination" (Merrill Otis in *Sonken-Galamba* v. *A.T. & S.F. Ry. Co.*, 34 F. Supp. 15, 16 (1940)), thus debasing the currency both of the trial court and the appellate court. On the other hand, a result in the trial court may be so unjust in the opinion of the appellate court that it cannot be allowed to stand, although the record may not contain "prejudicial" error if judged by ordinary standards. In this situation a reversal is in accord with our theories of ultimate justice, and reversal on an evidentiary point is often the least abrasive solution. See MORGAN, SOME PROBLEMS OF PROOF UNDER THE ANGLO-AMERICAN SYSTEM OF LITIGATION 193 (1956). Possibly a ground for reversal that "the result is not just" should be frankly stated, thus preserving some consistency in the law of evidence.

[43] "But somehow it [the law of evidence] has proved a workable even if clumsy system when moderated by discretionary controls in the hands of a wise and strong trial court." *Michelson* v. *United States*, 335 U.S. 469, 486 (1948).

RURAL DEVELOPMENT: THE CONSERVATION OF MAN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Nation long ago recognized the vital necessity of conserving our natural resources, and over the years we have developed particularly effective programs of agricultural conservation. But, ironically, we seem to have done a better job of conserving agriculture's natural resources than we have its human resources.

As an uncontrolled stream erodes the soil, a stream of economic deprivation opportunity has eroded our rural population. The migration of people from rural areas to the cities is in large part of the result of a technological revolution which has made the United States a rich and powerful industrial nation. Thus there have been great benefits. But we have now come to see that trend has gotten out of hand. The rural-urban distribution of people and economic resources has become unbalanced. Each year 600,000 to 800,000 rural Americans migrate to our already overcrowded, overburdened, and troubled cities. This continuing erosion of rural America must be stopped.

This necessity of action to conserve the human resources of rural America is the theme of a significant speech by Mr. John R. Fernstrom, of the Department of Agriculture's Jobs and Industrialization Division. Mr. Fernstrom points out that the erosion of our rural communities will surely continue unless we act to create new jobs and equal opportunities for a decent life in the countryside. The problem is imposing but certainly not insoluble. For as Mr. Fernstrom points out, the potential for rural development is considerable. On the one hand, because of high economic and social costs congested metropolitan areas are not desirable location sites for many types of production facilities. On the other hand, locations in the smaller cities and towns can be particularly desirable because of the availability of a productive and conscientious labor force. Rural labor is easily and quickly trained and the increase in vocational schools throughout much of rural America has significantly expanded the skills available to industry.

But it is clear that the economic revitalization of rural America will occur only if we take a number of steps to better control the forces which have eroded the economic base of our rural communities. Incentives must be provided to restore the economic base and to repopulate rural America. I believe the tax incentives offered in the Rural Job Development Act of 1967—S. 2134—introduced by Senator HARRIS and myself, would provide a powerful inducement to the creation of new jobs and industry in rural areas and that the enactment of this bill would be a major step forward to the economic development of rural America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this most worthwhile speech by Mr. John R. Fernstrom, entitled "The Conservation of Man," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CONSERVATION OF MAN

(By John R. Fernstrom)

I have been asked to talk about the need to create more and new job opportunities in non-metropolitan America—this part of America includes our cities and towns with populations less than 50,000, as well as the countryside. I have chosen to call these remarks the *Conservation of Man*.

The meaning of "conservation" is not unknown to you who are here tonight. You know that "conservation" means all those things which help to maintain the quantity and quality of natural resources at their best long-term productivity. The focus for you is on the natural resources you work with—

mainly, the soil, the water, the plants—and your immediate aim is to keep them in the most useful condition.

The narrow objective of conservation is to maintain the supply and quality—the usefulness—of natural resources at levels which most fully meet your needs and in turn the needs of other people. In this narrow view is implied the larger objective—that of human welfare. The narrow end is sought, not for the sake of the soil, or the forests, or waters, but for man's sake, for the individual, the community, the region, the state, the nation, and all the peoples of our world.

Our total environment includes not only the natural, but the human resources. The greatest of America's resources—the human resources—are in many ways the most neglected and most poorly utilized. As an example, it's estimated that a third of our total income is spent raising children. Much of this human material is produced in rural America and exported to the cities. It follows—I think—that rural America should make a concerted effort to conserve this resource just as it conserves its soil, its water, and its trees.

The direct road to conservation of rural America's human resources is the creation of economic opportunity at home for the nearly million who now must leave rural America each year.

A pretty basic question is, why should your children run off the land like the soil when it is not properly cared for? To find the solution to this question is the problem of all of rural America—it is not just the problem of the businessman of the small town with his concern as to whether his town can survive—it goes deeper than that into every home in rural America. It will take all of rural America working together to answer this question. I truly believe that the lesson of conservation which has been learned by the farmer will help us to a solution, if we approach the problem in the same way.

For nearly two years, Secretary Freeman has been speaking to the entire Nation about the need for a national policy on rural/urban balance. The problem that arises from the lack of economic opportunity in relation to the human resources of rural America has arisen from lack of a policy.

The Nation has allowed itself to be gobbled up by a little stream that got started in a back corner somewhere and now has eroded rural America into social and economic imbalance.

This stream of misfortune—grown into an overwhelming river—first eroded opportunity out of the countryside—and no one thought to replace it—and many more erosion cycles, swept up millions of rural Americans and carried them off into the city sea.

At first this was a healthy trend. The technological revolution changed our society from pastoral to industrial, and as fewer and fewer people were needed on farms, in the forests, and in the mines, people were freed to go to the cities to help build the commercial and industrial complexes that were a key factor in the development of our powerful national economy.

But the river has eroded rural America too long—today 70 percent of our people are jammed onto 1 percent of our land, while only 3 out of 10 people live on the remaining 99 percent.

And the outmigration from the countryside continues.

Each year another 600,000 to 800,000 Americans shoulder their way into our already overcrowded cities. It is estimated, if current trends continue—by the year 2000, no less than 174 million will live in super cities concentrated in five small areas of the country.

And without an alternative, this trend *will* continue. This force which has produced the centralization of economic activity and the technological revolution is such that fewer and fewer farmers will be needed to feed more of us in the future. Without jobs and equal opportunities for a decent life in the countryside, where else can those who are displaced go?

Recognizing all of these problems, the President, by Executive order, has made this problem the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture.

But let me make clear from the beginning that the problem is not the exclusive property of the Department of Agriculture.

It is really your problem—the problem of all non-urban America.

Through the recognition and under the direction of Secretary Freeman, we have assumed a leadership role to help revitalize rural America—we are gaining recognition and making progress toward solutions for rural poblems. But there is much to be done.

We find too many places that can no longer support a vital rural America solely on agriculture, or lumbering, or mining, or the services they generate. Nor can America's small towns expect to survive forever on the economics of a county seat.

Our basic problem and our goal is to strengthen in many places, and restore in some, the economic base of rural America. One way to do this is to create new job opportunities by bringing industry to the countryside.

Economic growth in the United States is achieved mainly as a result of countless private decisions to buy or sell, to invest or save, to go into or out of business. There has been a growing realization that the future economic growth of communities, States and regions depends in part on local efforts to bring about expansion. With this realization has come the organization of many groups to stimulate the rate of economic growth.

Industrial development programs have evolved in both rural and urban America to meet this objective. A point which is evident is that the decision as to where, when, and what investment will be made remains in the control of private business. Industrial development programs are designed to influence the location, timing, or growth rate of private business. They are not intended to replace the power of private business to make its own decisions on where, when, and on what scale it will operate. Nor can we forget that such decisions are profit-motivated whether made in rural or urban America.

What this really means is that a local development group must persuade an industry to locate in a specific place. In the businessman's parlance, it is a selling job. To do it, an industrial development group must know what it has to sell and how to sell it. Equally important is where to sell their product. All this is based on the assumption that they want to sell a product—their community.

Too many communities still do not have the leadership and motivation to seek industry. Too many people in rural America still do not want industry. Many are still crying "Industry brings higher school taxes," or they don't want to share a labor force they use only seasonally. Equally as uninformed are those who think of industry as just a means to "improve" the tax base.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has produced a chart depicting what 100 new factoryworkers bring to a town. This chart says 100 new factory workers bring 359 more people, 91 more school children, 100 more households, $710,000 more personal income per year, 97 more cars, $331,000 more retail sales, 3 more retail establishments, 65 more non-manufacturing jobs, $229,000 more bank deposits.

This chart is both a help and a hindrance—a hindrance especially in the implication that 359 more people including 91 school children will arrive. This statement alone is enough to make the weary taxpayer lose interest. But it is a rare case where industry brings a labor force to a new plant. What industry seeks in a new location is a new source of labor and it brings only a few key people from outside. New industry really means—359 more people can remain in their home town—the economic base has received a shot in the arm and all will share in the prosperity, whether in town or on nearby farms.

Lack of interest and support, and understanding, by the general public is an important drawback to the success of local development efforts. Participation in development programs by local businessmen and the general public has been strongest and most effective where they have realized that their own interests are involved. It follows that a successful industrial development effort is 50 percent internal public relations, and 50 percent external public relations.

Knowing what rural America has to sell, community by community, is a continuing need. When an industry finally locates, it locates at a specific place. All the fine statements that the efforts of the department, your own Nebraska Department of Economic development, or those anyone else can produce to lure industry to rural America can only bring results when a community clinches the deal. Providing industry with reliable and detailed economic data about the area is the most effective development technique. If an industrial development group knows what it has to sell, then it can know better where to sell it. The drawback to success in rural areas is most often inadequate information or personnel—a sales pitch and a good salesman is what is needed.

This produces another concern, what is the "new plant market?" Estimates say there are 3 to 4,000 new plants established each year, and this includes those employing one or more persons. Included are branch plants, relocations and new or "home grown" industries. Of these, perhaps 700 to 900 are "million dollar" plants. That may not appear to be much of a market for the thousands of industrial development groups across the country. As far as I know, the only thing you can do about this is work hard, have patience, and perseverance—none of which is easy to live with.

There are other gaps, not the least of which is the one we have come to call the "financing gap." There are Federal programs to help but it is still a major problem for many areas—but before I'm accused of casting the "pall of doom" over the rural industrialization effort, we need to say, and with emphasis, that there are many advantages for industry in non-metropolitan areas.

In a recent issue of U.S. News and World Report, the editors raised the question, "Can Today's Big Cities Survive?" This is getting to be an annual title with U.S. News and World Report—and if the problems of the cities continue unabated, I expect it will soon become the title of a monthly exposé.

In another article in the same issue, U.S. News reported "Now 200 Million Americans." The report said population growth in the practical terms means 4 Americans today are demanding space, goods and services, offered to 3 persons, 20 years ago. This is great news for the market analyst, and it means industrial expansion somewhere, but it also means that 5 cars instead of 2 jam downtown streets so that transportation in N.Y. City is now traveling at an average of 6 miles an hour compared to 11 miles an hour by horse-drawn carts a century ago. It may be pointless to develop an electric car—perhaps all we need, in order to transport goods in the city, is a bigger turtle.

The political and commercial leadership of the cities has long tended to equate and measure economic growth in terms of population growth. Get more people—get more people—has been their repeated cry. Economic growth is *not* synonymous with population increase and in the city today a

change in income distribution would be more significant for economic growth than population increase because of the staggering unfilled economic wants and needs among the lower income groups. Economic growth in the city is possible with a stable population, as well as with an increasing population. Today the magnitude of the population of the cities with unfilled needs actually hampers growth, while at the same time it is accepted by many that the greater increases in population and more concentration are inevitable. But I do not believe that we have to passively accept greater centralization of economic activity. We can develop ways to stem that portion of the growth of the cities that takes place at the expense of the rest of America.

U.S. News and World Report commented on something else we all know about the city—it takes an hour or more every morning to get to work, and the drivers get more vicious every morning—it also takes an hour to get to a golf course and you have to get in line before dawn in order to tee off and finish the course before dark.

You have to plan way ahead to get into a hit show, and the future is even bleaker. Joseph Timan, an Arizona developer, has forecast for the cities—"not only business and industry, but schools, even in the primary grades, may have to operate around the clock, including a midnight to 8:00 a.m. shift. Trips into town will require advance reservations for parking space, department stores will allocate shoppers a limited period in which to do their errands—attendance at swimming pools and theaters will be rationed."

Now the most serious thing in that forecast is to consider what our life will be like if our wives are only allowed limited access to department stores. It is no wonder that Dr. Stanley Yolles of the National Mental Health Institute says that the current situation results in tension and anxieties and the consumption of tranquilizers, sleeping pills, and drugs. The doctor didn't mention riots. It is apparent that the need for conservation of man in the cities may, in final analysis, be the greatest problem of mankind.

So the cities have problems, and in the same sense so do businessmen. They must ask the question, "Where is the best place for business to survive?" Offices can exist in the cities, but cities are no longer the place for production facilities.

The best place for industry to locate is outside the metropolitan areas. We suggest a big jump—not just into the suburbs, but into the open country beyond and into the smaller cities and towns of America.

In rural America labor is abundant, is productive and is loyal, and is therefore profitable in our smaller cities and in the countryside. The size of the labor force continues to increase, students are getting out of school and are available for the labor market—all of which produces a labor force that is intelligent, conscientious, and proud of the job it is doing. Sometimes, for the moment, skills are lacking, but we find time after time that people who have been forced to migrate to the cities want to come home and will come home when there is an appropriate job for the skills they have developed.

Rural America's existing work force—continually increasing—is highly susceptible to training—you all know the "science" of baling wire mechanics—and vocational schools are springing up all over the rural countryside to provide the training and skills that industry demands and schools are ready to take special orders.

The message emphasizing the many advantages of nonurban location is reaching businessmen. There is a healthy trend toward location in rural areas. Almost half of the "million dollar" plants last year were outside the metropolitan areas.

The Department of Agriculture position is clearly set forth in the "Communities of Tomorrow" policy statement. In support of economic development it is U.S. Department of Agriculture policy:

"To inform businessmen of the economic and personal benefits of locating new plants outside areas of congested traffic, impacted population, and high-cost commuting.

"To encourage the development—including financial support where needed—of training programs and electric, telephone, transportation, housing, water, waste disposal, recreation, and cultural facilities. Facilities will encourage industries, businesses, services, and other job-creating enterprises to locate where there is space and need for them.

"To develop public and private financial support for enterprises that will create jobs in communities of tomorrow.

"To encourage incentive plans that will induce new business and industry to locate in communities of tomorrow.

"To encourage and facilitate growth of new and existing rural cooperatives to provide jobs and increased economic opportunity.

"To encourage Federal agencies to locate new installations in communities of tomorrow where feasible and, when awarding contracts, to give special consideration to developing rural areas.

"To work with rural leaders to help develop in rural communities and understanding of the importance of developing industrial financing, zoning regulations, essential community facilities, and other resources needed to attract industry.

"To help other Federal agencies extend their community facility development services into rural areas."

We have taken many concrete steps, especially in the areas of communication with businesmen, technical assistance to local development groups, and help to communities and non-profit groups to provide community facilities to support local development efforts—but what is still needed is a profit-oriented incentive for business to locate in rural areas—one that requires a businessman to stop and evaluate rural America before making a location decision.

An impressive number of members of the Congress have introduced bills, either called the "Rural Job Development Act of 1967" or the "Jobs Development Incentives Act of 1967." In my opinion, this is legislation in the right direction.

We are at the crossroads. We have been there for some time and it gets more congested all the time. Much of the population of rural America is now too small and too scattered to enable these areas to attract and absorb new industry on the speed and scale necessary to stem depopulation. If the attack on migration from rural America is based solely on the retention of the remaining population and its natural growth, the growth of rural America in such areas is unlikely to be fast enough or strong enough to reduce the outflow of population.

The lack of economic opportunity forces migration of the youth at the end of the local educational processes. If jobs are not available, almost precisely at that moment, there is no alternative but migration. On the other hand, industry considering locating in such areas is not likely to make a decision based upon expectations, and that is the nature of the labor force offered in many of these areas. If rural America is to be developed and its migration stemmed, positive action must be taken to attract people as well as industry to rural areas. Basically, the solution to the problems of rural areas which stem from depopulation lies in the restoration of an economic base and in the repopulation of rural America. We will need a strong incentive for this.

The gist of the whole thing, then, is this—the human resource of America is overwhelmingly the greatest of its assets. This resource, we all fondly believe, is fundamentally good. It is produced in excessive and uneven amounts in different regions, and also under different economic and social conditions. Almost invariably the tendency is for the largest supply to be produced where the economic and social conditions are least favorable. The contrast between this and our procedure in respect to farming is extraordinary. We recognize that corn should be produced where the soil and climate is well adapted to its cultivation and where grain of high quality can be raised. We also appreciate that it is essential that the best seed and methods of production should be employed. In respect to human resources, we follow the opposite course, for we have not yet learned the most elementary lesson of human conservation. The regions which produce the largest crop of children are the very ones where the economic conditions and opportunity are least favorable. The result—from these less-favorable regions—young people pour into the cities each year in the quest for a blue ribbon.

I said earlier—creation of economic opportunity and the conservation of the human resource in rural America is not the sole province of any one person or group.

The opportunities inherent in achieving these goals can be exploited by working together. Together, we must motivate, plan and promote industrial growth in our towns and in the countryside, if we are to accomplish the conservation of man in rural America. All of us have a role and all must do our part.

THE HIGHER COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Myron Brenton, a regular contributor to our leading magazines, is now at work on a book about education. Many of his conclusions are found in "The Higher Cost of Higher Education," which was published in the New York Times magazine on April 21, 1968. To those of us who have followed closely the problems of higher education, his analysis comes as no surprise:

Each school year heralds an inexorable rise of 3 to 5 percent . . .

All indications are . . . that things will get a lot worse before they get better. In fact, it is difficult to find any knowledgeable person who will speak hopefully about the finances of the college student's parents, and figures from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provide no basis for optimism . . .

Even a student who lives at home and commutes to a tuition-free college can expect to pay about $1,000 a year for books, supplies, fees, transportation and living expenses . . .

Mr. President, there is no one answer to the myriad problems caused by the rising cost of higher education. However, tax relief in the form of tax credit is certainly a necessary part of the solution. I hope the Congress may soon see fit to enact such relief for our Nation's working students, and the wives, parents, and others, who are shouldering the burden of providing the education on which the future of this country rests.

The charge has often been made by those opposed to my bill, S. 835, that enactment of the tax credit would cause colleges to raise their tuitions. Mr. Brenton's excellent analysis makes it perfectly clear that our Nation's institutions of higher learning are raising their tuitions whether our citizens get tax re-

lief or not—and will continue to do so. The colleges and universities must raise their tuitions, because the money must come from somewhere. We in Congress must do our part to keep the educating of our children from being a financial disaster.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brenton's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE HIGHER COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Myron Brenton)

Recently Julius Margulis, the owner of a thriving furniture and appliance store in Columbus, Ohio, conducted an exercise in masochism. At a visitor's request, he calculated roughly how much he would end up paying to give his five children the benefits of higher education. Since one daughter was already a Northwestern University graduate, a second had received her degree from Ohio State University and a son was midway through Wisconsin State University, Margulis had plenty of experience to draw on. Despite the fact that he is, as he put it, "comfortably upper middle class," the figures he so casually jotted down shocked him. He had already spent $18,500, and before the last of his brood proudly departs with his sheepskin, Margulis will have put out a total of $40,000. "More," he added in awed tones, "if any of them go on to graduate school."

Margulis is perhaps atypical in that he plans to give five children college educations and is single-handedly picking up the king-sized tab. As a man stunned to discover how really high the cost of education can be, however, he is quite representative. Not only successful appliance dealers from Ohio but parents by the hundreds of thousands, from all parts of the country and in all income brackets, are discovering each year the awesome facts of educational life.

They find themselves caught in what, over the past six years or so, has settled into a classic squeeze: (1) they have failed to prepare adequately for the financial demands of higher education or have been unable to do so; (2) they underestimate the costs or, more likely, overestimate their children's chances of obtaining hefty scholarships, and (3) their incomes—at least the portions available for discretionary purposes—fail to keep pace with college cost increases or have already been allocated for other purposes.

All indications from governmental educational and foundation sources are that things will get a lot worse before they get better. In fact, it is difficult to find any knowledgeable person who will speak hopefully about the finances of the college student's parents, and figures from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provide no basis for glowing optimism. They show that the average annual all-inclusive costs to a resident student at a private institution of learning was $1,850 in 1957 and $2,570 in 1967, and will be an estimated $3,280 in 1977. They indicate that the average anual cost to a resident student at a public college or university was $1,260 in 1957 and $1,640 in 1967, and will be $2,160 in 1977.

In other words, each school year heralds an inexorable rise of roughly 3 to 5 per cent. According to a study by the College Entrance Examination Board, to which over 850 colleges and universities belong, even a student who lives at home and commutes to a tuition-free college can expect to pay approximately $1,000 a year for books, supplies, fees, transportation and general living expenses.

Statistics such as these cause millions of parents whose incomes are adequate for most ordinary purposes to ask searching questions. One distraught mother wrote her Congressman, Rep. Charles S. Joelson of New Jersey: "My husband and I pay tax on about $9,000 income. Average middle-class American family. We have two children, a boy and a girl—again, average American family. Now both these children have reached their college years. Both children have above-average ability and potential and will, more than likely, go on to receive their doctorates. Lovely! Something, as parents, we are proud of. But, as parents, how do we pay for it?"

How do we pay for it? A plaintive cry heard not only from distraught parents and students but from the educational institutions themselves. They, too, are very much in a financial bind. The crucial matters for both are the population explosion and the changing socio-economic pattern of American society—as well as the rising expectations it reflects.

Forty years ago, only 8 percent of all American families earned more than $8,000; today their number has quadrupled. Forty years ago, college was a way station for the well-to-do, with a sprinkling of lower-income students (many from immigrant families) whose parents scrimped and saved to put them through. Today the broad middle class clamors at the university's gates, demanding to be let in, demanding quality education. Result: a bachelor's degree is very nearly an indispensable requirement for even moderate success in job or career, and the pressures of our technological age (as well as the quest for status) are making graduate work increasingly popular.

Though higher education is becoming less a privilege for the wealthy and more a right for everyone, it should be noted that the disadvantaged—despite scholarship and community-action programs designed to help them—are not in college in significant numbers. U.S. Office of Education statistics show that only 4.6 per cent of the campus population is Negro. At the moment, for groups with very low incomes, failure to be academically prepared and motivated for college is more of a problem than finding the money to pay for it.

Thus, its clientele drawn primarily from the middle classes, higher education is undergoing its own population explosion. Enrollment swells unchecked, with a 3-million increase in the past decade and a similar one expected in the next. This means more construction, more services, more instructors and spiraling costs all down the line. Paradoxically, as high as they are, tuition and fees pay a surprisingly low percentage of the total costs. Joseph Froomkin, Assistant Commissioner for Program Planning and Evaluation at the U.S. Office of Education, estimates that, on the average, the student pays only about 20 cents of ever dollar it costs to educate him, even if he pays full tuition. This figure may be low, especially for the more expensive private institutions, but Froomkin insists that "college is still a bargain in that only a small percentage is being paid for by the student." It is a point worth making.

In another sense, though, a bargain is a bargain only if one is able to pay for it. To the family making, say, $10,000 a year before taxes, with two or more children away at college, even a low-cost state university proves exorbitant.

Shouldn't parents have been saving over the years for this contingency? Ideally, yes, But a survey commissioned by the College Entrance Examination Board shows that the majority of families whose sons and daughters will go on to college fail to, or aren't able to, plan adequately ahead. And even if money has been systematically put away for college, the sum frequently turns out to be painfully short of the mark because of unexpected tuition boosts. The same holds true for many insurance plans begun a couple of decades back.

Commonplace among parents who saved for their children's education is the New Jersey couple who years ago put aside $1,500 for each of their two children, thinking that this would cover most or all expenses. They now maintain both youngsters at private universities at a combined annual cost of $7,000; family earnings are $9,500 a year. The schools are prestigious, the children were readily accepted, the parents wanted their youngsters to take advantage of the opportunity; the family is now saddled with heavy long-term debt.

"We didn't really pay much attention to college costs, to the way they were taking big jumps," explained the mother in this unremarkable case history. "Not till Alan was in his senior year in high school and we had to come face to face with the thing. There had been other things to worry about—the house, the cars, vacations that cost us dearly. . . ."

House, cars, costly vacations. Add on, for some parents, payments on expensive furniture, stereo sets, country club fees and all the other appurtenances of the good middle-class life. Here is another aspect of the problem, one having to do with the philosophy of sacrifice. With even relative affluence, increasingly higher levels of comfort and aspiration become the norm. Almost subtly, as is so often said, former luxuries become necessities.

Given such circumstances, the quality and nature of sacrifice change. To be sure, some families still work day and night to send their kids to college, but for most it is no longer a question of giving up everything to accomplish this. The family struggling to pay off the mortgage and make car payments will hardly dispose of house and automobile and move into a two-room flat to pay college bills—and no sane person would expect them to. Other adjustments are made, other compromises sought. Cheaper vacations, for instance, or maybe just a few summertime weekend trips. One lets several extra years go by before trading in the car. Some husbands take second jobs, wives go to work or stay on the job longer than anticipated. Other expedients are also found: Julius Margulis, the Columbus furniture-store owner, recalls when money had to be withdrawn from the firm to meet college bills, "causing harm to the business."

In sum, one scrambles to maintain as nearly as possible one's accustomed way of life and to meet the extra expenses. For many parents, planned economies help only so much. A survey made for the New York State Board of Regents, startling in its implications, shows that, on the basis of 1963 income figures, little more than one-fourth of America's families can meet all college expenses, even when tuition is as low as $200. Only 4 per cent of American families can meet the entire cost of high-tuition institutions, the ones in the $3,000 range for resident students.

"Soon I will be spending—if I have to rob a bank!—some $10,000 a year with three children in costly schools," complained an angry Fort Lauderdale man who is clearly not in that 4 per cent. Addressing himself to Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, who has been responsive to the plight of the student's family, he added, "I have bright kids. I only make a little over $15,000. Literally, I will have to sell the roof over our heads to do it!"

He will not rob a bank or get rid of his home, not really. If he follows the typical pattern, the first thing he will do is have his sons apply for scholarships. But according to financial aid officers, the scholarship realities offer a real shock to many parents. "Because their children are scholarship material," explains Sanford Jamison of the College Entrance Examination Board, "parents take it for granted substantial scholarships are going to be won. But need plays a very important part. Of course, the better potential student he is, the more chance he has of getting money."

It may be a measure of how expensive schools have become or how behind-the-times some families are that not even relatively substantial incomes deter them from seeking scholarships. "Even $30,000 parents are asking for financial aid," says Virginia Shaw, who is in charge of the aid office at Barnard College.

Of course, whatever the family's earnings, the chance for scholarships is much better for straight-A students and, in some schools, for applicants who are excellent basketball or football material. But the reactions of a very generous number of middle-income families are accurately mirrored in that of Milt Miller, a suburban New York newspaperman. Recalling that both his sons were in out-of-state institutions at the same time, Miller concluded: "The middle-income family is really in a bind. Not poor enough to qualify for a scholarship, not rich enough to pay for the tuition costs—especially if there's an overlap of children going to school."

Actually, things aren't that rosy for low-income families, either. On the one hand, there has been a moderate but steady increase in available scholarship dollars over the past several years (though it is not necessarily a higher percentage of school budgets). For instance, in 1961 institutional funds available for scholarships, grants and work-loan programs totaled $275-million, and by 1967 the amount had grown to $513-million. On the other hand, the demand for funds grows at a far more rapid rate and scholarship funds are very limited, even for the sons and daughters of poor families. Many of these, too, find themselves unable to win grants. Applicants for Columbia University's Class of 1970, for example, included 84 needy students placed in the "Admit-Deny" category—admitted to the school, but denied financial aid. Only by raising the amount students were expected to supply themselves through jobs and loans could this category be eliminated in the following year's class. The money problem is becoming worse at many schools because of a cutback in Federal funds for a number of aid programs. Students with C-averages, those who are near the end of the scholarship line, tend to be hardest hit.

To bring order into what would otherwise be a chaotic and perhaps capricious situation, the College Entrance Examination Board's College Scholarship Service has set up guidelines widely used by school financial aid officers. The rules are based on a variety of factors, including family assets and liabilities, but fundamental to them are U.S. Department of Agriculture cost-of-living-studies. The guidelines suggest the amounts parents can expect to contribute under varying circumstances. Though the tables recently were revised downward, they nevertheless reflect the basic assumption that higher education is a privilege calling for a significant measure of parental sacrifice. A two-child family (with only one in college) earning $10,000 a year before taxes is expected to contribute $1,350 toward annual college expenses. If this family earned $15,000, it would be expected to contribute $2,300. These expectations are for "uncomplicated" cases; high medical bills, the necessity to support aged parents or other extenuating circumstances lower the amount parents are expected to contribute.

To stretch their limited scholarship funds, most schools supply "package aid," combining a grant, a loan and a job. Columbia's Director of Financial Aid, Harland W. Hoisington, cites the example of an A-minus student. The family earned $7,000 a year and was expected to contribute $900, while the student was given a $2,150 scholarship, a $200 loan and a $500 job.

Generally, needy students are expected to work during the summer and possibly also during the school year. The high percentage of undergraduates who hold jobs during the school term—whether under institutional plans, the Federal Work-Study Program or on their own—is another significant indication of the high cost of higher education. A survey by Northwestern Life Insurance Company's Family Economics Bureau shows that at many of the nation's most prominent schools, better than three-fourths of the male undergraduates earn at least part of their expenses by working. And while work may be a virtue, it is not too much of one given the extreme academic pressures in most colleges. In the official view, no full-time student should work more than 10 or 15 hours a week. But if the need is there, students will work many more hours than that. Describing two of her classmates who, despite scholarships, must work 25 hours a week and find it difficult to keep up their grades, Barnard senior Sue Levine says: "I've never seen such valor in my life, but the squeeze is on those kids, and they may lose their scholarships. It's tragic.

Increasingly, families that can do so borrow the money to pay for education. Borrowing against life insurance policies is a method recommended by some financial aid officers, but many families apply for commercial loans at banks, savings and loan associations or finance companies, often repaying the money over a five-year or six-year period. Even that is proving a hardship in some cases, and eight-year plans are now in the works.

"Years ago, people resisted the idea of financing their children's educations with monthly payments, but when the Government got into the educational loan business it took the stigma away," reports Robert K. Keir, president of The Tuition Plan, a subsidiary of the far-flung C.I.T. Financial Corporation.

There is no stigma now, that is certain. The Tuition Plan illustrates one interesting phenomenon in education-financing—the emergence and growing prosperity of firms devoted solely to selling loans for schooling. Though founded in 1938, The Tuition Plan has, according to Keir, enjoyed particularly good fortune only in the past 10 years. In 1956 it had a handful of employes; now there are over 80. In 1956 only about 5,000 students were being covered by its finance plans; now the number exceeds 50,000. In the past decade, it has financed college educations for over 500,000 people.

A number of banks handle educational loans as they would any other consumer loan transactions, with charges running roughly from 9 to 11 per cent a year in simple interest, though the rate may be expressed in jargon that makes it sound much lower. Other banks offer educational loans at a lower-than-usual rate—as a public service—but a tight money market may help force a change. Educational loans cannot always be handled as economically as others. The specialized educational-loan firms charge the highest rates of interest, though exact fees are often hidden in a welter of "service," life insurance and other charges. A few years ago an independent firm of consulting economists made a study of programs offered by several educational loan companies. It said simple monthly interest ranged from 1.09 to 3.64 per cent. Though the cost is high, parents heavily committed to bank loans find the educational lenders especially useful because few applicants are turned down for credit reasons. Nonetheless, delinquencies tend to be low.

And what are the states and the Federal Government doing about the college cost squeeze? Some states do very little; others quite a bit; New York State the most. New York has the strongest scholarship program in the nation; it awards Regents Scholarships ranging from $250 to $1,000 to some 20,000 students each year; under its Scholar Incentive Program nearly every full-time undergraduate is given a stipend of $100 to $500 depending on need, for the payment of tuition. New York also operates the largest state guaranteed-loan agency in the nation.

The Federal Government, under the National Defense Education Act of 1959, has a guaranteed-loan program that allows needy undergraduates to borrow up to $1,000 a year, graduate students up to $2,500. Repayment is spread over 10 years at 3 per cent annual interest on the unpaid balance. For people going into teaching, as much as half the debt may be written off at the rate of 10 per cent a year.

Not surprisingly, there are plenty of problems. Participating schools must put up $1 for each $9 the Government contributes—and, as the demand rises, they are increasingly hard-pressed to produce the funds. Collections, which the schools must handle, add to the cost of maintaining the program. Though no official figures are forthcoming, the delinquency rate is proving to be alarming. "About five times as high as for the average commercial loan," estimates one informant in the educational loan field. He says borrowers tend to be more responsible about repaying private loans, possibly because of a concern over maintaining their credit ratings with the private lenders.

Under the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Government instituted a guaranteed-loan plan aimed at middle-income and upper-income families, who have not been inarticulate in conveying to lawmakers their chagrin about mounting college costs. Need is not a requirement. Seed money is given to states that want to administer their own guaranteed-loan agencies, and standby Federal funds are available for those that don't. Undergraduates may borrow up to $1,000 each year, graduate students up to $1,500. The money is borrowed from a bank or credit union. Repayment may begin up to nine months after the student leaves school and, in some instances, run for as long as 10 years. If the family's adjusted income (total income minus exemptions) is less than $15,000, the Government pays half the interest—6 per cent a year—during the repayment period and all of it while the student is in school.

Once again—problems. State legislatures didn't rush to sign up, and the paperwork proved more involved and expensive than anticipated. Though the banks, through the American Bankers Association, pledged unyielding loyalty to this new program, they were not overjoyed to receive it just when "tight money" was giving them difficulty. Furthermore, the banks quickly discovered that 6 per cent simple interest did not allow them to break even, much less earn a profit.

Thus, while theoretically any student could obtain a loan from any participating bank, in practice it has not worked out that way. Many banks allocate a certain sum to the program each year, and the well quickly runs dry; some banks see that guaranteed loans go only to children of regular clients. (Generally, this does not hold true for banks in New York State, possibly because the state's own program is so well-established.) There have been abuses on the part of students, too—for instance, using loan funds to purchase cars instead of education, or keeping a large bank balance—at 5 per cent interest—while borrowing college money at 3 per cent.

Authority for the Office of Education to set up new Federal guarantees expires at the end of June, and the House Special Subcommittee on Education is receiving testimony to determine what direction the program should take.

The Office of Education would like to see a broader insurance plan that would greatly expand the Government's role and risk in guaranteed loans. The banking community would like to see interest rates rise to 7 per cent. The United Student Aid Fund, a

private, nonprofit guarantee agency that also operates 29 state programs, would like to see a number of reforms—among them, limits to Federal involvement and the extension of authority to school financial officers to determine need. Basic to the fund's objections seems to be the fear that Federal support will drive out state and private loan contributions.

This being a political year, observers in Washington foresee a final bill that continues the program for another few years, without creating a need requirement or significantly expanding its scope, and that sweetens the pot for the bankers by raising interest rates or adding a special fee.

This is not likely to be the year, however, that Senator Ribicoff's efforts on behalf of parents and students make significant headway. Ribicoff has introduced legislation that would provide a tax credit for anybody—including the student himself—who finances college tuition, fees, books and supplies. The credit would be applied on a sliding scale and have a ceiling of $325. The proposal, twice voted down, has earned the Johnson Administration's implacable hostility because of Treasury Department estimates that it would cost the nation roughly $1.1-billion in the first year alone. Indeed, some observers note that the guaranteed-loan program came into being partly as a way of shunting aside Ribicoff's proposal, which at present languishes in the House Ways and Means Committee. The committee chairman, Wilbur Mills, is reported to have said that the bill would pass over his dead body.

Any massive social problem—and the high cost of higher education is certainly becoming one—fosters its share of visionary proposals. One such suggestion, free higher education for everyone, has been advocated over the years by several leading educators. Among its drawbacks are the fact that many people are likely to reject the idea of total Federal subsidy and, of course, the problem of paying for it.

Possibly more tantalizing for some is the idea of an "educational opportunity bank," which was briefly mentioned by President Johnson in an economic message last year and has been endorsed by such educators as Yale's president, Kingman Brewster Jr. In effect, the Government would finance through loans every student's higher education. The loans would be repaid out of earnings over a 40-year period in the form of specified income-tax surcharges. Graduates entering low-incomes fields or suffering a run of bad economic luck later in life probably would not pay back all they owed. Those who became extraordinarily successful would no doubt demand a lump-sum payback option. These and other puzzlers—for instance, what to do about women who get married right after school and do not work—remain to be ironed out.

This proposal, admittedly visionary at present, triggered an angry response from the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and from the Association of State Colleges. They talked about a "life indenture" for students—though the students would be self-sufficient adults by the time they began paying off their loans. Underlying the opposition seems to be the fear that state legislatures and private sources would greatly curtail their support of public colleges and universities if such a program were enacted, requiring even greater tuition boosts than would otherwise be necessary.

But tuition will keep on zooming in any event, and already the high cost of higher education is creating problems that go far beyond the heavy drain on family purses. Most educators applaud the idea of diversity in educational life, but rising tuitions are tending to do away with it. No school, public or private, can expect a good "socioeconomic mix" of students if tuitions are high and scholarships insufficient. Private schools cannot survive if the majority of students are forced to choose only low-cost, state-supported schools. The beginning of a geographical freeze—with its resultant provincialism—is becoming evident as the more popular state-run schools raise tuitions for out-of-state students above $1,000 and the pool of parents who can afford them is drastically reduced.

Apart from limitations on diversity, there is the issue of heavy student indebtedness. Increasing numbers of young people are beginning their careers heavily in debt, some with overlapping loans to be paid off. Consequently, many graduates are making their career choices on the basis of pay rather than long-range advantage or reward.

The problems are considerable; it may well turn out that the solutions will have to be of equally impressive dimensions.

FURTHER TRIBUTES ON PASSAGE OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION; COMMENDATION OF SENATOR SMITH AND OTHERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to single out the exemplary manner in which the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] offered her unstinting devotion and support to the military procurement measure passed last Friday by the Senate. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services she has consistently lent her outstanding skill and ability, her tireless dedication in obtaining for this Nation a defense system without equal. She applied that same dedication and ability on this measure. I simply wish to thank her for her contribution, adding it to the thanks already extended on this measure to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I emphasize once again that the discussion during the consideration of the military procurement authorization was highly thoughtful and interesting in developing many, many worthwhile questions and issues. A number of Senators were responsible for making possible such a high-level discussion; many I singled out following the passage of the measure last Friday. Added to that list is the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] whose wise and penetrating analysis is always welcome. The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] similarly deserves commendation as do the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and many others.

THE PLASMA SCALPEL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, an exciting new bloodless-surgical-scalpel medical development has emerged in Utah from the cooperation between the University of Utah Medical Center and Hogle-Kearns, a Salt Lake City firm. This development is the invention of a bloodless surgical scalpel by Mr. Forrest Brayshaw, of Hogle-Kearns.

This instrument, called plasma scalpel, uses radiofrequency energy and argon to produce a highly ionized gas that flows through the tip of an insulated handpiece at a diameter of only 1/7,000th of an inch but at a temperature that literally vaporizes the moisture of the tissue, leaving a hemorrhage-free incision. This cutting-edge temperature is hotter than the corona of the sun.

Dr. Theodore S. Roberts, chairman of the Division of Neurological Survey at Utah, has conducted extensive and extremely promising tests of the scalpel. He points out that the scalpel shows particular promise in operations involving the nervous system.

The plasma-scalpel generator is a compact, portable instrument weighing about 100 pounds. The handpiece resembles an oversized ballpoint pen. The unit consumes less than 400 watts of power from a standard 120-volt a.c. line.

The scalpel has aroused widespread interest in the medical community, and a recent demonstration before the American Association of Neurological Surgeons in Chicago brought additional attention to this potentially great achievement.

Mr. President, I share with other Utahans the pride in this most interesting development and hope that it will further increase the already amazing abilities and contributions that medical science has made and is continuing to make.

Because the progress of this new surgical scalpel deserves widespread recognition, I ask unanimous consent that a statement from the public affairs office of the University of Utah Medical Center and a technical sheet by Dr. Roberts and Mr. Brayshaw be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH MEDICAL CENTER

CHICAGO.—A new surgical scalpel that has made deep, bloodless incisions on animals with an ionized gas at temperatures above 10,000 degrees centigrade was demonstrated today at the 36th annual meeting of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons.

The "bloodless scalpel" was shown in an exhibit prepared by the University of Utah College of Medicine where surgeons have tested it during the last 16 months in more than 100 operations on guinea pigs, rabbits, rats and monkeys.

Dr. Theodore S. Roberts, 41, chairman of the Division of Neurological Surgery at Utah, described the scalpel as "most promising". He said the animals have made a routine recovery and that year-old tissue history indicates normal wound healing, normal scar tissue, no adverse side effects and no damage to surrounding tissue.

He said the instrument, called "Plasma Scalpel", uses radio frequency energy and argon to produce a highly ionized gas that flows through the tip of the insulated hand piece at a diameter of only one-7,000th of an inch but at a temperature that literally vaporizes the moisture in the tissue, leaving a hemorrhage-free incision.

Dr. Roberts said further research will be conducted before any plans are made to use it on human tissue, but that the scalpel shows particular promise in the field of neurosurgery—operations involving the nervous system.

The animal incisions have been made in all parts of the skull, limbs, chest, abdomen and lower back along with spinal cord area.

The scalpel was developed at the University of Utah Medical Center in association with Hogle-Kearns, a private Salt Lake City

firm whose principals have western mining interests. They have experimented with plasma gas for use in mineral separation.

Forrest G. Brayshaw, 37, plasma technical director for Hogle-Kearns and inventor of the special "E-Field" method of generation used for the scalpel, said the cutting edge temperature is "hotter than the corona of the sun".

"But the heat transfer of tissue just 3 millimeters away from the plasma tip has measured only 4 degrees," he said, "and the depth of cutting is readily controlled with no blasting or cratering effect."

"The length of the plasma 'torch' is adjustable from ¼ to ½ inch, and the E-Field method of generation is designed to transfer the plasma energy only into the tissue. It will not ignite combustible items such as surgical gowns, towels, gloves or combustible gases."

"The scalpel does not leave the walls of the incision burned. Instead, the blood vessels are sealed off by a thin layer of coagulum. The scalpel sterilizes and cauterizes the blood as it cuts."

Dr. Roberts said he found during the experimental surgery that the plasma scalpel "makes possible rapid hemostatic tissue cutting and provides for excellent tissue surface coagulation."

During one operation on a monkey's back, forceps accidentally ruptured a small vessel. With a touch of the plasma tip, the bleeding stopped instantly.

The operations have included deep incisions in the most vascular parts of the body without drawing any blood, thus saving the considerable time usually required to clamp off bleeders, negating the problem of blood obscuring vision and reducing the need for transfusions.

Fittingly, the term "plasma" in this sense has nothing to do with blood. The name was applied to an ionized gas when early researchers in the 1920's thought its behavior in a closed atmosphere resembled the behavior of blood as it pervades the vascular system.

"The word 'plasma' denotes a gas in which an important fraction of the molecules are disassociated into ions and electrons while the gas as a whole remains electrically neutral," Brayshaw said.

"The use of electrical discharges for heating gases to extremely high temperatures goes back to the turn of the century. Within the past dozen years, however, interest in plasmas or ionized gases has increased considerably because of the development of new uses for them in high temperature chemistry, metallurgy, chemical synthesis, space propulsion, thermal nuclear research and, indeed, medicine."

Brayshaw said the Plasma Scalpel principle has been confused with the laser.

"They are entirely different scientific families, in no way related," he said. "The laser is a highly concentrated beam of light, the plasma a high temperature gas."

He also described as "totally different" the bloodless tissue cutting of the Plasma Scalpel and the "cold knife" principle of cryosurgery.

"In cryosurgery, liquid hydrogen or nitrogen is used to effect very low temperatures to coagulate tissue in a small, limited area. The 'cold knife' is scarcely a scalpel," he said, "as we know it now."

The Plasma Scalpel generator is a compact, portable instrument that weighs about 100 pounds. The hand piece, which resembles an over-sized ball point pen, is connected to a small, flexible and light weight coaxial cable through which the argon gas flows.

The generator cabinet contains two bottles of inert argon gas that permit continuous operation up to four hours or more. The unit consumes less than 400 watts of power from a standard 120-volt AC line.

Dr. Roberts, a native of Waukesha, Wisconsin, was graduated from the University of Wisconsin College of Medicine, interned at Swedish Hospital in Seattle, Washington, and then took further training in neurological surgery at Wisconsin. He went to Utah in 1961 and was named chairman of the Division of Neurological Surgery in 1965.

Brayshaw has worked in plasma research and development since 1958 and was named plasma technical director of Hogle-Kearns three years ago.

The Plasma Scalpel

Experimental use of a thermal plasma as a tissue-cutting device

Since December of 1966 a "Plasma Scalpel" developed by Hogle-Kearns/International (H–K) of Salt Lake City, Utah, has been used in experimental animal surgery in more than 100 operations conducted by the University of Utah Medical Center, Department of Neurosurgery, College of Medicine.

In each case the device has effected hemorrhage-free surgery. Year-old tissue history indicates normal wound healing and scar tissue with no apparent adverse side effects. There has been no evidence of damage to surrounding tissue.

The H–K "Plasma Scalpel" uses radio frequency energy and argon gas to produce a thermal plasma with minimum temperatures above 10,000° Kelvin. The thermal plasma in this case is a gas that has absorbed enough radio frequency energy to become ionized or electrically conductive. The unique method of H–K plasma generation is described by the developers as the "E–Field."

The plasma, as it emits from the tip of the hand piece, is of such small diameter (.007 of an inch) and high temperature that upon contact with live tissue has consistently vaporized the moisture in the tissue instantly, leaving a hemorrhage-free incision.

The scalpel has not yet been used on live human tissue.

The skin incisions and paraspinous muscle dissections in experimental animal surgery suggests that the "Plasma Scalpel" has the following advantages:

1. It makes possible rapid hemostatic tissue cutting.
2. It permits readily controlled depth of cutting with no cratering or blasting effects.
3. It provides for excellent tissue surface coagulation.
4. It creates only very limited trans-tissue heating.
5. It has the characteristic whereby the thermal plasma flow does not readily couple or "arc" to nearby instruments.
6. It permits continuous use without collection of tar on the tip.

The length of the plasma "torch" is adjustable from one-quarter to one-half inch. The gas velocity is adjustable from less than one cubic foot per hour (CFH) to 10 CFH or more and does not affect the stability of the plasma.

The H–K "Plasma Scalpel" is not a plasma arc device and does not exhibit the same characteristics. As a tissue cutting device with its E-Field method of generation, it is designed to transfer its energy into the tissue and not to any surrounding material. It will not ignite combustible items such as surgical towels, gowns, rubber gloves or combustible gases. Metallic items such as forceps and clamps must come in direct contact with the plasma before any energy is transferred; even then, it must remain in the plasma for some time before any damage is done to the instrument.

There are no cooling hoses from the generator to the hand piece. And, since the argon gas flows inside the coaxial power cable, the plasma knife is very light and flexible. There is no harmful radiation and there is no necessity for the surgeon to wear any special goggles or eye protector piece.

The tip, hand piece and cable can be sterilized in solution. The tip is removable from the hand piece and is easily replaced.

The generator contains two bottles of argon gas to permit up to four hours or more of continuous operation. Total power consumption of the unit is less than 400 watts from a standard 120-volt AC line.

The E-Field approach to plasma generation has the advantage of being smaller, electrodeless, more reliable and safer than conventional methods of plasma generation.

Plasmas

The word "plasma" in the thermal sense was first used by the physicists Langmuir and Tonks in 1929 to denote a gas in which an important fraction of the molecules are disassociated into ions and electrons, the gas as a whole remaining electronically neutral. Langmuier is said to have suggested "plasma" as a proper term after observing that the behavior of the gas in a closed atmosphere suggested to him a similarity with the behavior of blood pervading the vascular system.

A plasma has been described as "the fourth state of matter." In this state, the plasma is electrically conductive if operated at one atmosphere or more.

The simplest generator capable of producing a thermal plasma may consist of two electrodes at a voltage different sufficient to cause an arc between them. Sir Humphrey Davey is generally credited with the discovery of the electric arc, in 1809, an event that marked the generation of the first man-made plasma.

Commercial devices based on this discovery have included arc welders, search lights, fluorescent bulbs, and a variety of plasma torches.

The use of electrical discharges for heating gases to extremely high temperatures extends back to the turn of the century. Within the past dozen years, however, interest in plasmas or ionized gases has increased considerably because of the development of new uses for them in high temperature metallurgy, chemical synthesis, space propulsion, thermal nuclear research and, indeed, in medicine.

The Experimental Plasma Surgery

Laboratory experiments with the thermal plasma device have, from the outset, suggested that it could be effectively employed for soft-tissue cutting. The earlier experiments carried out on rabbits and rats were limited to skin incisions and observations of the tissue healing ability post-thermal plasma cutting. It was uniformly observed in these experiments that the skin wounds were healing only by secondary intention despite asepsis and careful suturing techniques. Some 14–16 days post-incision with the thermal plasma device, a sloughing of the skin margin immediately adjacent to the cut edge would occur. In these same animals, post-slough, healing would then proceed rapidly by secondary intention. The wound tensile strength before sloughing of the skin margin was quite minimal and later, post-sloughing, compared favorably with that of cold knife incisions.

With later developments in the plasma characteristics (viz. smaller size cutting tip and change of argon gas flow rate) the extent of the skin margin coagulum has been reduced in amount. Further, by a technique of peeling away the skin edge coagulum, the skin will heal per primum with immediate suturing.

To date, the laboratory experimental work with the plasma scalpel has been primarily limited to skin incisions and paraspinous dissections. The mode of cutting relates to tissue destruction mediated by dissection and immediate vaporization in an area limited to the plasma tip.

While it is necessary to resect the coagulum from the free edge of the cut skin (1–3 mm. depending on the thickness of the

incised skin) direct tissue reapproximation and prompt healing is observed with muscle and fascia. These latter structures are cut rapidly and as tissue separation can be simultaneously achieved the coagulum formation is minimal.

Histological studies of tissues incised with the thermal plasma device have shown twelve months post-operative the same scar characteristics as observed with cold knife surgery.

Coadjacent tissue heating when cutting with the thermal plasma is limited as there is no flow of current toward an indifferent electrode. In experiments where ambient temperatures were measured in muscle tissue, some 3 mm. from the cutting site of the plasma tip indicated an increase of only 4 degrees F.

Paraspinous dissections carried down to the lamina of the cervical and lumbar spine in the monkey have been done rapidly and with satisfactory hemostasia—no outward effects have been noted. Of interest, is the ease with which tissue surfaces may be coagulated to a very limited depth or virtually charred as one might employ it in destruction of en plaque tumors.

Advantages that seem apparent, as observed with its experimental use thus far, appear to be: rapid hemostatic tissue cutting limited trans-tissue heating; depth of cutting readily controlled with no tendency to "arc" to nearby instruments; no blasting or cratering effect; and no toxic and inert gases used.

THEODORE S. ROBERTS, M.D.,
Director, Surgery.
FORREST G. BRAYSHAW,
Director, Research and Development.

WEST VIRGINIA'S TECHNICAL ACTIONAL PANEL BEAUTIFYING STATE—A MANMADE UGLINESS DISAPPEARING—SENATOR RANDOLPH PRAISES FIELD REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, few States surpass West Virginia in wealth of natural beauty. We who live there love our hills and mountains, our streams and rivers, and the incomparable charm of our countryside, with rural communities and important cities. We enjoy sharing this beauty with the hundreds of thousands of out-of-State visitors who come to West Virginia each year to see and enjoy this natural wealth.

However, as is too often the case, natural beauty is marred by manmade ugliness and neglect. We in West Virginia, Mr. President, are meeting this problem. West Virginia is now launching a massive statewide program of beautification that could be adapted for other States which have the same problems.

I refer to the project being carried on by West Virginia's State technical actional panel.

Early last month, our State director of the Farmers Home Administration, A. James Manchin, who also serves as chairman of the panel, issued a proclamation which sets the program in motion.

This massive beautification effort is unique in that, for the first time, anywhere, high school students on a statewide basis are being mobilized during the spring months of this year to carry out the responsibility of beautification.

The object of this program is to clear the highways of some 2,200 abandoned junk cars, raze dilapidated and hazardous buildings, and carry out other clean-up projects.

Last year, the West Virginia technical action panel functioned with a pilot program in certain areas of the State. Some 1,600 junk cars were removed from highways and streets.

In his proclamation, Mr. Manchin said:

> TAP panel members encourage and help local citizens in many ways to maintain beauty where it exists, to restore beauty when it has been scarred, and to create beauty by using land, water, and forests in ways which enhance the quality of environment.

Cooperating with the thousands of high school students in West Virginia in this beautification project are hundreds of garages and tow service companies who will assist the young people in hauling away the junked cars. Federal, State, and local agencies plus private organizations are also cooperating and sponsoring local efforts.

Local, district, and State technical action panels, which were established a few years ago by the Department of Agriculture in every rural county and in every State, make such a statewide program feasible and workable.

Technical action panels, Mr. President, are comprised of field representatives of the Department of Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration, Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Extension Service, Forest Service, and are often supplemented by members of various local agencies.

These panels provide technical advice and counsel to rural areas and to rural people so they can avail themselves of existing programs. These panels aid in making surveys and drafting feasibility plans for community and area improvement and development.

Rural communities have at their disposal for the first time a workable coordinating body to assist them in the complexities of Federal and State programs. Structured as they are, on a local, regional, and State basis, they can—as they are in this beautification program—effectively contribute to statewide projects as well.

Congratulations are due Chairman Manchin and his associates for this imaginative and constructive program. This beautification program really covers a broad spectrum of activity on a long-range basis—including installation of water and sewer systems, improvement of small watersheds, development of rural residences and profitable farms and the establishment of outdoor recreational areas. All of these are programs available to rural people and rural areas under existing programs of the Farmers Home Administration and other USDA agencies.

As Senate sponsor and floor manager of the highway beautification bill, it is gratifying to me to see the progress being made in my home State.

Surely the problems and the agony now being experienced by our large central cities point to the need of revitalizing rural America as never before. It is a worthy undertaking.

AMENDMENT OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1071, H.R. 14940.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14940) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorizations for appropriations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, line 7, after the word "of" to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 702

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 702 to the committee amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 702) as follows:

> On page 1, line 7, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,000,000".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that I may talk for a couple of minutes with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania would have to withdraw his amendment for that request to be in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment for the time being.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "of" strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000,"; and after line 7 insert:

"(b) Section 49(a) of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not more than $7,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence for fiscal years 1969 through 1970 may be used for the purpose of research, development, and other studies conducted in whole or in part outside the Agency, whether by other government agencies or by public or private institutions or persons'."

AMENDMENT NO. 701

Mr. CLARK. Now, Mr. President, if I am in order, I call up my amendment, No. 701, and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "for the two fiscal years 1969 through 1970, the sum of $17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for the three fiscal years 1969 through 1971, the sum of $33,000,000".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that we are on limited time, one-half hour to a side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the request of President Johnson for a 3-year authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and an authorization of $33 million, or $11 million a year for each of the 3 years.

It has seemed to me that this was an entirely reasonable request. We debated and passed, after a couple of days, at the end of last week, a $22 billion authorization for 1 year for military hardware and missiles research and development, all of which will be used to improve the capacity of the United States of America to wage war. I would think that we could afford to authorize the modest sum of $11 million a year for 3 years in order to permit the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to proceed with its work, which is essentially that of waging peace.

In the individual views which were appended at my request to the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on this bill, which views were printed in the RECORD on Friday at my request, I quoted at some length from the message of the President, and shall not reiterate it here, except to point out the President's strong endorsement of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the work it has been doing.

I am not particularly happy with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, because I think it has been unduly timid. But it has significant accomplishments to its credit, the last but not the least of which was the negotiation of the treaty providing for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

One of the advantages of a 3-year authorization is to give some stability to the employment of the officials of the agency, who, if the authorization is shorter, are apt to feel a considerable sense of insecurity. Another advantage is that a 3-year authorization permits some adequate long-range planning.

Mr. President, I suspend in order to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. A third reason, I should think, would be that the waging of peace will never come to an end, and perhaps in our lifetime the waging of war can be brought to an end. Yet the Department of Defense is a permanent agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a temporary agency, whose lifetime, at the present moment, has to be renewed every 1, 2, or 3 years, as the case may be.

Basically, Mr. President, my argument is philosophical in its motivation. It just seems to me that this modest sum could well be spent for the cause of peace over a 3-year period, particularly in the light of the priority which we in Congress have given to the weapons of war.

I think in the next 3 years a great many difficult questions dealing with arms control and disarmament will arise. I certainly hope so. I hope we are moving toward a truce, and then a peace, in Vietnam, some kind of better understanding with the Soviet Union and other powers of the Communist bloc, and a very real opportunity for significant arms control and disarmament measures, including, I would hope, the dream of President Kennedy of a world with law, and a treaty of general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law. I suggest the least we can do, if we do not wish to shatter such hopes, tenuous though they may be, would be to adopt this amendment and give the Agency a 3-year lease on life and a $33,-million authorization.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The amendment of course, would simply pick up the administration proposal and reinstate its request. The House of Representatives, of course, has acted on this bill, and has provided $20 million for 2 years, as contrasted to $33 million for 3 years. The Senate Committee, as I have already stated on Friday, has proposed to provide the Agency $17 million, the cut to affect only the funds for external research.

Mr. President, we have a number of examples of the research which has been undertaken by this agency. I do not think that the argument that this is a small amount compared to the gross national product, or to military expenditures, is relevant at all.

The question is whether the research undertaken by this Agency is worthwhile. Does it serve any constructive purpose in the promotion of peace or, in some cases, is it a proper kind of research for this agency considering its jurisdiction?

I do not think it is. I do not think that the Senator from Pennsylvania has addressed himself to the real question, which is the merit of the external research projects which have been undertaken or are in process by the agency.

I have a number of examples of these contracts and projects and, in all honesty, I do not believe they are very significant, and in some cases I do not believe they are relevant to the problem of arms control.

By the way, the original background of many of these programs of research is that they were undertaken with the idea of giving assistance to universities. The universities had been under hard financial straits, and I supported this research originally on the basis that it would be at least a good thing for the universities. However, the time for that has passed or, if not passed, the relative capacity of the Federal Government to do this job is certainly not as good as it was.

Moreover, if we are going to do it on this basis, we ought to give the funds to the universities directly for the purpose of teaching the students or perhaps conducting research that they themselves originate. I think that this kind of research simply neither promotes the main objectives of the universities nor contributes anything significant to the solution of the problem of peace or of war.

Let me emphasize. I will read from one of these to illustrate. These are summaries of studies which have been given out by the agency and indicate, I think, the rather superficial nature of some of the research projects.

This is the final paragraph of the summary volume of a five-volume MIT study on "The Control of Local Conflict: A Design Study on Arms Control and Limited War in the Developing Areas."

The summary paragraph indicates what it dealt with and how significant the conclusions were. It reads:

In the final analysis, policy will still operate in the gray area, unable for sound reasons to occupy either black or white. Freedom and justice remain the highest values of political ethics. But they sometimes become confused with power and prestige. In our judgment, both world peace and deepest American values will be served by a strategy of conflict control that vigorously seeks to support freedom and justice in ways that purposefully minimize violence.

This cost $232,500.

The study came up with a generality which, in my humble judgment, I fail to appreciate, and I do not think the study is justified.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of these summaries to illustrate other aspects of the program in general.

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

ACDA EXTERNAL RESEARCH CONTRACTS

This is the final conclusion of the summary report of a University of Wisconsin Law School study on "legal aspects of verification in the Soviet Union."

"Hard information about Soviet law and practice is unavailable in many areas relating to the verification of an arms control agreement. For this reason, many questions relevant to the legal aspects of verification cannot be fully answered. The problems that would arise in the negotiation of an arms control agreement would be mainly administrative. Since the political underpinnings will determine the overall acceptability of a verification arrangement, political monitoring would be necessary on a continuing basis. And because the practical administration of the verification arrangement will determine the ultimate success of an arms control agreement, a single Soviet agency that could centralize and therefore support and facili-

tate the work of an arms inspectorate would be desirable."

It cost the ACDA $45,000 to be told this.

This is the summary of a summary report on "Arms Control Arrangements for the Far East" by Stanford University.

"We do not wish to advocate either for ourselves or for others a position in which we have 'peace' simply because we cannot defend ourselves and must accept the declarations or fiat of others if we wish to survive. Therefore, we cannot advocate a reduction of arms where the threat to the whole region is such that no regional state is completely free from fear. On the other hand, we do not advocate an increase in arms; instead we advocate an increased sense of regional security. The preceding proposals are designed to promote this end and to effect a breakthrough in realistic arms control. In our view, these proposals will best serve the long-term interest of the United States as well as that of the region."

It cost $164,183 to come up with that conclusion.

The following studies are in process, and of course, cannot be reviewed. However, from ACDA's official description of what the research is about, questions could be raised.

1. ACDA/WEC–119 Control Data Corporation "Computer Services for U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency." Cost: $176,669.85.

"Contractor will furnish computer services including analysis, programming, and computation on a task order basis in support of war simulation activities in the Agency."

Question: Why is ACDA involved in war simulation activities?

2. ACDA/ST–137 Sperry Gyroscope Co. "Further Investigation of SCEPTRON Audio Frequency Techniques." Cost: $37,776.

". . . and visit missile manufacturers to see whether any unique process is associated with missile production."

Question: What Agency purpose is served by Sperry visits to other manufacturers for such an indefinite reason?

3. ACDA/E–113 University of Colorado. "Analysis of Defense Worker Reemployment." Cost: $64,600.

"This study will coordinate, compare, and evaluate the data developed on the mobility of defense workers from the following three studies sponsored wholly or in part by ACDA:

"ACDA/E/RA–13 Dyna-Soar Contract Cancellation (Boeing Co.);

"ACDA/E–67 Martin Company layoff; and

"ACDA/E–69 Republic Aviation Corporation layoff."

Question: ACDA paid more than $92,587 for the three studies cited above. Why is it necessary to spend another $65,000 to find out their worth of ACDA? Isn't the "coordination, comparison, evaluation" role within ACDA's in-house capability?

4. ACDA/WEC/IR–126 University of California at Los Angeles "Arms Control Special Studies." Cost: $120,230.

"This project is designed to provide ACDA with a flow of new ideas and approaches to the military/political aspects of arms control and disarmament. It will involve the preparation of short, specialized research papers, and self-generated research keyed to the exploration of new concepts and approaches to problem areas, utilizing the techniques of political and security analysis, or mathematics and statistics as required."

Question: Doesn't this seem a bit expensive for new ideas?

5. ACDA/E–104 Purdue University, "Social and Psychological Aspects of Verification, Inspection, and International Assurance." Cost: $63,500.

"This study will survey current relevant principles of international assurance and assess their credibility and usefulness in relation to a series of recent international events in which assurance and lack thereof played some role. An attempt will be made to determine specific factors that would increase confidence and assurance."

Question: What's the direct connection with arms control and disarmament?

6. ACDA/ST/RA–34 Commerce Department/ESSA Cost: $15,000. "College Alaska and Mould Bay, Canada, seismological data will be examined for the purpose of plotting ground amplitude versus NTS nuclear explosion yield. It is expected that these plots will provide further insight into the magnitude-yield relationship."

Question: Doesn't this subject fall more precisely into the Atomic Energy Commission's area? What relationship does it have to arms control and disarmament?

7. ACDA/ST–127 University of Pennsylvania. "A Model Study of the Escalation and De-escalation of Conflict." Cost: $130,681. "This contract is an extension of ACDA/ST–64 ($73,899) and ACDA/ST–94 ($127,894). It has the purpose of continuing pioneering theoretical and experimental explorations in escalation processes. The object is to develop an overall theory from which useful predictions and methods can be provided for de-escalating conflicts. The theory of meta games will be pursued in depth to study the effect of policy change on opponents attitude and to analyze circumstances which lead to stable outcomes for resolving conflicts. A theory of team coalitions involving models for analyzing the effect of group structure will also be developed."

Question: For more than $300,000 what relevance do these studies have on the current crises confronting the U.S.? And how do they apply to the arms control and disarmament negotiations?

8. ACDA/WEC–135 Massachusetts Institute of Technology "Arms Control and Local Conflict." Cost $153,800 FY 1967. "This study will advance the work initiated under ACDA/WEC–98 ($232,500) to develop arms control and disarmament measures applicable to local conflict in the developing areas . . . the initial model of conflict control for *potentially effective control measures* in local conflict situations and develop and utilize the RAND-MIT manual political/military gaming technique as a tool for validation and elaboration of these conflicts."

Question: Isn't this project similar to the Escalation-De-Escalation Study (ACDA/ST–127)? What practical value do gaming techniques have for spotting, alleviating, or ending conflicts?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To summarize the main point—and I do not think the Senator from Pennsylvania has really grappled with it—it is whether these particular research programs are relevant to arms control and whether they in themselves are meritorious. Do they really make a contribution to the struggle to do something about the control of armaments? I do not think they do. I think they have a minimal value.

I think the whole program of research has achieved a prestige status, so that each agency gradually seeks to increase its research program because it generates a constituency for them among their supporters in the intellectual community.

I made almost exactly the same statement against the research program of the Pentagon last week. I do not think the programs contributed at all to the function of the Defense Department. In fact, many of them are not relevant whatever to the carrying out generally of what is called the mission of the Defense Department.

The Departments get started on these programs. They employ various agencies—one that is notable, the Hudson Institute, that I mentioned last week—and the results of the studies support the policies of the Pentagon and constitute propaganda material. They are made at the cost of the Pentagon and the taxpayers. I think they are less than useful. In some cases, they are damaging to our relations with foreign countries because they lead to legitimate complaints that we are interfering with their internal affairs, and particularly their great educational institutions.

We all know about Camelot. The controversy originated with complaints in Chile. More recently there have been similar complaints from Sweden and Japan. I think there will be more from other countries if we continue that kind of intervention by the Pentagon. I do not think the research programs are worth while. I do not think they are needed.

All the committee did was to cut them down to a reasonable amount. There will still be some remaining. There will be $7 million for 2 years. The program as we recommend it is $10 million for the regular operations and, as I say, $7 million for research.

I would be perfectly willing to go along with something less than that. I do not think it would be harmful. That is the best judgment of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with what the Senator has been saying. It seems to me that we have been overdoing this matter of contracting work out, with the contract being let out either by a particular agency of the Government or by a committee of Congress.

I noticed that when the reports come back, a good share of the information which is conveyed through the study has been secured from the files of the same committee or the same agency which let the contract in the first place.

It looks very much as if each agency of the Government, as well as many committees of Congress, just wants to be liked. And the best way to make an institution like one is to give that institution a contract.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is quite correct. I think that is what happens.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first let me speak directly to these research contracts that my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, raised.

I put 10 of the summaries in the RECORD on Friday. They appear on pages 10052 through 10054 of Friday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I submit that any objective consideration of these 10 contracts which are samples of the ones the agency has been conducting would cause one to conclude that they are useful and valuable in terms of the work of the Agency.

I also had printed in the RECORD on

Friday the individual views which I had filed and which contain a quotation from the portions of the act establishing the Agency and instructing it to undertake research in designated fields.

Because only three Senators are present in the Chamber, I shall not repeat what I said on Friday. But I suggest that anyone interested in the debate who compares the sample contracts with the direction of Congress to the Agency with respect to research would inevitably conclude that these are valuable and useful contracts.

I would like, by way of being specific, to refer to two of the contracts which are typical of what the Agency has been doing.

I refer to page 10052 of the RECORD, at which the contract dealing with reemployment experiences of the Martin Co. workers related at Denver, Colo., is set forth. This contract was initiated in December of 1964 and was completed in December of 1966. Its purpose was to survey the workers laid off en masse from the Martin plant in Denver between December 1963 and March 1965 in order to determine how they fared in obtaining new employment.

This, it seems to me, is a very vital part of the work of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; because if we are to have arms control and disarmament—and I hope we will—we must meet the argument that massive unemployment will be caused if all these defense plants operated by the military-industrial complex are shut down by reason of the coming of peace, arms control, and disarmament.

There have been a number of studies in this area, but none of them at a level as detailed as this one dealing with the experience of the Martin Co., which did shut down a plant in Denver during the years indicated.

My view is that the Agency needs to know, Congress needs to know, and the American people need to know what is the impact on unemployment and reemployment in the shutting down of an arms plant.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator mean to say that if it is shown that there would be some dislocation of the community by closing a plant, therefore, we should not seek the end of the war?

Mr. CLARK. Of course not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is about all it could show. It seems to me perfectly obvious that even though there is dislocation, and so forth, we still would not want to continue the war.

Mr. CLARK. I say to the Senator, is it not much better to be able to tell the American people that if they do terminate the war, they will not create an unemployment problem? It seems to me that this presents an additional reason for not continuing the war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot imagine that anyone would doubt that if an arms plant is closed in a community, it will cause some unemployment there. That is not the problem, and it does not take a million dollars to find it out. The question is the growth of nondefense things, about which we all know. It creates difficulties. But it will not be the jurisdiction of the Arms Control Agency to solve that problem.

Mr. CLARK. Let me strongly disagree with the Senator from Arkansas. I believe it is very important, indeed, to determine whether, when individuals were dismissed from an armament factory, they were able to secure reemployment in short order. I do not know what this study showed. I suspect it showed, as have many others which dealt with the subject in generalities, that these men did secure reemployment reasonably soon. I believe this is an excellent additional reason for pressing forward with arms control and disarmament negotiations, despite the fact that it may cause some temporary employment problems.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. I do not believe we need to spend $1 million or $2 million to find out what would happen if the war in Vietnam ends.

Certainly, anyone who is familiar with the economy knows that to a large extent our economy has been stimulated by the war. The prosperity we have today under the Johnson administration is to a large extent a wartime prosperity. If it were not for the war, things would not be so booming. There is no question about that. That was true in World War I, it was true in World War II, it was true in the Korean war, and the prosperity of this administration to a large extent is founded on war.

What we need in this country is a prosperity based on peace, and a stable economy based on a sound dollar.

Mr. CLARK. I say to the Senator from Delaware that that makes two against one, there being only three Senators in the Chamber.

I disagree as strongly with the Senator from Delaware as I did with the Senator from Arkansas.

I should like to read from a summary of this contract which, in my judgment, clearly indicates the utility of the contract:

> This study and the other two mass layoff studies constitute a highly original and valuable contribution to the available knowledge of the employment effects of mass layoffs. The Department of Labor fully recognizes the value of the three studies and has distributed copies to all the state Employment Offices. The three studies have been widely cited in various literature on manpower problems. Data from the three studies is now being analyzed by the University of Colorado. Data cards from the three studies will then become available to interested scholars.

This happens to be an area in which I have a certain expertise.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty, I am deeply interested in the impact caused by unemployment, from whatever source derived; and I can vouch, from my point of view, that this was and is an extremely valuable study, as indeed are the other nine studies which I put into the RECORD on Friday. I do not believe there is any particular occasion to discuss them in depth.

In the end, the quarrel, if it could be called such—the disagreement, I will call it—among the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Arkansas, and me is a question of judgment. With all due deference to my two friends, I suggest that there was 3 years ago, and there has been now, a certain amount of nit picking about these contracts. The contracts, in my judgment, are all—not all, but the overwhelming majority of them—worth while. It would be a mistake to cut back the authorization. In fact, I believe the authorization should be increased above what the President has recommended. In effect, the Agency, which has the expertise, thinks these contracts are worth while. I believe that creates a presumption in favor of going along with the agency, which, of course, can be overcome by clear and convincing evidence that the Agency is wrong. I do not believe that the evidence exists. It certainly is not in the record of these hearings, and I suggest that my good friend the Senator from Arkansas has not met the burden of proof to establish that the Agency is wrong and that these contracts are improper.

The Senator from Arkansas did not undertake to deal with one of the principal matters involved in my amendment, which is to restore the life of the Agency for 3 years. In the Committee on Foreign Relations there was some dissent, not only mine but that of Senator PELL as well. I believe the Senator from Arkansas would agree that a number of committee members were absent when this action was taken.

I suggest that the 3-year authorization is a very well justified request. We think that the State Department is with us forever; the Defense Department is with us forever. The Senator from Arkansas has been the leader in criticizing activities of both the Defense Department and the State Department in connection with the present crisis in Vietnam. Yet, nobody has suggested that we should put the State Department on a 3-year life or the Defense Department on a 3-year life.

I suggest that there is very little to be said in justifying cutting back President Johnson's request, which I strongly endorsed, to put this new Agency, which has done fine work—I believe we all agree—on a 2-year basis instead of a 3-year basis, which the President recommended.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, although I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from Arkansas is willing to do the same.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that we suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to either side, in order to bring more Senators into the Chamber and to assure a vote at a reasonable time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). All time has been yielded back.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we have a quorum call, without the time being charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 701) of the Senator from Pennsylvania. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Wisconsin, [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 117 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Bartlett	Metcalf	Proxmire
Clark	Mondale	Randolph
Inouye	Montoya	Ribicoff
Javits	Moss	Williams, N.J.
McGee	Pell	Yarborough
McGovern	Percy	Young, Ohio

NAYS—53

Aiken	Fulbright	Mundt
Allott	Gruening	Murphy
Anderson	Hansen	Muskie
Bennett	Hatfield	Pearson
Bible	Hayden	Prouty
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brooke	Hill	Scott
Burdick	Holland	Smith
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Sparkman
Cannon	Jackson	Spong
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dodd	Mansfield	Tower
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—29

Baker	Gore	Magnuson
Bayh	Griffin	McCarthy
Brewster	Harris	McIntyre
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Morse
Case	Hartke	Morton
Church	Hollings	Nelson
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Dominick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Ervin	Kuchel	Tydings
Fannin	Lausche	

So Mr. CLARK's amendment (No. 701) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 702

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 702, ask that it be read, and request the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "$17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,000,000".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The Senate has just rejected the recommendation of President Johnson that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should be given a 3-year lease on life and an authorization of $33 million, or $11 million a year.

The present amendment would go back to the amount passed by the House, which would be a 2-year authorization for $22 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the House passed a $20 million authorization for 2 years, not $22 million.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator is correct, I apologize.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The House passed an authorization of $20 million for 2 years.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment so as to make the authorization $20 million, instead of $22 million, in order to conform with the House figure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. The amendment, as modified, would give the Agency a 2-year lease on life and a $20 million authorization, as opposed to the 2-year $17 million authorization, recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations by a divided vote.

It was, and of course is, my strong view that this Agency should be given at least a semipermanent status. I thought that 3 years was little enough. Two years is less. But the Senate has spoken in no uncertain terms as to what it thinks about voting for 3 years and $33 million for peace as opposed to voting $22 billion for 1 year for war, as we did on Friday.

I would hope the House figure might prevail in the Senate, thus making a conference unnecessary, and giving the Agency $3 million more, which it badly needs, than that given by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have already discussed the objections of the committee to the external research program. I do not think much remains to be said. It is a matter of judgment as to whether or not these projects of research are significant or relevant or worth the money. The committee did not think so. Two members of the committee supported the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I am ready to vote, if the Senator from Pennsylvania is ready to vote. I do not know that much more could be said about it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Rhode Island wishes to speak on the amendment, and I yield him such time as he may need.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I would like to express regret that the previous amendment was defeated. It seems to me correct and right that the Disarmament Agency should have exactly the same permanent status, as do those departments of Government that are responsible for either the prosecution of war or for the attainment of our objectives short of war; that is, the Department of Defense and the Department of State. It seems to me very odd that the latter two should have permanent status while the one agency whose objective is the elimination of war is given a short-term lease on life.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania and hope it may prevail.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, unfortunately I was not present in the Chamber earlier today when Senator CLARK's effort to restore funds to the House level was voted on.

I am especially regretful of my absence because of the very light support the amendment mustered.

Certainly, I would have been happy—no; eager—to add my vote and vocal support to his proposal.

My speech at this point is perhaps deprived of timeliness—but I certainly wanted my views known to the RECORD.

Mr. President, once again today we are testing an authorization bill in our perennial agony over what is responsible expenditure and what is commendable frugality.

Once again I fear we are in serious danger of making a bad choice.

The Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament asked for a 3-year authorization at $11 million a year.

The House granted them a 2-year authorization at $10 million a year.

Now the Senate Foreign Relations Committee proposes to whittle that to a 2-year authorization at $8½ million a year.

When the Congress is seized with economy fever, we all know how tempting is the meat-ax approach. Give every department and agency a straight cut and the arithmetic is simplified, the decisions made easy.

But too often this approach will not respond to the demands of logic.

First of all, here is an agency dedicated to discovering the techniques of peace, the nuts and bolts of arms control. It has, if the Senate committee report is to be believed, done a good job.

Even the majority report, which recommends the cut, contains considerable praise and only the mildest of criticisms of the Agency's work.

It did remain to a dissenting member, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], to catalog the Agency's remarkable accomplishments. It was, as he points out, the central force behind the Limited Test Ban Treaty, the United Nations resolution against bombs in orbit, the "hotline" between Moscow and Washington and the yet-to-be-consummated Nuclear Proliferation Treaty.

An imposing record, yes—and in a field that is not of indifferent concern to the American public and the world.

I hardly need remind this body that the problems of peace and the problems of the cities are the most pressing that we face today.

And when I consider the productivity, the results per dollar, that this Agency has attained, it strikes me as a poor place to slow down the machinery.

As to the committee's proposed limitation on research funds for the Agency, I am reminded of a vote on the floor of the Senate last week while the Armed Forces authorization was being considered.

At that time the Senate was being asked to approve an increase in military research and development of more than $500,000,000. I asked at that time that the Military Establishment's research funds be held at the previous year's level. My amendment was narrowly rejected.

The Senate should remember that the total military R. & D. budget was some $7.9 billion—I repeat—billion.

Now we are asked to find fault with the $12 million that the Arms Control Agency had hoped to spend for its external research in fiscal 1969 and 1970.

The committee recommends a limitation of $7 million for this purpose.

Mr. President, $7.9 billion for military research versus $7 million for arms control research. I am sure there are many pragmatic explanations but might not a newcomer to this planet—if presented with these facts—be justified in wondering if our priorities were not a little lopsided?

Senator CLARK, in his dissenting views, listed the 13 complex areas in which the Arms Agency has been directed to undertake research. He asks how the Agency can be expected to do an adequate job with the funds the committee majority recommends. It seems a pertinent question.

The authorization, it seems to me, should remain at at least the level set by the House. And it does not seem prudent to limit the research expenditure.

Three years ago the committee suggested to the Agency that it transfer more external research to in-house operation and the report states that the Agency has obediently moved in this direction.

Mr. President, I do not—and hopefully never will—take the position that we should spend money unnecessarily merely to impress foreign nations with our enthusiasm.

But when the President asks for an $11 million annual expenditure for an agency, $8½ million a year hardly seems spendthrift.

And we might well consider the international impression Congress leaves when it increases military research while cutting back in the hunt for the techniques of peace.

It certainly leaves me feeling a little uneasy.

Moreover, this Agency has previously enjoyed a 3-year authorization and now will have only 2. This, in my experience, is usually treatment accorded to executive agencies with whom the Congress has become displeased.

Yet, there is little in the majority report to indicate displeasure.

The majority report points out:

> Foreign governments by now must be familiar enough with the U.S. Congress authorization and appropriation procedure not to interpret this action as any reflection on the ACDA's negotiating efforts.

Perhaps so. But the foreign public might not be as sophisticated. And this public's unease is a minus that I would be prepared to accept if there appeared to be any compelling reason to cut the authorization's lifespan.

But what is the Agency doing that we disapprove of? I do not detect the answer in the report. The majority states that it has consistently preferred a 2-year authorization but that a 3-year term was settled on in conference.

But now that a 3-year term has been established, should not we weigh the pluses and minuses over again, with all the new weights on the scale?

If we believe that this Agency has performed well—and I think it has—then we should treat it that way.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from Arkansas is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I yield back my time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have a 6- or 7-minute speech. I wonder if the Senator will yield me time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator can do that after the vote.

Mr. THURMOND. I can make it after the amendment is voted on.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified (No. 702), of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina with vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon

[Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 118 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bartlett	Miller	Proxmire
Clark	Mondale	Randolph
Gruening	Monroney	Ribicoff
Inouye	Montoya	Sparkman
Javits	Moss	Symington
Long, Mo.	Muskie	Williams, N.J.
McGee	Pastore	Yarborough
McGovern	Pell	Young, Ohio
Metcalf	Percy	

NAYS—47

Aiken	Ellender	McIntyre
Allott	Fong	Mundt
Anderson	Fulbright	Murphy
Bennett	Hansen	Pearson
Bible	Hatfield	Prouty
Boggs	Hayden	Russell
Brooke	Hickenlooper	Scott
Burdick	Hill	Smith
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Spong
Cannon	Hruska	Stennis
Carlson	Jackson	Talmadge
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Thurmond
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dirksen	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Dodd	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—27

Baker	Fannin	Kuchel
Bayh	Gore	Lausche
Brewster	Griffin	Magnuson
Byrd, Va.	Harris	McCarthy
Case	Hart	Morse
Church	Hartke	Morton
Cooper	Hollings	Nelson
Dominick	Kennedy, Mass.	Smathers
Ervin	Kennedy, N.Y.	Tydings

So Mr. CLARK's amendment (No. 702, as modified) was rejected.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have before us H.R. 14940, which authorizes an appropriation of $17 million for the fiscal years 1969 and——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought we were operating under limited time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no time on the bill if there are no further amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is another amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the amendment had not been offered, and I have been recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. I ask the Senator from South Carolina if he has an amendment to offer. There is no time limitation on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have an amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. I will not yield. I have been recognized and I have the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order. Does the Senator from South Carolina have the right to speak under a unanimous-consent agreement, no amendment being pending and no time limitation having been arrived at on the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no provision in the unanimous-consent agreement to take care of general debate on the bill. The Senator from South Carolina or any other Senator has until 3 o'clock to talk on the bill if no amendments are offered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, if it hurts the conscience of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I offer an amendment.

I move to strike out all after the enacting words of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pro forma amendments are not in order in the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have before us H.R. 14940, which authorizes an appropriation of $17 million for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, for the continuation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. A significant section of H.R. 14940 provides as follows, and I quote:

> Not more than 7 million dollars of the funds appropriated . . . may be used for the purpose of research, development, and other studies conducted in whole or in part outside the agency.

This remarkable provision, in effect, puts a limitation upon the Agency's main function, which is to undertake research in its field. I am in favor of this limitation; in fact, I believe that it does not go far enough. The report of the Committee on Foreign Relations says:

> A sampling of available studies during the Committee's hearings raised sufficient doubts that all of them are either necessary or particularly useful.

To put it mildly, this is one of the great understatements of our time.

I have neither the time nor the patience to undertake to review here the reports and studies which the ACDA has undertaken. Moreover, it is not necessary. The basic premise of arms control studies is that man will be able to invent some kind of control system that will abolish human nature. In essence, the ACDA is seeking a series of graduated steps by which the military power of the United States and the military power of the Soviet Union and of all other nations can be so reduced that an international agency will have superior power over all. The theory is that by reducing arms to a minimum a small international central force could keep every nation in check.

Power is not eliminated simply by being transferred. In fact, the history of the world shows that whenever power is removed from many hands and concentrated in one, then freedom dies. The illusion that some men will cease to want power or that they will give up the attempt to tyrannize over others is based upon a misunderstanding of human nature. There is no way in which concentrated power can be checked unless it is balanced against an equal or even a superior power.

I do not deny that those who hold power in the world can hold it responsibly. In fact, probably the majority of world powers do act responsibly. But it will never be possible to eliminate the human factor, the uncontrollable desire of evil men to abuse power. It is not the possession of power, nuclear or otherwise, that threatens mankind; it is man himself who provides the potential either for good or for destruction.

The chief goal of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is to reduce nuclear armament. Although nuclear armament is the most destructive of modern weapons, it is not necessarily the decisive factor in shifting the world balance of power. The fact that the United States has held overwhelming nuclear superiority has saved this world from the nuclear holocaust. Our overwhelming power has dampened Soviet nuclear ambitions, and has taught the Communists to be somewhat prudent in challenging us. Yet the very moment when the Communists thought that they could gain an advantage over us by installing nuclear weapons in Cuba, they seized that advantage. So it is our nuclear superiority that has saved the world.

Nevertheless, our nuclear superiority

has served only to check the Soviets' use of nuclear weapons. It has not in the least reduced the Soviet dream of world conquest.

Our nuclear weapons have held Soviet nuclear weapons in check, but our nuclear arsenal has not stopped the Soviets from proliferating worldwide support to so-called guerrilla movements which seek to dissolve legitimate and free government. The Soviets have turned to diplomacy, economic pressures, conventional armament supply, and many other forms of strengthening their position at the expense of the United States. In short, the Soviets are far more sophisticated than we are in advancing their own interests and the interest of international communism.

I need hardly point out that the Soviets are now engaged in a proxy war against us in Vietnam. It seems to me incredible and contrary to every dictum of commonsense to seek to promote disarmament when the Soviets are arming the world against us. We must adopt a more sophisticated and less naive view of the Soviet designs against us.

The concept of an arms control and disarmament agency is out of date and out of step with current developments. This Agency was set up in 1961 in an era of good feeling based upon self-delusion. The exhuberance and momentum of a new administration won out against a cold view of reality. That false atmosphere has long since dissipated. The world is more involved in turmoil and divisive military actions than ever before.

The ACDA concept has been proved wrong both in theory and practice. Its very essence today is a sign of the weakness and indecisiveness of our national policies. It is my hope that if this program is not defeated today that it will die a natural death in 1971. That date will mark 10 years of pursuing a delusion.

I intend to vote against this bill, and if there is no rollcall vote, I wish the record to show that I am opposed to it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 5, insert the following before the period: *"Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to field test activities conducted pursuant to the authority of this Act".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is concerned that the cuts made by the Foreign Relations Committee may be construed as prohibiting the use of research and development or other studies conducted in whole or in part outside the Agency where the field test verification concepts for a variety of possible arms control and disarmament agreements are involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum submitted to me by the Agency outlining the proposition in great detail may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE ACDA FIELD TEST PROGRAM

The amendment to the Arms Control and Disarmament Act proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee provides that not more than $7 million of the funds appropriated for Fiscal Years 1969–70 may be used for the purpose of research, development or other studies conducted in whole or in part outside the Agency, whether by other Government agencies or by private or public institutions or persons.

We think it important to make clear that this restriction does not apply to the Agency's program to field test verification concepts for a variety of possible arms control and disarmament agreements.

As Mr. Foster testified before the Committee:

"Under section 2 as well as subsections 34(c) and 31(b), (e), and (f) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, the Agency has a special responsibility to develop verification procedures for arms control agreements. Field testing is often important to establish criteria for assured dependability of the verification procedures in a given agreement requiring inspection. Field testing of particular arms control inspection techniques is useful to protect our national security very much as field maneuvers are useful to check out the capabilities of our armed services.

"Prior to fiscal year 1968, the Agency and the Department of Defense jointly sponsored and funded field-test operations under the name 'Project Cloud Gap.' In past years, the Defense Department contributed in the neighborhood of $1 million a year to this joint enterprise. DOD funding for the project was terminated in the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1968. Under the circumstances, field testing of inspection concepts by ACDA itself is more important than ever if protection of U.S. security is to be assured by field-tested verification proposals.

* * * * *

"In this connection, I would like to point out that, while Congress decided in fiscal year 1968 against the continuation of DOD funding for Project Cloud Gap, we do not believe that this action reflected any decision by Congress to derogate from ACDA's responsibility for field testing arms control and disarmament verification methods. In fact, the Congress demonstrated its continued support of that responsibility by approving an ACDA appropriation that included funds for field testing. We have been advised by Deputy Secretary of Defense Nitze that DOD's interest in the field testing of arms control measures has not diminished in the least. DOD has agreed to allow 29 experienced officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to continue to serve with ACDA in field test operations although, as the result of the action on the DOD fiscal year 1968 appropriation, ACDA must pay for their salaries and allowances."

Our present program must provide for completion of a major field test (FT–15) begun in a previous fiscal year. This field test is a joint US–UK exercise, to be conducted this summer in a 2,000-square-mile area of southern England. It will bring together some 500 US and UK test operations and support personnel in a complex exercise to determine the least intrusive, yet most effective, inspection procedures and techniques for inspection of retained levels of deployed tactical ground and air forces. Such a test would be very useful in appraising the effectiveness of verification measures connected with any plan for mutual reduction of forces in Europe.

Another planned field test is pertinent to the implementation of international safeguards under the nonproliferation treaty.

Some non-nuclear-weapon powers have expressed concern over the possibility of industrial espionage by international inspectors looking at peaceful nuclear facilities in their countries. Although we do not believe there is a serious problem of industrial espionage, the United States has taken a number of steps to allay this concern, including research by the Agency on unmanned sensor systems that could minimize the number of inspections.

One element in devising any unintrusive system is the problem of transmitting data from a given sensor on a peaceful nuclear facility to a receiver. In addressing this problem, ACDA has sponsored hardware research to develop a tamper-proof communications link between the sensor and the data receiver. Such a system must be field tested to determine if the concept developed is, in fact, tamper proof.

Other field tests ACDA considers important in providing assurance in our capabilities to verify arms control and disarmament agreements are scheduled for the requested authorization period. We consider it essential, therefore, that a proviso be added to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee amendment to section 49(a) of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act along the following lines:

"Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to field test activities conducted pursuant to the authority of this Act."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the heart of the amendment is a proviso that the limitation on outside research shall not apply to field test activities conducted pursuant to the authority of this act.

Mr. President, I inquire of the junior Senator from Illinois whether he desires time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the meantime, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Pennsylvania. It is my understanding that it does not change the amounts of money allocated for research in this bill. It simply gives discretion to the Agency to use the amount for the field tests or for other research as contemplated. I have no objection to the amendment. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Arkansas, and I am grateful to him.

Before we dispose of the amendment, I believe the Senator from Illinois desires some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. PERCY. Two minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I speak in support of this bill. I do not believe this is the time to cut down our arms control program. At a time when the United States is spending $70 billion a year on defense—$30 billion a year of this amount on war itself—we should be giving more rather than less support to efforts to find ways of limiting arms races.

At a time when the Army is spending $10 million to process a questionnaire about fallout shelters, it does not seem unreasonable to allocate at least that amount each year to the search for ways of reducing the chances that such shelters will be needed.

Yet, the bill as reported by the committee cuts the authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to $17 million for 2 years—a level which is $3 million less than granted by the House and $5 million less than requested by the administration.

The committee's cut affects primarily the Agency's external research program. While I fully endorse the committee's belief in the value of in-house research, I believe that, in a field where there is constant need for new ideas, fresh insights, and detailed technical expertise, it is extremely important to supplement the efforts of the Agency itself with efforts by other institutions—whether other Government agencies or contractors outside the Government.

The need for such external support is dramatized when one compares this small Agency, with only about 200 total personnel, with the 4½ million civilian and military personnel in this Government involved with military matters. And even with that huge in-house capability, the Defense Establishment spends several billions a year on external research.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas is willing, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 14940) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to ask for a conference with the House on this bill and the appointment of conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for a conference?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to make these remarks concerning the Agency's efforts. First, I wish to commend Mr. Foster, and his deputy Mr. Fisher, for their outstanding performances in negotiating the draft Nonproliferation Treaty. Their labors in Geneva in this regard have been nothing less than heroic. They deserve the Nation's tribute and gratitude for the skill, the patience, the persistence and the far-sighted vision so amply displayed—in circumstances that were often as difficult as any of this sort can be.

In my judgment, it is not enough to praise the outstanding performance of Messrs. Foster and Fisher. It is critically important to the highest national interests of this country to strengthen the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency as an institution of our Government. The truth is that ACDA represents, in an institutional sense, the voice of arms restraint, of control of the engines and artifacts of warmaking, within the highest councils of Government. This voice must be a strong, steady, competent and self-confident voice, if the system of competing institutional advocacy—which is the basis of decisionmaking in this Nation—is to work in a balanced and optimum manner. The perspective, the viewpoint and the reasoning of those charged with the statutory responsibilities which Congress has given to ACDA ought not to be overbalanced—I might even say overawed—in an institutional sense, by the agencies which represent other viewpoints within the structure and councils of our Government.

Certainly—and as is most proper and desirable—the viewpoint and interests and considerations represented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for instance, is and must continue to be given ample budgetary support and institutional status and prestige. But a sense of balance in the two aspects of our national effort is critically important. It is for that reason that I voted to increase the authorization for the appropriation to provide for more activity and research according to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF BOLIVIA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we are honored today by the visit by a group of parliamentarians from a friendly republic to the south, the Republic of Bolivia. They are on the Senate floor at this time. We have just had the pleasure of their presence with the Committee on Foreign Relations, and have had a very pleasant and helpful discussion with them. I should like to present our guests to the Senate at this time: Congressman Victor Hoz de Vila Bacarreza, Senator Guillermo Tineo Leigue, and Congressman Hugo Torres Suarez.

[The distinguished visitors rose in their places and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we are delighted to have these distinguished visitors in the Senate Chamber today.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 2:07 o'clock p.m.

During the recess, the distinguished guests were greeted by Members of the Senate.

On expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, there is today being released a report by the Citizens Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States demonstrating anew that millions of infants, schoolchildren, and adults in this affluent Nation are undernourished. Permanent physical and mental impairments stemming from malnutrition are widespread both in our cities and rural areas.

Entitled "Hunger, U.S.A.," the new report is a study of the inadequacies of our food distribution programs among the poor. However well intentioned, these programs still leave a painful hunger gap among multitudes of Americans condemned to half lives because of deprivations beyond their own control in both childhood and adult life.

The one statistical summary of the overall situation in the report is that only 18 percent of the 30 million poorest Americans are receiving Federal food aid. That cold statistic is highlighted by numerous heartrending stories of human suffering.

There is sufficient evidence to indict our food distribution efforts on the following charges, the report tells us:

1. Hunger and malnutrition exists in this country, affecting millions of our fellow Americans and increasing in severity and extent from year to year.

2. Hunger and malnutrition take their toll in this country in the form of infant deaths, organic brain damage, retarded growth and learning rates, increased vulnerability to disease, withdrawal, apathy, frustration and violence.

3. There is a shocking absence of knowledge in this country about the extent and severity of malnutrition—a lack of information and action which stands in marked contrast to our recorded knowledge in other countries.

4. Federal efforts aimed at securing adequate nutrition for the needy have failed to reach a significant portion of the poor and to help those it did reach in any substantial or satisfying degree.

5. The failure of federal efforts to feed the poor cannot be divorced from our agricultural policy, the congressional committees that dictate that policy, and the Department of Agriculture that implements it; for hunger and malnutrition in a country of abundance must be seen as consequences of a political and economic system that spends billions to remove food from the market, to limit production, to retire land from production, to guarantee and sustain profits for the producer.

Perhaps more surprising and shocking is the extent to which it now rests within our power substantially to alleviate hunger and malnutrition . . . .

I shall comment later on as to what I regard to be an injustice in singling out agriculture in such a blanket indictment, but I want now to mention another study.

Last Monday, five national groups of church women told us that the school lunch program is reaching only one-third of the 6 million children who need free or low-cost lunches. Federal, State, and local support of the program, intended not only to guard the lives and the health of our children but to make them capable of acquiring an education, has been inadequate to achieve its most important objective—providing adequate nutrition to those children who, because of their parents' economic situation, could not otherwise be nourished adequately.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been such an effective leader in spotlighting the problems of malnutrition and hunger in various parts of the country.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from South Dakota. I wish to commend him for the action he is taking in the speech he is presently making.

I believe it is very important, indeed, that there should be a select committee of the Senate composed of representative members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and other Senators appointed by the Vice President, without regard to committee assignment, because in my view we are not doing nearly enough at the executive level or in the approach by Congress to see that no American man, woman, or child, and particularly children, should suffer from malnutrition, hunger, or, indeed, starvation.

As the Senator has been kind enough to mention, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, of which I have the honor to be chairman, made an extensive investigation into this question last year. The committee held hearings and took testimony in Mississippi and elsewhere, and established the fact that there are clearly a great many Americans, and including American children, suffering from hunger, malnutrition, and, indeed, starvation.

I commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for what he has done. I am quite sure that most, if not all, members of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty will want to join in this effort.

I am a little more critical of the Department of Agriculture than is the Senator from South Dakota because I do feel that when the bill sponsored by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was passed by the Senate, and subsequently by the House of Representatives, authorizing substantial sums of money to be spent for relieving the hunger of our children in affected areas, the Department dragged its feet badly and is still dragging its feet in putting that measure to work.

I hope the speech of the Senator from South Dakota will spur the Secretary of Agriculture and his bureaucracy, because they have plenty of money, if they want to use it, to be sure that nobody in America suffers from hunger, malnutrition, or starvation.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am not defending the administration of these programs. The point I make is that we should ask ourselves whether the Department of Agriculture is the actual and proper agency to carry the major burden of what is essentially a welfare program geared to the health and well-being of our people. However, I do not say all has been done that could have been.

Mr. CLARK. My guess has been all along—and I request the attention of the Senator from New York in this matter—that the Office of Economic Opportunity with its particular interest in our poverty-stricken States, is better equipped than either the Department of Agriculture or even the Public Health Service, to feed the hungry. However, I agree that this matter could well be investigated by the select committee of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from South Dakota has made the proposal which he has suggested. I shall not interrupt the Senator at length nor shall I express my pleasure as fully as I feel it.

Many of us have the impression, and some of us have seen studies which support the feeling, that in this land of plenty there are plenty who do not eat very well.

I do not know how many Americans with incomes of less than $2,000 a year are actually given Federal assistance to enable them to have some kind of nutritional diet, but I have heard shockingly low estimates. I do know that a great many children, including those in schools, and most particularly preschool children in this country today, are not getting the kind of nutritional food that the most coldhearted, the most sharp-eyed bookkeeper would defend as decent in a land where the opportunity to give that child a decent meal is great.

The difficulty is that because of the several committees, all of which have a measurable responsibility in this area, we are not able to zero in on the problem, identify its extent, the opportunities to meet the need, and then the action that would insure that the need is met.

Therefore, it would seem to me that the select committee that the Senator from South Dakota now proposes may be the most effective means promptly of making sure that this country does do justice to men and women, pensioners and little children alike who today go to bed hungry.

Mr. McGOVERN. I want to thank the Senator from Michigan, and also take advantage of this occasion to express my appreciation for his leadership last week in restoring the school lunch program to the level authorized by the House, which was one of the really constructive and significant steps that we have taken in the Senate this year. I commend the Senator from Michigan for making it possible.

Mr. President, I am distressed at the picture described in last week's school lunch report, "Their Daily Bread," of children who have no breakfasts, and nothing to pack for lunch, who have to watch their classmates eat lunch—lunches for which we put up some part of the cost, but not enough to feed all the children who cannot pay the 20 to 45 cents required toward the full cost. A few of the unfortunate children scavenge crusts or share the lunches of compassionate classmates and teachers, but thousands of them—at near starvation—get nothing at all. These malnourished children do not have a chance to absorb the education being made available to them, and it is almost a certainty that one day in later life they will be criticized as ignorant and lazy; a lethargy that is actually no fault of their own but the fault of society.

The new report, "Hunger, U.S.A.," tells us:

> If you will go look, you will find America a shocking place.
>
> No other Western country permits such a large proportion of its people to endure the lives we press on our poor. To make four-fifths of a nation more affluent than any people in history, we have to degrade one-fifth mercilessly.

We learn from the report that the introduction of the food stamp program in some counties, as a consequence of the simultaneous discontinuance of direct free food distribution, often results in cutting off aid to thousands of the very poorest people—those who do not have even a small amount of money to pay toward stamps.

We learn that State and local cooperation, which works wonderfully well in some areas, breaks down in others and becomes a barrier between Federal assistance and oppressed minorities in others.

Copies of the report will be made available to all Senators, I am advised. I, therefore, shall not attempt to review or even summarize it. It is something every Member should read, for the existence of this unmet hunger—a national shame in itself—is a revelation of one important source of the schisms that are threatening our society today. As the report comments:

> In a land of affluence and agricultural plenty, it (hunger) cannot help but aggravate a sense of injustice, of grievance, of frustration and revolt.

I want to return to the indictment of the performance of agricultural agencies contained in the new study. It reviews correctly the fact that Federal food distribution programs have grown out of agricultural surplus disposal programs; that we did not approach the food needs of the poor from the standpoint of meeting human needs. The food distribution programs exist mainly because we diverted surplus commodities which were creating agricultural problems to welfare uses for whatever good they would do.

As a consequence of this approach—diversion of surpluses—to which we make a continuing allocation of 30 percent of all import duty collections, there are sometimes millions of dollars not used for surplus removal which revert to the Treasury although millions of people are

still hungry. A total of $208 million reverted in 1966, and another $181 million reverted in 1967. Only relatively small amounts reverted in 1965 and 1964—not because unmet human hunger was less acute but because livestock prices were low, marketings were heavy and there was an obviously large surplus of meat to be removed from the markets.

Because I believe that farmers are entitled to full parity, and supplies which depress prices below that level are surplus to a "proper market"—and I quote those last two words—I would have spent all of that section 32 money to remove surpluses and divert them. My definition of surplus would have differed from the yardstick used. But regardless of such differences in view, the basic fact remains that the Department of Agriculture is not a welfare agency in the sense of immediate and direct aid to the poor. Its mission is the welfare of agriculture.

I am personally very proud of the fact that out of the compassion of farm-oriented policymakers, administrators, and citizens there has developed a Federal effort to provide our disadvantaged people with food. I am proud that recognition that food is essential to successful education, and that the school milk and school lunch programs to provide that essential originated in the agricultural sector. I am proud that an agricultural economist in the Department of Agriculture, Frederick V. Waugh, and an agricultural administrator, Milo Perkins, conceived and promoted the food stamp program—essentially a two-price system to make adequate food available to lower income citizens, and to help close both the farm income and the nutrition gap in the Nation. I am proud that our food-for-peace legislation came out of agriculture.

I feel that "Hunger, U.S.A." is a little long on criticism of the adequacy of the human welfare job agriculture has not done and short on praise of the agricultural sector for doing all that it has done.

But history will allocate credit and place blame, and it is really not important to allocate it now.

What is important is that there is a serious food gap in the United States today.

We need to meet it just as speedily as is humanly possible.

It is long past time that we quit relying on diversion of unplanned surpluses to provide food for people trapped in poverty and want.

It is time that we took a look at our programs to meet basic human needs for food, clothing and other necessities of life and health and useful citizenship from the standpoint of our obligations as a civilized people toward our fellow men.

It is time that we arrayed all the things that we are doing through the Department of Agriculture, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the economic opportunity program, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and elsewhere in Government—the whole patchwork of programs, and that is what it is—and examine their purposes and their adequacy from the viewpoint of our social responsibilities, and then developed a coordinated program or programs to meet basic human requirements for food, clothing and other necessities of life among our disadvantaged people.

Believing this, several of us in the Senate, Senators MONDALE, BOGGS, HATFIELD, and I, have looked into the situation, have concluded that a group of five Senators from the Agriculture Committee, five from the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and five appointed without regard to committee assignment by the President of the Senate, should be designated as a select committee to study the existing programs, the needs, and jurisdictional problems, and report back to the Senate by the opening of the 91st Congress.

We have prepared a Senate resolution which provides for such a select committee and instructs agencies of Government with any applicable authorities, meantime, to do their utmost to alleviate want and hunger.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the draft of the proposed resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas it is policy of the Senate of the United States that every resident of the Nation should be assured the basic food, clothing and other necessities essential to life and health, and

Whereas surveys conducted by Government agencies and responsible groups of citizens show that in spite of America's abundance of food, fiber and other resources our Federal food programs reach only 18 percent of the poor and millions of citizens lack adequate quantities and/or quality of food, resulting in the lifetime impairment of children mentally and physically, and in unnecessary disease, suffering and premature deaths among both young and adults, and

Whereas restricted use of programs authorized by Congress, reversion of funds, divisions of responsibility and authority within Congress and administrative agencies, unwise regulations and other obstacles impede and frustrate efforts to banish starvation and want for necessities among desperately disadvantaged poor within our Nation; Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the President, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and any and all other agencies with applicable authorities shall use to the fullest possible their authorities under existing laws, including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Johnson-O'Malley Act, section 32 of the Tariff Act of 1935, the OEO Food Assistance Act, the school lunch and all other authorities for child and relief commodity programs, to meet immediately the food, fiber, and other basic needs of the Nation's poor to the fullest extent possible; and be it further

Resolved, That there is established a select committee of the Senate composed of three majority and two minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, three majority and two minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and three majority and two minority Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate without regard to committee assignment, to study the unmet basic needs among the people of the United States and to report back to the Senate not later than the opening of the 91st Congress legislation necessary to establish a coordinated program or programs which will assure every United States resident adequate food, clothing and other basic necessities of life and health; *provided further,* that the select committee shall recommend to the Senate appropriate procedures for congressional consideration and oversight of such coordinated programs.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I announce that on Friday of this week, I shall introduce the resolution for myself, Senators MONDALE, BOGGS, HATFIELD, and any others who care to cosponsor it who so notify me of their desire. We believe that the proposed resolution offers a means for all concerned to face up to the problem of want for basic necessities in our country, resolve such comparatively inconsequential questions as just where the costs go in the budget, and develop a strategy to end the paradox of want and starvation in the most affluent society in the history of mankind.

We invite all Senators to join us as cosponsors. Any who will join can call my office and they will be put on the resolution when it is formally introduced on Friday.

The resolution now carries the sponsorship of Senators MONDALE, BOGGS, HATFIELD, and CLARK, as well as all others who notify me during the course of the week. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the present occupant of the chair, has asked that his name also be added as a cosponsor, as well as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota also add me as a cosponsor?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am particularly happy to do so because of the strong interest the Senator from New York has taken in the problems of malnutrition and the leadership he has provided thereon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. That is what we were talking about when we were unable to carry the Stennis bill. It has been critically important, and we are learning more and more. While society serves very ably the 80 percent of our Nation, it raises serious deficiencies among the 20 percent in the underpar economic category. That is one of the most shocking manifestations of it. We actually found hunger verging on starvation and malnutrition in children. I think that is a very important reason and I am pleased to join the Senator as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am most pleased to sponsor the resolution introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN]. The resolution indicates the very high degree of urgency that we attach to the

problem of starvation and malnutrition in the United States today.

In a report released today by a committee of distinguished citizens on hunger in the United States, a shocking picture of neglect and tragedy is shown. The foreword of this report points out two functions intended to be served by it; First, that the public and Government have been slow to respond to starvation; and second, that the public will in fact respond when it knows all the facts.

The proposed select committee to be established by this resolution should provide a special forum for bringing public opinion to bear on the problem. I believe, too, with the report that the public will act to force its Government to eliminate hunger when it knows the magnitude and depth of the tragedy.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator McGOVERN and other Senators in sponsoring the Senate resolution: First, urging the executive department to use all existing legislation to meet immediately the food, fiber, and other basic needs of the Nation's poor; and, second, providing for the establishment of a select committee of the Senate to study the unfilled basic human needs of residents of the United States to the end that every U.S. resident be assured the basic food, clothing, and other necessities essential to life and health.

Despite our abundance of food, fiber, and other resources; despite our affluent society; despite our highest living standard in the world; surveys by a Senate subcommittee and responsible groups of citizens show that there is widespread hunger and malnutrition in the United States. This has been confirmed by a report made public today, of a citizens' board of inquiry into hunger and malnutrition in the United States. The board found concrete evidence of chronic hunger and malnutrition in every part of this country, as a result either of field trips or hearings or upon a review of all available studies evaluating the nutritional status of the poor.

The board's report states:

That substantial numbers of new-born, who survive the hazards of birth and live through the first month, die between the second month and their second birthday from causes which can be traced directly and primarily to malnutrition.

That protein deprivation between the ages of six months and a year and one-half causes permanent and irreversible brain damage to some young infants.

That nutritional anemia, stemming primarily from protein deficiency and iron deficiency, was commonly found in percentages ranging from 30 to 70 percent among children from poverty backgrounds.

That teachers report children who come to school without breakfast, who are too hungry to learn, and in such pain that they must be taken home or sent to the school nursery.

That mother after mother in region after region reported that the cupboard was bare, sometimes at the beginning and throughout the month, sometimes only the last week of the month.

That doctors personally testified to seeing case after case of premature deaths, infant deaths, and vulnerability to secondary infection, all of which were attributable to our indicative of malnutrition.

That in some communities people band together to share the little food they have, living from hand to mouth.

That the aged living alone, subsist on liquid foods that provide inadequate sustenance.

It is imperative that the executive department use all of its existing authority to meet this shocking and widespread problem of hunger and malnutrition in the United States. And it is important that the Senate establish a select committee of study and oversight to meet the Senate's responsibility in this problem area.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from South Dakota proposed his resolution, I should like to ask him: The resolution will be composed of members from which committees?

Mr. McGOVERN. Five members from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; five members from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and five members to be named by the President of the Senate without regard to committee assignment. They would report back on the whole problem of malnutrition in the United States and the problems in the existing administration of various food programs in this country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such as?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Department of Agriculture, HEW, OEO, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and any other agency involved in the handling and distribution of food to the needy.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, I opposed an amendment to the school breakfast bill that was presented here last week.

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The substitute for the committee amendment provided a fund of $32 million for 3 years in order to feed children in day-care centers and nursery schools. I was, and am, not opposed to feeding children, of course, but I am opposed to mixing these new programs with the school lunch program. As the Senator knows, I authored the school lunch program over 20 years ago. Two years ago, we put in the school breakfast program on a trial basis. From the information I was able to gather, that program has worked pretty well.

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not object to renewal or extension of the school breakfast program for another 2 years at the amount fixed by the Department in order to expand and gain further experience.

Now, what prompts the Senator to ask for such an investigation?

Mr. McGOVERN. Before the Senator came into the Chamber, I was defending the Department of Agriculture and the Committees on Agriculture. I do not think it is fair to single out Agriculture for the fact that there is hunger in the United States. The purpose of my resolution and the purpose of the select committee, if Congress sees fit to move in that direction, would be to look at how the present food distribution programs are being administered and human needs that admittedly, fall into another area of government, to see if there are not problems that overlap, and to see if the programs and administration could be improved.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, OEO has a feeding program along the line that was intended, under the substitute adopted last week, and I understand that HEW has a feeding program also. Is it the Senator's idea to try to consolidate this?

Mr. McGOVERN. I would hope that maybe some consolidation could come. I am not proposing a new agency or trying to beg the question. I really do not know what recommendations will come out of a select committee of this kind.

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator expect to file his resolution?

Mr. McGOVERN. I expect to do so on Friday.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what committee will that be referred?

Mr. McGOVERN. I could not answer that. I expect that would have to be resolved by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because I should like to see it.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator will certainly get a copy of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our committee is well able to look at a matter of that kind.

Mr. McGOVERN. I will say to the Senator that my assumption is it could be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry but I, of course, do not know that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that it should be because it certainly covers programs which have been under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture for a long period of time. Even more so than OEO and HEW. Food distribution, in several forms by the Department of Agriculture has been authorized by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes. I appreciate the Senator's comments. I have indicated my pride that concern for human welfare has been shown by our committee in initiating distribution of surpluses to unfortunate people and suggest we should also look at the matter from the standpoint of meeting human needs—welfare of individuals.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the business now before the Senate with regard to the previous order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from West Virginia that there is no pending business, but the Chair is informed that, previously, there was an order to extend to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] 30 minutes in which to speak.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 5 minutes, notwithstanding the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senate's attention to the rather

critically important statement made last Friday by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, in which he said:

> The Nation is in the midst of the worst financial crisis since 1931.

He also said:

> I hope I am not being too emotional about our situation, but we are faced with an intolerable budget deficit and also an intolerable deficit in our international balance of payments. Both have to be corrected over the next few years or the United States is going to face either an uncontrollable inflation or an uncontrollable recession.

Mr. President, correcting these problems over the next few years is very different from being in the "worst financial crisis since 1931," as 1931, and leading into 1932, was at the height of the depression which closed the banks and resulted in 13 or 14 million unemployed. It seems to me that statement is, in our defense lexicon, an overkill. One cannot couple that tremendous and sensational finding of imminent and the gravest kind of emergency with the fact that unless we do something about it things are going to get badly fouled up "in the next few years."

Mr. President, a very responsible Government official spoke. What he says is going to be looked and listened to all over the world. I agree that our situation is very serious, but I hope it is not emotionalism which dictated the rise in the discount rate to the highest since 1929, because it is going to be too taxing and too trying for many people, for people in small business and people trying to get home mortgages, and for the whole business and financial community.

I have agreed with Chairman Martin that we must have a tax increase and an expenditure reduction. With the valiant comradeship of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I have worked to bring that about.

I hope Chairman Martin will take occasion to put the situation in focus and point out that we are in a grave dilemma and terrible crisis, without any question, but we are not facing a 1932 depression and that we can act, and that action of a vigorous character is available, which can right the situation.

I join with him in the expectation that action will arise on the Senate-passed excise tax bill, which is combined with a $6 billion cut in spending for fiscal year 1969 and a 10-percent tax surcharge.

I speak only because I hope very much the world will not take from Mr. Martin's speech the impression that we are helpless in the matter, that Congress is mindless and heedless of what is going on in the country; and, second, to say that the rise in the discount rate is hopefully not a response to emotionalism, because it is serious and worrisome, and that there will have to be action by the other body as the Senate has acted to deal in a direct way with this crisis.

Much as I appreciate the concern of Mr. Martin—it may have a desirable effect—I do not think it should be taken as meaning that we are headed into a 1932 type of depression. I do not think so. I am sure Mr. Martin does not think so. That does not seem to be the opinion of the most astute experts in this country.

I very much hope that the Joint Economic Committee will take another good look at the state of our economy in the near future to ascertain what the effects on the economy could be of the excise tax, the surcharge, spending cut package passed by the Senate combined with the higher discount rate. Such hearings would be vitally important to guide the fiscal decisions of Congress at this time.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief quorum call before the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is recognized, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESPECT FOR LAW AND ORDER MUST BE RESTORED

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at the end of a surge of riots that swept across the country following the death of Martin Luther King, most thoughtful Americans hoped for an end to violence and disorder.

It is clear from the developments of recent days that the situation is still tense and that feelings run very deep. For example, here in the city of Washington, at least eight fires were set by arsonists in the past few days. One store was burned only days after it had restocked its shelves replacing goods that had been stolen by looters the week before. Just last night arsonists set fire to a store at 14th and U Streets in Northwest Washington, D.C.

It is apparent that the American people must capitalize on the major lessons learned from the breakdown of law and order that shocked the world. It appears to me that two conclusions have emerged from the experience of our violated cities. First, it is absolutely necessary that the leadership of our country at all levels—Federal, State, and local—act to restore respect for law and order. Second, this responsibility must be equally shared with the informal leaders of the minorities.

With regard to the restoration of law and order, it is my belief that greater use of police power must be exerted in the early stages of a disorder. Although many officials and writers today are applauding the restraint exhibited during the recent riots, many others deplore the fact that riots were simply allowed to run their course.

There will always be lawbreakers among us; in fact, social studies show that most populations have a small percentage of people who are inclined toward criminal acts. However, there is a great deal of difference between isolated incidents of crime and the kind of mob violence that our country experienced recently. Law enforcers are authorized to use such "force as necessary to control the situation" in making arrests of felons. Under District of Columbia law, both arson and looting, which is second-degree burglary, are felonies. Yet, in the city of Washington, as well as in many other cities, no real force was applied to stop looters and arsonists. Photographs and police reports show the results of these policies that hamstring law enforcement officers. The police and soldiers were under orders to fire only in self-defense.

In anticipation of riots here in the Nation's Capital, in March of this year I wrote Attorney General Ramsey Clark urging that necessary steps be taken to deal with any disorders. My correspondence was answered by Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr., who assured me that the Justice Department was keeping abreast of developments with respect to riots in Washington. In the last paragraph of his letter, Mr. Vinson made a statement of assurance as follows:

> You may be assured that interested law enforcement agencies will be prepared to meet whatever contingencies may arise, and that no one will be permitted to engage with impunity in illegal activities in the vicinity of the Capitol or elsewhere in the city.

Anyone who watched what took place here in Washington during the weekend of April 4–7 knows that certain elements of this city were allowed to "engage with impunity in illegal activity." This policy sacrificed the property of hard-working citizens rather than employ the power necessary to control the criminals involved.

I mentioned earlier that the minority leaders must share some of the responsibility for returning reason to their people. It is up to them to speak out against burning, stealing, and killing. They, better than anyone else, can get across the message that this is no way to achieve the economic and social goals to which they aspire.

In this regard, it is particularly puzzling that Washington should suffer so much from the hands of the Negro citizens. There are few cities in the country where this group is more in control or more involved with the future of their city. Washington's population is almost two-thirds Negro. It has a Negro Mayor, and Negroes hold majorities on the City Council, Board of Education, and many other important public bodies. The police force is nearly one-fourth Negro; schools and public accommodations have been totally integrated. The Federal and District of Columbia Government employees are 30 and 55 percent Negro, respectively. The city has an excellent record for co-

operation in meeting racial problems. Yet, the senseless burning and looting began in this environment.

I urge my colleagues, as well as the American people, to take advantage of the examples of the past 2 weeks, and seek to bring order out of the chaos. The primary lessons that require immediate recognition are, first, to insist on law and order and permit the use of necessary force to maintain it; and second, to encourage leaders of the Negro communities throughout this country to exert a restraining influence upon the more reckless members of their race.

Toward that end, Mr. President, I suggest that the advocation of restraint, and the exertion of the good will and offices of Negro leaders could be used now with best effect for the prevention of the proposed poor people's march on Washington.

I am not certain that my colleagues here in the Senate realize the dangerous potential of this protest. Let me cite some of the actions that are planned.

According to the leaders of the march, the ultimate purpose is to "raise the moral issue of the 35 million poor people in this country." They hope to persuade the Congress to underwrite a $20-billion-a-year program including guaranteed annual income, slum eradication, and increased aid to ghetto schools. To achieve this goal they plan to come to Washington to demand compliance by demonstrations.

If the Congress refuses these demands, the demonstrators are prepared to escalate their demonstrations by sit-ins in various offices of the Congress, in the streets, and in the local hospitals. As a last resort they have plans to form human barricades to block the bridges and main highways leading to the District of Columbia.

What will be the results of these actions?

It is quite conceivable that the demonstrators will be able to bring the Government machinery to a grinding halt.

It is almost a certainty that there will be more violence.

It is certain that the Washington Metropolitan Police will need the National Guard and Federal troops to maintain some semblance of order.

It is a certainty that local businessmen face a loss of revenue.

It is a certainty that communism's worldwide propaganda machine will cable home dispatches on the misery of these oppressed Americans, and will exaggerate any further violence so that it will damage the prestige of the United States.

And, finally, it is almost certain that the march and demonstrations will cause a violent backlash of public opinion among the remainder of the American populace—the people whose taxes pay for the welfare and unemployment programs.

In short, I believe that the poor people stand to lose much more than they might gain from their drastic plans.

Already we are beginning to see some of the adverse effects. The hotel association reports thousands of cancellations of tourists who would otherwise be visiting Washington during the height of the tourist season. Washington metropolitan hotels have sales of approximately $10 million a month during this time of the year. With the loss of revenue already experienced and the further loss now anticipated, the hotel association reports that many small hotels of the area may be put out of business.

Yesterday the Southern Christian Leadership Conference announced the new timetable for the poor people's campaign in Washington. It showed an elaborate schedule of caravans originating from Mississippi, Chicago, and Boston to converge on Washington. It provided for a cadre to arrive on May 13 to begin construction of shanty towns to house the demonstrators. It also schedules May 21 as the commencement of major demonstrations, followed by a mass march on May 30 through downtown Washington with all caravans and thousands of local residents.

Mr. President, I submit that this poor people's march is potentially dangerous and explosive. It will be expensive, channeling away millions of Government funds that might be better spent in the behalf of the very people who are marching. It will cost private enterprise millions in lost revenue. And who knows what the toll in human life might reach if lawless elements resort to violence?

In this regard, I invite attention to an editorial of the March 30, 1968, edition of the New York Times on the Memphis protest. The editorial stated that the Memphis riot showed that nonviolent protest if taken to the streets can be used as a cover by rowdy elements bent on violence. In support of this statement the editor pointed out:

> After all, 6,000 persons participated in the Memphis march, yet officials estimate that no more than 50 teen-agers took part in the window-smashing and looting.

I also invite attention to a statement made by Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP. This appeared in the Washington Post April 3, 1968, issue. Speaking to the National Press Club, Wilkins said:

> There are always some mavericks in any large group, and if a maverick in the rear ranks of the march decides to throw a brick through a window, there is nothing Dr. King can do about it.

The plight of businessmen, many of whom have been wiped out by the surge of riots across the country, was highlighted by an article in the New York Times April 16, 1968, issue which reported that 100 Negro and Puerto Rican operators of small businesses had lodged a protest with Mayor Lindsay. The police, they said, were too slow and hundreds of stores had been totally destroyed. One reported that places in Brownsville looked as if they had been bombed out. This is what the demonstrators did to members of their own minority group.

Mr. President, I think that it is time for the leadership of the country to take some positive action to stop further trouble. I believe that the Mayor of Washington and the Secretary of the Interior should see to it that no permits are granted for demonstrations in the Nation's Capital, where violence is apt to occur in a march of this kind.

In this regard, I invite attention to two decisions of the Supreme Court which say that the freedoms of speech and assembly are not licenses to create public disorder and violence. These are *Cox* v. *Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 559 (1965) and *Walker* v. *City of Birmingham*, 388 U.S. 307 (1967). These decisions reject the use of the first and 14th amendments as ground for patrolling, marching, and picketing. They further point out:

> Civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I believe that the leaders of the poor people's campaign should be reminded that there are twice as many poor white people in this country as there are poor Negroes. By that token, if the poor people's march does not have twice as many whites as Negroes, then it will not represent the poor. On the contrary, it will be just another racial demonstration.

Finally, if all attempts to dissuade the leaders against this march fail, I would like to offer a substitute goal for them to consider. Instead of marching on Washington for the avowed purpose of obstructing, let them do something positive and beneficial for the Negroes who live in the burned out areas of the city. Let this march become a "clean up march." If the marchers will come to Washington to clean up the rubble of their Nation's Capital I am certain that local authorities will make shovels, wheelbarrows, trucks, and other equipment available. Let the marchers come to town to work for wages, and not to depend on charity. Let them come to rebuild, not to tear down.

I challenge the leaders of the poor people's campaign to direct the great energies of their marchers toward this constructive goal.

If they do, Mr. President, I predict a great deal more sympathy for their cause.

I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials be placed in the RECORD: "Order Must Overcome," the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., April 10, 1968; "Orgy of Crime Is a Mystery," by David Lawrence, the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., April 15, 1968; "Reason Must Replace the Tumult," the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., April 12, 1968; "Congress and Coercion," the State, Columbia, S.C., April 12, 1968; and "Burning Washington," by Holmes Alexander, the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., April 13, 1968; "Wreckers Inactive as Rubble Remains in Ravaged Area," the Washington Daily News, April 22, 1968.

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

[From the News and Courier (Charleston, S.C.), Apr. 10, 1968]

ORDER MUST OVERCOME

If racial turmoil tells us anything, it is that utopia won't be created overnight. No amount of federal spending, social engineering or enactment of civil rights laws will alter

instantly the human condition. Both the assassination of Martin Luther King and the riots in the cities testify to the enduring fact of savage behavior in a supposedly civilized country.

President Johnson's decision against addressing Congress at this time may be indicative of a new realization in the White House that conventional formulas for pacification—federal spending and new "rights" legislation—aren't applicable at this time.

For years, American liberals have revealed an astonishing capacity for self-deception. In their swapping cliches about rights and equality, they have refused to deal honestly with latent violence in our society. Their partly-baked ideas about "social revolution," which have been trumpeted so loudly, took the form of an orgy of destruction in more than 50 cities. It is fair to make the accusation that those who aroused unreasonable expectations, and thereby bred frustrations, set the stage for disorder.

Where does the United States go from here? First of all, the survival of the United States demands a tolerable urban order. The majority won't tolerate many more long, hot summers that seem to stretch over almost 12 months, with outbreaks occurring year around. The basic requirement of any society is public order.

In city after city, streets have become unsafe. Citizens have had to avoid certain areas of cities at some hours of the day. If this process were to continue modern America would return to conditions of the Dark Ages in Europe when no man was safe in moving from castle to castle and towns were guarded with walls.

Law and order is the basic need and the principal issue, much more than seemed the case a week ago. The New York Times has said editorially that "there can be no hesitation, no timidity in protecting endangered cities." The plain truth is that cities, states and the federal government must equip themselves with whatever instruments of surveillance and control are necessary to prevent looting, arson and murder on a mass scale.

Lawless elements must be stripped of their ability to coerce cities and states and to plunge great communities into chaos. Far-reaching laws may be needed to accomplish this end. For example, legislation may be required to prevent advocacy of violence and uttering threats to burn.

We all can hope that as the economy grows, social bitterness may evaporate. In the meantime, however, the United States cannot allow a relatively small segment of the population to terrorize the vast law-abiding majority of both races. If anyone is going to overcome in the months and years ahead, it must be the people who obey the laws of city, state and nation.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Apr. 15, 1968]

ORGY OF CRIME IS A MYSTERY

(By David Lawrence)

Police from one end of the country to the other are baffled by the riots that have swept more than 100 cities and towns during the last few days. Arson, vandalism and looting have occurred in so many parts of a city simultaneously that previous planning seems to have been involved.

Though government authorities say they have no "evidence" of a conspiracy, law-enforcement agencies concede that nothing like the orgy of crime and destruction which has emerged in the past week has ever been witnessed in America. In some respects it resembles guerrilla warfare. The formula has been to provoke disorders in one section of a city, and, when police and firemen move in, then the looting and setting of fires with gasoline bombs are promptly started in another section. The originators of the arson have thus been able to escape.

Although more than 40 people were killed and many thousands were injured during the disturbances, the nation as a whole has not come to grips thus far with the methods of the rioters. Gangs of teenagers seem to have been formed and taught exactly how to start the riots. While the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., supposedly triggered a number of uprisings, it is recalled that for several weeks there have been predictions of riots and disorders. The assumption now is that the arsonists were ready to start the fires at any time an occasion arose which they could use as an excuse for their action.

What most Americans, both Negro and white, are puzzled about is the renewal of disturbances in places which were thought to have been quieted down. On Tuesday of this week, arsonists set more than 100 fires to homes and stores in the very same Negro district in Newark, N.J., where the riots occurred last summer. Hundreds were again left homeless, and stores were looted. The mayor said that "most of the fires were well planned and well organized" by arsonists.

Among the deaths the Negroes far outnumber the whites. Whether the purpose of it all is to inflame the entire Negro population or whether it is to break down authority generally is a mystery to the police. There is no question but that the riots have saddened the Negro population as much as the white and that it is a small minority which is responsible for the disturbances.

Some experts in guerrilla warfare claim that the Communists have always adopted a similar technique in smaller countries. Nobody in the Department of Justice or in the local police departments, however, has come forth with any charge that there has been foreign intrusion.

The disturbances on many of the college campuses have been regarded as "spontaneous." But it is well known that some students have been subverted by Communist agents and aroused to take rebellious action.

It requires a certain amount of planning to bring about the riots and to set the fires which have caused tens of millions of dollars of damage in the past week. Few arrests have been based on a charge of conspiracy. People generally are beginning to suspect that sooner or later facts will become available to confirm that 110 cities in the United States would never have been victimized by arsonists and looters if there had been no concerted effort in certain areas.

Violence can be stimulated by inflammatory speeches. While federal authorities say they have no evidence of a connection between speeches that have threatened disorder and the subsequent disturbances, more and more people are beginning to believe that some agents of subversion have been busily engaged in supplying guns and giving instructions on how to make and use "molotov cocktails." Various "marches" and "demonstrations have been scheduled and announced for the spring and summer of 1968. A series of disorders far more sensational than any witnessed last year is still expected.

Both federal and state troops have been mobilized in large numbers. The realistic fact is that instigators of riots are not being detected or apprehended. Congress is being stampeded into passing legislation to provide more civil-rights "reforms," but the Negro leaders themselves seem unable to cope with the virtual insurrection which has left its mark on almost every section of the country.

[From the Greenville News]

REASON MUST REPLACE THE TUMULT

It is tragic for the nation that it did not come to pass before the death of Martin Luther King, but it is now time, and past time, for the emotional orgy and attempt at deification of the victim to subside and for reason to prevail.

It is time for Americans of all races, colors and creeds, in high stations and low, in public office and private life, to come to their senses and to put the whole cause of "civil rights" and the betterment of the lot of the Negro people into proper perspective.

It is time for thinking and courageous men to stand up to the demagogues and the lawless elements to whom they appeal and say, in effect:

Millions for education and better health and housing for all people and for the care of the helpless indigent, but not one cent for the encouragement of the deliberately indolent; and millions for law enforcement for the equal protection of all citizens, but not one cent for blackmail.

We belatedly echo the warning of U.S. Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield that the Congress should not attempt to rush new civil rights bills to passage in the wake of the riots which followed the shooting of Dr. King. The nation generally, and especially the emotion-prone Negro people, have suffered an emotional trauma of one sort or another. Mansfield rightly reasoned that the atmosphere in the country and in the Capitol was not conducive to carefully reasoned and objective congressional action.

President Johnson must have reasoned the same way when he postponed indefinitely the special message to a joint session of the House and Senate which he originally had scheduled for last Monday night.

We would go even further and state that Congress too often has acted in this field more through emotion than reason. It has submitted to blackmail in the form of demonstrations and the threat and actuality of riots and violence more than once and the results have been only to make a bad situation worse.

About all that could be done by laws favoring minorities was done long ago, certainly with passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It was rushed through in a welter of emotion as a "memorial" to the late President Kennedy. Except for the anti-riot section, the main portions of the latest civil rights bill with the "open housing" provision just passed as a "memorial" to Dr. King can have no effect but more trouble.

The riots and violence since the fatal shot have seen to that.

Different methods of improving relations between the races, so that integrated housing can come, if it can come at all, voluntarily, must take the place of punitive federal laws and protest in the streets.

The next step, the highest priority now, is to restore civil peace and social order. This means the rebuilding of respect for law and order and for law enforcement. For the majority, it will require public relations of the highest order. For the minority, it will require the use of no-nonsense force to whatever degree is necessary to stop rioting and looting forays before they can get a good start.

Some consideration should be given to elite and specially trained anti-riot police forces in every state, or special units in big city departments, rather than a federal police force or the naked power of the regular military. The National Guards of none of the States are properly equipped for the job.

The re-establishment of law and order, for it has been wrecked, is necessary because the pattern of non-violent civil disobedience established by Martin Luther King has reached the point where it takes the form of militant and vicious violation of every law on the books.

King himself went from disobedience of pro-segregation laws to the flagrant disobedience of laws created to maintain civil order,

and the flouting of court decrees issued for the same purpose.

At the time of his death, he probably was headed for his final confrontation with the law. He was under a court injunction not to demonstrate again in Memphis, but said he would go ahead even though he knew violence had taken over the previous one. Only the presence of an overwhelming force for law and order prevented trouble during the march which his followers led in his stead, after the court injunction was lifted.

If that final confrontation with the law had not come in Memphis, it probably would have in Washington.

There can be no justification under the sun, morally or otherwise, for any of the violence which followed King's death. At this time the killer's identity is not known, and he is merely believed to be White. He may not be; it is not likely, but the officers could be pursuing the wrong man.

There is no doubt, however, that he is a sick man, a crackpot. He acted out of the same motives which caused a Negro man who, upon hearing of the death of King, declared he was going to get himself a "honkey." And he went out and killed his White neighbor.

Both killings were the acts of single individuals, not of all members of a White majority in the one instance, nor all of a Black minority in the other. This is what citizens and public officials alike must realize, and work together to stamp out lawlessness.

To get along together now, Negroes and Whites must turn to each other, as individuals, in an attitude of self-help and mutual assistance. Education, economic opportunity and religious inspiration (not merely a "social gospel" but genuine spiritual uplift) must be exploited to the limit as the only paths to real advancement and justice.

All must realize, and analyze, the fact that "equal protection of the law" means just that—equal; no more and no less. To assert the right to protection of the law is also to accept responsibility for helping to uphold the law.

The ultimate solution to the Negro's special problems, we are more than ever convinced now, lies not in laws discriminating in his favor to counteract discrimination against him, but in job opportunities. Economic advancement is a step toward educational and cultural advancement.

In this overriding factor, the ability and potential of private enterprise, with such government help as may be needed, is many times over that of government alone.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Apr. 12, 1968]

CONGRESS AND COERCION

Once again, in a humiliating abandonment of its role as a deliberative body, the Congress of the United States has allowed itself to be stampeded by pressures from the White House and riots in the streets.

This time, it was the House of Representatives which capitulated, swallowing outright a package of civil rights legislation assembled by the Senate. Earlier declarations of House intent to discuss the bill's provisions, especially those relating to "fair housing" practices, evaporated amid the Negro disorders that followed last week's assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King.

Serious questions arise as to the constitutionality of legislation that ultimately will prohibit the owners of about 80 per cent of America's housing from disposing of their own property as they see fit. Perhaps the entire package will wind up in the courts, but let us proceed in the reasonable expectation that the present Supreme Court will uphold this latest erosion of property rights.

Is it to be hoped that the enactment of this particular legislation will placate the Negro arsonists, looters, and anarchists who have been terrorizing America?

If anything, it is likely to urge them on to greater violence, now that they see how supinely the Johnson administration and its Congressional adherents submit to force and the threat of force.

When intimidation, like blackmail, begins to succeed, it becomes insatiable and incessant. The congressmen and the bureaucrats who think they have bought peace will find that they have just paid another installment on the price of surrender.

Americans now have another civil rights law, or they will have as soon as President Johnson can arrange an adequate fanfare for his signing the bill. Americans should obey the new law, even though it obviously was enacted in deference to that minority within a minority which flouts the law.

Even if there were good in the new statute, there is little cause to expect lasting benefit from any legislation that is rooted in emotion rather than in reason. And there is even less cause to look for leadership from a Congress which enacts such laws while cowering behind the protective bayonents of federal troops guarding the smouldering capital city of the United States.

This country must get back on the road to a disciplined and lawabiding society. Those who guide the nation's destiny today obviously have lost their way.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Apr. 13, 1968]

BURNING WASHINGTON

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—The Red Coats in August, 1814, and the blacks in April, 1968—they both tried to burn down the city named for George Washington, the capital of this republic, the seat of the government.

President Madison got on his horse and went out with several members of his Cabinent to try and rally the militia. He was no soldier and soon took flight, while his wife cut some of the portraits from their frames at the Executive Mansion and tried to save what other valuables she could from the looters.

President Johnson, who wears a military ribbon, acted promptly in calling out the federal troops, and putting a former Deputy Defense Secretary, Cyrus Vance, in over-all charge. But some of us last weekend who watched the ugly smoke of arson and vandalism polluting the lovely sky above the marble buildings and the flowery parks must have felt like the watchers in the War of 1812.

We were feeling, at least one of us, that fearful and inept politicians had let the enemy get the jump on us and had allowed the nation to fall into futility and disgrace.

Maybe Madison couldn't help it. We were a weak, young nation in his day. There is no such excuse in 1968. Perhaps we were luckier in 1814, for there was a climate of truth and resolution in the land. Soon after the sacking of Washington, the British fleet would be repulsed at Fort McHenry, Baltimore, and by January, Andrew Jackson at New Orleans would give us a victory that expunged the disgrace.

But truth wasn't to be found in official Washington last weekend, and resolution was sicklied over with fear and hypocrisy. "By the Eternal," Jackson had vowed when he learned that the Red Coats had landed, "they shall not sleep upon our soil."

But Lyndon Johnson fell into the feeble cliche and summoned Congress into joint session with the attackers' own slogan: "We shall overcome."

We—? The blacks who were putting buildings to the torch, and ransacking other men's properties, hardly deserved that brotherly pronoun. These were gangs of outlaws. These were foes of the government and the Constitution which Lyndon Johnson had taken his oath to defend.

It is not racism to recognize that this was an all-Negro assault upon the city. It is not racism to be honest about that. The lacking ingredient last weekend, last year, and for several terrible years, was the simple, forthright, self-evident quality that men call truth, but you couldn't find it in the words and actions of American leadership during this critical time when the nation wobbles from bad to worse.

Flags in the city, including the one over the White House, stood at half-mast for Martin Luther King, who had threatened to march on the capital later in April.

Let us speak well of the dead, and be sorry for any man's treacherous murder. But there is something psychotic about a nation that strikes its colors for an acknowledged troublemaker.

The local newspapers were sanctimoniously applying the word assassination to King's murder, as if he had been a public officer instead of a public menace.

There is something very cringing and cowardly about a government that fears to be candid with its people, and something lacking in responsibility when the press, protected by the Constitution in its truth-telling function, chooses the imposter-words that conceal the real situation in the language of hyperbole and pomposity.

We have an enemy in our midst, and the fault is more ours than his.

The Negro rioter has become an outlaw because we have condoned his lawlessness, and have tried to purchase his friendship, and have intoxicated him on the firewater of self-pity.

None of this means, of course, that the Negro citizen is incapable of self-government for he has been stupidly misled and mistutored.

But last weekend it looked very much as if we, the entirety of the American people, were the ones incapable of self-government. And what logically follows, incapable of self-defense.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 22, 1968]

WRECKERS INACTIVE AS RUBBLE REMAINS IN RAVAGED AREA

(By Donald Saltz)

There are several reasons why very little work has been done to remove the burned-out shells of riot-destroyed buildings along Seventh and 14th streets nw and H-st ne.

Gilbert C. Fisher, vice president and an owner of the Ace Wrecking and Building Material Co., one of the largest wreckers in the area, said the question of who's going to pay for the removal is the main one.

"We have to have a guarantee of payment," he said, "and there's question as to whether insurance companies will pay, or the District Government, or the property owner.

"Then, in some instances, if we wreck a building an adjoining one may fall over. Some building owners want to proceed with the work but adjoining property owners won't go along."

An example, he said, is a burned-out building at 813 H-st ne which should come down but if it did the one at 815 H-st would probably topple over. The two property owners must get together, Mr. Fisher said.

After wreckage, D.C. law requires that wood be separated and removed to prevent a fire hazard, and the land filled in. A number of owners are undecided on rebuilding.

Harold Sender, the executive wrecking supervisor for Reilly the Wrecker, said his company could have 50 wrecking jobs in the burned-out areas but the firm hasn't ac-

cepted even one of them. The question of payment is involved, as well as risks of leaving expensive wrecking equipment overnight in disturbance-prone neighborhoods.

"People are just not anxious to go into those neighborhoods" Mr. Sender said. "We have enough government and large contract work to keep us busy."

Mr. Fisher noted that he has received about 100 inquiries from owners of burned out buildings but has accepted only three of them, all "from friends."

He said the average cost of wrecking a building is $3,000 or $4,000, with three or four days required. The cost of renting and moving equipment in is a big factor, and it costs Ace about $4.75 an hour (including taxes, insurance, etc.) for laborers.

What happens if the rubble isn't cleared? The District Government could have it done and assess the property owners, along with taxes.

The D.C. Demolition Association is scheduled to meet today at the District Building to work out a uniform wrecking code.

A WELL-DESERVED HONOR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am sure that it will come as no surprise for the Senate to learn that our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has been awarded the first Speaker of the Year Award by the Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa forensic honorary society of West Virginia University.

Senator RANDOLPH is an excellent public speaker, as any Senator who has ever heard him address this body can attest.

The Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, of Saturday, April 20, noted Senator RANDOLPH'S award and said:

His selection as "Speaker of the Year" is a well-deserved tribute to a man who sets great store by the art of communication through the spoken word.

Mr. Randal L. Strother, the editor of the Clarksburg Exponent, on April 16, 1968, wrote an article with regard to the event which was attended by Senator RANDOLPH and at which he received the award. In his article, Mr. Strother stated that Senator RANDOLPH responded as the recipient of the plaque in this way:

He emphasized the need "for people to communicate with other people" and praised the opportunity "for the students to study and major in public speaking at West Virginia University.

"There should be," the Senator asserted, "additional emphasis on spoken communication."

In his response, the senior West Virginia Senator quoted the words of Aristotle, "Think like a wise man, but communicate in the language of the people."

My able colleague said, at the time, that it was his feeling that universities and colleges should devote more time to public speaking. Senator RANDOLPH stressed the need for understanding the structure of speech, and he appealed to students to get through to the audience and to work with the audience. I quote Senator RANDOLPH, as his words appear in the article published in the Clarksburg Exponent:

We have just reached a crossroads in civilization and we have just come to one of the great watersheds of history. Some speaker in the very near future—as they have in past periods of crises—may speak the right word at the right place at the right time.

Mr. President, I wish to express my gratification and appreciation to the panel which decided upon Senator RANDOLPH as the recipient of the first award of this kind in West Virginia. It was a distinguished panel, and Senator RANDOLPH'S name was chosen from among the names of 50 West Virginians which had been submitted to the panel for its consideration. I believe that its choice of Senator RANDOLPH as the speaker of the year was very appropriate and fitting. I believe that my colleague highly deserves this recognition, and I wish to congratulate him on the honor which has been bestowed upon him.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Fairmont Times, entitled "Speaker of the Year," together with the article which appeared in the Clarksburg Exponent of April 16, to which I have just alluded, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SPEAKER OF THE YEAR

It could scarcely have come as much of a surprise than when the Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa forensic honorary chapter at West Virginia University made an award for "Speaker of the Year" this week, the trophy went to U.S. Sen. Jennings Randolph.

The senior senator from West Virginia is a polished public speaker. In fact, he once taught courses in this field at Davis & Elkins, it is recalled. He generally has a carefully prepared text for his formal appearances, but so well does he always know his subject that his audiences are rarely conscious of his reading.

Some 50 West Virginians were nominated for the first award to be made by the WVU honorary. Judges narrowed the field down to seven and from the finalists came the name of Jennings Randolph. A handsome plaque and certificate were presented to the senator at a formal dinner in Morgantown.

Probably the most widely known orator this state ever had was the late U.S. Sen. Matthew Mansfield Neely of Fairmont whose seat Randolph now fills. Neely was of the "old school" and was most effective in speaking "off the cuff." His prodigious memory enabled him to lard his addresses with apt quotations from many sources, especially the Bible.

One of the best speech-writers West Virginia ever had was the late Gov. Herman Guy Kump. His style, like his language, was conservative as contrasted with Neely's free-wheeling liberalism, but it was effective and widely praised.

Most of West Virginia's orators flourished in the political field, and old-timers used to tell of their platform triumphs in a half-century that ended with the widespread use of radio. Campaigning, except for certain stalwarts like Neely, also changed and now, of course, television is the preferred medium for the message.

Senator Randolph, speaking either on the spur of the moment or from a prepared text, is never at a loss for words. He must make hundreds of speeches, short and long, over the course of a year and he generally has something different to say.

His selection as "Speaker of the Year" is a well deserved tribute to a man who sets great store by the art of communication through the spoken word.

SENATOR RANDOLPH IS RECIPIENT OF HIGH HONOR AT WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

MORGANTOWN.—United States Senator Jennings Randolph, known as one of West Virginia University's best orators of all times, was the recipient of the "Speaker of the Year" award here Monday night from the Delta Sigma Rho Tau Kappa Alpha Forensic Honorary chapter at West Virginia University.

The national organization has given "Speaker of the Year" awards for the past three years, but this is the first year that the award has been presented by the University Chapter here.

Approximately 50 West Virginians were on the original list of potentials for the award, but the judges narrowed the list down to seven and the chapter members and the judges then narrowed it down to the selection of Senator Randolph.

In the halls of Congress, in many places in West Virginia, and elsewhere in the Nation Senator Randolph's eloquent voice has pleaded many causes and persons at the gathering here Monday night said it was very fitting that he is the first "Speaker of the Year" for the University honorary.

The dinner was formal and it was held in Mountainlair of the University. President James Harlow of the University was one of the Honorary's special guests for the occasion.

The Rev. Joseph Gluck, director of student affairs at the University, gave the invocation. Professor William L. Barnett, Director of Forensics in the Speech Department at the University, told of the value of the Award. He introduced Benjamin Snyder of Clendenin, president of the chapter, who presented the beautiful plaque which goes with the award, along with the framed certificate, to Senator Randolph.

The plaque is a clock in gold color, with a man shown at a podium. Obviously, much thought had gone into the selection of the plaque.

Obviously pleased over his designation as "Speaker of the Year" and affected by the kind tribute as Snyder presented the plaque and certificate, Senator Randolph responded in fitting words.

He emphasized the need "for people to communicate with other people" and praised the opportunity "for the students to study and major in public speaking at West Virginia University."

"There should be," the Senator asserted, "additional emphasis on spoken communication."

In his response, the senior West Virginia Senator quoted the words of Aristotle, "Think like a wise man, but communicate in the language of the people."

The Senator said he feels that universities and colleges should devote more time to public speaking.

He stressed the need "for understanding the structure of the speech" and appealed to the students "to get through to the audience and to work with the audience * * *".

"We have just reached a crossroads in civilization and we have just come to one of the great watersheds of history," the Senator asserted. * * * "Some speaker in the very near future—as they have in past periods of crises—may speak the right word at the right place at the right time."

Dr. Walter H. Rockenstein, chairman of the Department of Speech at West Virginia University, was at the awards ceremony.

The students were all in formal attire, as were the guests, and the setting in Mountainlair was very pleasing to the eye.

Senator Randolph's longtime neighbor and friend, U.S. District Judge Robert E. Maxwell of Elkins, was one of the guests.

Another longtime friend present was T. Edward Davis, vice president of Salem Col-

lege. The latter was accompanied by his wife, Sylvia Davis, who is also an official of Salem College.

Mr. and Mrs. Sandford Randolph of Bridgeport and Clarksburg and their daughter, Virginia, were other guests.

Two secretaries in Senator Randolph's Clarksburg office, Mrs. Ruth McGraw and Mrs. Gayle Limbers, also were guests for this pleasant occasion at Mountainlair.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1052, S. 1401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "REVENUES." strike out "All revenues received on and after July 1, 1967 and prior to July 1, 1972, to the extent that such revenues otherwise would be deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the United States Treasury, under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U.S.C. 184 et seq.), as amended (except revenues received from lands within naval petroleum reserves), and under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 462; 43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), as amended (including the funds held in escrow under an interim agreement of October 12, 1956, between the United States and Louisiana, to the extent the United States is determined to be entitled to such escrow funds), and by or on account of the Forest Service which are disposed of pursuant to the provisions of law contained in section 499, title 16, United States Code.", and insert "For a period of five fiscal years from July 1, 1968, to June 30, 1973, the following portions, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, of the revenues due and payable to the United States for deposit in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462; 43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) as amended: Such amount as is necessary, in addition to the sum of the revenues and collections estimated to be covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (a), (b), and (c) of this section, to make the total income into the fund the amount of $200,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971, and $300,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973. For the purposes of this subsection, revenues shall include the funds held in escrow under the interim agreement of October 12, 1956, between the United States and the State of Louisiana to the extent the United States is determined to be entitled to such escrow funds."

"(b) The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 is amended by deleting the words 'for a total of eight years' and substituting in lieu thereof 'until the end of fiscal year 1969'. "; on page 3, at the beginning of line 9, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; in line 11, after the word "new" strike out "section:" and insert "sections:"; in line 15, after the word "years" strike out "1968" and insert "1969"; in the same line after the word "and" insert "1970"; at the top of page 4, insert:

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts for options to acquire lands, waters, or interests therein within the exterior boundaries of any area the acquisition of which is authorized by law for inclusion in the national park system. The minimum period of any such option shall be two years, and any sums expended for the purchase thereof shall be credited to the purchase price of said area. Not to exceed $500,000 of the sum authorized to be appropriated from the fund by section 3 of this Act may be expended by the Secretary in any one fiscal year for such options.

In line 14, after the word "area" insert "except property within national parks, or national monuments of scientific significance"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "owner" insert "or owners"; in line 5, after the word "which" strike out "he is" and insert "they are"; in line 7, after the word "such" strike out "owner wishes" and insert "owners wish"; in line 9, after the word "person" insert "or persons, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe"; in line 11, after the word "to" insert "pay"; and in line 13, after "(b)" strike out "Within a unit of the national park system or miscellaneous area in which exchange is authorized by law as a method for property acquisition, the Secretary may accept title to any non Federal property or interest therein within such unit or area and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property or interest any federally owned property or interest therein within any such unit or area, subject to such terms and conditions as he deems necessary; and insert "Within a unit of the national park system or miscellaneous area under the administration of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior may accept title to any non-Federal property or interest therein, and in exchange therefor the Secretary may convey to the grantor of such property or interest any federally owned property or interest therein under his jurisdiction which is in the same State or States where such unit or area is located and which he determines is suitable for exchange or other disposal."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2 of title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) OTHER REVENUES.—For a period of five fiscal years from July 1, 1968, to June 30, 1973, the following portions, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, of the revenues due and payable to the United States for deposit in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462; 43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) as amended: Such amount as is necessary, in addition to the sum of the revenues and collections estimated to be covered into the fund pursuant to subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, to make the total income into the fund the amount of $200,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971, and $300,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973. For the purposes of this subsection, revenues shall include the funds held in escrow under the interim agreement of October 12, 1956, between the United States and the State of Louisiana to the extent the United States is determined to be entitled to such escrow funds."

(b) The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 is amended by deleting the words "for a total of eight years" and substituting in lieu thereof "until the end of fiscal year 1969".

(c) Title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 8. Not to exceed $30,000,000 of the money authorized to be appropriated from the fund by section 3 of this Act may be obligated by contract during each of fiscal years 1969 and 1970 for the acquisition of lands, waters, or interests therein within areas specified in section 6(a)(1) of this Act. Any such contract may be executed by the head of the department concerned, within limitations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. Any such contract so entered into shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the United States and shall be liquidated with money appropriated from the fund specifically for liquidation of such contract obligation. No contract may be entered into for the acquisition of property pursuant to this section unless such acquisition is otherwise authorized by Federal law.

"SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts for options to acquire lands, waters, or interests therein within the exterior boundaries of any area the acquisition of which is authorized by law for inclusion in the national park system. The minimum period of any such option shall be two years, and any sums expended for the purchase thereof shall be credited to the purchase price of said area. Not to exceed $500,000 of the sum authorized to be appropriated from the fund by section 3 of this Act may be expended by the Secretary in any one fiscal year for such options."

SEC. 2. (a) With respect to any property acquired by the Secretary of the Interior within a unit of the national park system or miscellaneous area, except property within national parks, or national monuments of scientific significance, the Secretary may convey a freehold or leasehold interest therein, subject to such terms and conditions as will assure the use of the property in a manner which is, in the judgment of the Secretary, consistent with the purpose for which the area was authorized by the Congress. In any case in which the Secretary exercises his discretion to convey such interest, he shall do so to the highest bidder, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, but such conveyance shall be at not less than the fair market value of the interest, as determined by the Secretary; except that if any such conveyance is proposed within two years after the property to be conveyed is acquired by the Secretary, he shall allow the last owner or owners of record of such property thirty days following the date on which they are notified by the Secretary in writing that such property is to be conveyed within which to notify the Secretary that such owners wish to acquire such interest. Upon receiving such

timely request, the Secretary shall convey such interest to such person or persons, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, upon payment or agreement to pay amount equal to the highest bid price.

(b) Within a unit of the national park system or miscellaneous area under the administration of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior may accept title to any non-Federal property or interest therein, and in exchange therefor the Secretary may convey to the grantor of such property or interest any federally owned property or interest therein under his jurisdiction which is in the same State or States where such unit or area is located and which he determines is suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchange either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal, the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor from funds appropriated for the acquisition of land for the area, or to the Secretary as the circumstances require.

(c) The proceeds received from any conveyance under this section shall be credited to the land and water conservation fund in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; and that bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc, and the bill will be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 704

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending measure and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 1, strike out line 6 and all that follows through line 4, page 3, and insert the following:

"(d) OTHER REVENUES.— Such sums as may be appropriated for each fiscal year, out of any moneys in the Treasury and not otherwise appropriated, equivalent to the amount if any (as specified and made available in appropriation acts) by which the total of the revenues and collections covered into the fund under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, to make the total income into the fund amount to $200,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, and June 30, 1971, and $300,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that no further action will be taken on the bill this afternoon.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is my understanding there will be no votes this afternoon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. However, I believe it would be best that those who favor the bill should explain the bill first. Therefore, I shall reserve my remarks on the matter until the bill has been explained to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding. I understand the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will present the matter tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is my understanding also that the distinguished Senator from Washington will present the opening statement tomorrow.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 15398) to amend the National School Lunch Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 23, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 22, 1968:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Edward Weinberg, of Maryland, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, vice Frank Barry, resigned.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

George Henry Hearn, of New York, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1973 (reappointment).

U.S. ATTORNEY

Thomas A. Foran, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years vice Edward V. Hanrahan, resigned March 11, 1968.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air Force officer for appointment as permanent professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333(b), title 10, United States Code:

Rosser, Richard F., FR30540.

The following cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Abold, Phillip L.
Abramek, Edward T.
Abramson, Richard S.
Adams, Walter W.
Ahern, Daniel B.
Alexander, David R.
Alexander, James E.
Allard, David C.
Allen, David K.
Allhoff, Francis H., Jr.
Anderson, Kimmel R.
Armstrong, Michael E.
Ashford, Gary L., Jr.
Atwood, Charles R.
Aubrey, James R.
Ayres, Timothy R.
Baer, Craig A.
Bailey, Brooke P.
Bailey, Steven D.
Balazs, Brent W.
Barclay, Lawson E.
Barco, Leroy G.
Baribeau, Michael D.
Barker, Daniel J.
Barnard, Douglas M.
Barnes, Joseph W.
Barnes, Larry R.
Barrs, David M.
Bassett, Frederick E.
Batchelor, John D.
Bauer, Bertrand J.
Bazar, William A.
Beanblossom, Bobby V.
Beauregard, Alfred J.
Beckett, Mason H., Jr.
Bednarz, Michael H.
Beekman, William D.
Begert, William J.
Behr, Robert D.
Bell, Warren J.
Belwood, Lloyd E.
Bettcher, James R.
Bettencourt, Manuel J., Jr.
Bierer, Lindsey E., III
Birk, Frank T.
Bjork, James R.
Blackman, Robert M., Jr.
Bluhm, Steven A.
Blumberg, Alvin E., Jr.
Bogart, David B.
Bohner, Scott N.
Bole, Samuel J.
Bonfiglio, Victor J.
Booker, Richard L. V.
Boots, Robert J.
Borah, Steve B.
Bowen, Jack E.
Bowers, Ralph K.
Bowles, Ralph D.
Bowman, William R.
Brant, William E.
Brinkerhoff, Jerry L.
Brockett, William F.
Broussard, Raymond D.
Brown, Gerald W., Jr.
Brown, Rayford K.
Brown, William F., Jr.
Brumm, David N.
Bucchioni, Daniel T., Jr.
Buford, William L., Jr.
Buono, Bruce J.
Buraglio, Rockne J.
Burgamy, Michael B.
Burgess, Stanley H., II
Burke, Charles C.
Burkey, Bruce A.
Burnett, Byron C.
Burnham, Russell C.
Busch, Dennis H.
Busselle, James R.
Butler, Michael R.
Cahman, John A.
Camp, James R.
Carr, James F.
Carson, John P., III
Cartwright, Michael R.
Caudill, Elmon C., II
Caughlin Donald J., Jr.
Chapman, John C., Jr.
Chapman, Michael G.
Chrismer, Denny L.
Clarey, Robert F.
Clark, James R., Jr.
Clawson, Duane W.
Cobb, John S.
Cochran, James E.
Coe, Richard E.
Cole, Ray M., Jr.
Collazodavila, Vicente
Collins, Brent R.
Colt, Richard J.
Connors, Terrance L.
Coolidge, Charles H., Jr.
Cooper, Ralph C.
Corley, Charles J.
Cousins, Paul A.
Covey, Richard O.
Craig, William A.
Crimmel, William W.
Cryer, James M.
Cummings, Jack S., Jr.
Cupello, James M.
Current, William E.
Curtiss, Walter D.
Daley, Robert A.
Danney, Mark M.
Davidson, Thomas E.
Davis, Peter E.
Davitt, William F., III
Dean, Roger A.
Defazio, James E.
Degovanni, George
Dellwardt, David J.
Deloach, Johnny G.
Denny, John R.
Devereaux, Thomas P.
Dikkers, Gary L.
Dillman, Alan D.
Dorger, John M.
Dowsing, Philip Q.
Draper, Stuart D.
Draper, Thomas A.
Dreier, Thomas A.
Drenkowski, Dana K.
Drennan, William M., Jr.
Driggers, David A.
Dudley, Garry W.
Duffy, John E.
Duncan, Charles V. S., III
Duncan, Donald W
Duncan, Ian J.
Dunham, John L.
Dunkerley, Alan G.
Durham, George R., Jr.
Durocher, Cort L
Dyer, Allen R.
Eaves, Thomas J., Jr.
Eberhart, Ralph E.
Eckert, William D.
Ecung, Maurice
Eden, Anthony

Edlund, Maurice E., II
Eggert, Martin F.
Eikleberry Daniel J.
Eisenman, William J.
Ellis, John D.
Ellis, Richard P.
Ellison, Michael A.
Engel, Richard W.
Entsminger, Arlen R.
Estes, James T., Jr.
Evanoff, Larry L.
Evans, Michael
Everett, Warren D.
Faith, Gregory G.
Fallon, Richard E.
Farley, James H.
Fast, Richard C.
Fehrenbach, Theron C., II
Feinstein, Jeffrey S.
Ferron, John J.
Fields, Richard K.
Findeiss, Steven H.
Finlinson, William R.
Fitzgerald, Michael A.
Floyd, Bobby O.
Flynn, Dennis
Flynn, Paul H.
Forster, Richard E.
Fossum, Basil D.
Franz, Dale V.
Freeborn, Michael D.
Freeman, John R.
Frey, Richard
Frost, John C.
Funk, Larry J.
Gage, Thomas P.
Gaines, George P., IV
Gauntt, William A.
Genna, Donald J.
George, William F., II
Gerhardt, Clark L., Jr.
Gerrity, Bruce A.
Gibbons, Ronald E.
Gibson, Samuel B.
Gilchrist, Michael H.
Gillette, Glenn L.
Glade, Bernard W., Jr.
Gonda, John C., III
Gordes, Joel N.
Gorsuch, Geoffrey S.
Gosnell, Paul A.
Goyette, John A.
Graham, John, Jr.
Graham, John S.
Grail, Michael M.
Grant, Lee B., Jr.
Gray, Richard R., III
Green, William E.
Greene, Edward A., II
Greer, Eugene F.
Gregory, William E., Jr
Gross, Frederick G.
Groves, Weldon K., Jr.
Gruters, Terence J.
Gurley, John W., Jr.
Guth, William M.
Haas, Dennis B.
Hager, Robert J.
Hall, Gary F.
Hall, Richard B., Jr.
Hallenbeck, Ted B.
Hamilton, Danny W.
Hannig, Jack D.
Harkness, Thomas R.
Harlamor, Slava W.
Harrington, Don R.
Hart, Montie B.
Hastings, James R.
Hause, Orvil R., Jr.
Hayden, John E.
Hazen, James L.
Hebenstreit, Lowell G.
Hedrick, Joseph C., Jr.
Heffer, James E.
Heinig, Patrick E., Jr.
Hembrough, William M.
Henderson, Donald A.
Henson, David L.
Hernlem, Frederick J., III
Higley, Harold A., Jr.
Hilton, Robert G.
Hites, Daniel P.
Hix, James H., Jr.
Hoerter, George J., Jr.
Hoffman, Edward G.
Hoffman, George S., Jr.
Hoge, William H.
Holaday, William W.
Holland, Charles R.
Holmes, Charles P.
Hoppe, James D.
Houghton, Ernest J., III.
Howorth, Leon A.
Hughes, Robert L.
Humble, Forrest B.
Hungerbeeler, Henry L.
Hunn, David W.
Hunter, Cary D.
Hurley, Paul J.
Iacobucci, John A.
Iverson, Derek E.
Jackson, Charles A.
Jackson Paul V., III
Jackson, Ronald N.
Janssen, Carl A., Jr.
Jensen, Thomas C.
Jensen, Vay S.
Johnson, Henry T.
Johnson, James A.
Johnson, James R.
Johnson, Randall L.
Johnson, Robert E., Jr.
Johnston, Robert M.
Jones, Charles D.
Jones, John R.
Jones, Thomas M.
Julich, Arnold L.
Kapp, David L.
Karaffa, Michael J.
Kavcsak, Charles J.
Keiser, Alan E.
Kelley, Lee D.
Kelso, James V., III
Kerchner, Ronald L.
Kiernan, James D.
Killebrew, Kerry E.
Kimmel, Philip M.
King, Michael H.
Knittel, Carl A., Jr.
Knupke, Carl G.
Knutson, Darrel R.
Kocian, Dean F.
Kolbe, Ansfrid L.
Kollenberg, Charles L.
Kostiuk, John P.
Kramer, George C.
Kramer, Thomas N.
Krenek, David A.
Kroenke, David M.
Krupa, Joseph F.
Kurzdorfer, John C.
Kyle, Howard C., Jr.
Lambert, John M.
Lambert, Oakley J., II
Lamont, Warren C., Jr.
Lancaster, James W., Jr.
Lang, Michael R.
Langley, John M.
Lawson, Michael L.
Leikam, Gary E.
Leitner, Frederick K.
Leonard, Edward L. R.
Leonard, Raymond E., Jr.
Levitsky, George
Lewis, Charles T.
Lillis, Thomas M.
Lim, Alfred E., Jr.
Linsmayer, Robert M., Jr.
Lips, Walter C.
Long, Mahlon H. III
Longenecker, John B.
Loveland, Larry E.
Lozito, Vincent J., Jr.
Lushbaugh, Robert E.
Lutter, Robert N.
Lutton, Paul H.
Lynch, Charles L.
Lyons, James P.
Maahs, Lawrence O.
Macaluso, Robert T.
Mackay, John A.
Macon, John C.
Macwherter, John B., Jr.
Madsen, James E.
Madsen, Kenneth R.
Maguire, Robert A., Jr.
Malloy, John E., Jr.
Mann, David C.
Marek, Peter J., Jr.
Markham, William E., Jr.
Marks, Alan S.
Marks, Bruce S.
Marlier, Steven F.
Marshall, Marion A.
Martin, Franklin P., III
May, Gary A.
Maywhort, William W.
Mazurek, William J.
McAdory, Davis G.
McBride, Patrick J.
McCalley, Michael G.
McCants, Walter O.
McCloy, Thomas M.
McConnell, William A., Jr.
McDaniel, William T., Jr.
McDonald, Gary L.
McElreath, Kenneth W
McGraw, Vernon S., Jr.
McGray, Bruce D.
McKee, William B.
McKlendin, Paul B.
McLain, Dennis R.
McPhail, Steve A.
McPherson, Carl L.
Melgevold, David P.
Menarchik, Edward D.
Merideth, Edwin L., Jr.
Messinger, George E.
Meyer, James L.
Meyer, Thomas J.
Michel, Joseph
Miller, Arthur R.
Mills, Nathan B., Jr.
Mirabello, Robert A.
Miracle, Melvin L.
Mish, Stephen C.
Mitchell, Laurence W., III
Mizell, Richard L.
Mobley, Clark L.
Moffitt, Michael A.
Monti, Virgil V., Jr.
Moore, David P.
Moore, Francis M.
Moorman, Henry D.
Moran, Richard F.
Morgan, Felix E.
Morris, John K.
Morrison, Michael J.
Mosbach, Richard J.
Moseley, Roger A.
Moss, Michael W.
Motz, Donald F.
Moxon, Arthur L.
Mrosla, Donald J.
Mrosla, Duane F.
Mueller, Michael J.
Mugg, Richard D.
Mulkey, David K.
Nash, Fred M.
Navarro, Michael
Nelson, Richard E.
Neu, James E.
Nice, Robert E., Jr.
Nicholson, John C.
Nordyke, Gary L.
Norton, Robert
Obeirne, Thomas S.
Oberg, David L.
O'Brien, Michael J.
O'Brien, Robert S.
Oderman, Dale B.
O'Grady, James P.
O'Hara, Brian
Orvis, Kenneth G.
Otroszko, Victor
Owen, Albert K.
Packard, Stephen L.
Paige, Stephen F.
Palermo, Francis X.
Paquin, Richard G.
Pardee, Stuart F.
Parker, James R.
Parkinson, Michael G.
Parrish, Jeffrey L.
Pasko, Donald P.
Patterson, Richard J.
Patterson, William N., III
Pauli, Robert W.
Pavelko, Robert J.
Pearson, Michael L.
Pederson, Steven C.
Penry, Jonathan A. M.
Perroy, Vangel L.
Perry, Richard L.
Petersen, Robert L., Jr.
Petersen, Wayne B.
Phillips, David M.
Phillips, Macwain
Pigg, William L.
Pignataro, Philip J.
Pilkington, Jeffrey S.
Pohlman, Robert J.
Polk, Steven R.
Pollock, Elton T.
Prevost, David G.
Price, Alan W.
Price, Charles P., III
Prins, Barry E.
Probert, Richard C.
Pueppke, James E.
Pulver, Robert O.
Radasky, William A.
Rand, Jonathan G.
Rasor, Ronald D.
Read, Lewis C., III
Reaves, Michael E.
Reese, James W.
Reid, Stephen H.
Reyling, Robert A.
Rice, Tony E.
Richardson, Carl H., Jr.
Riemer, William D.
Risher, Don K.
Rittenhouse, John D.
Roberts, George L.
Roberts, Jackie L.
Robertson, Charles T., Jr.
Roget, Anthony J.
Rominger, John D.
Rosaluk, Warren J.
Rose, Eugene A., III
Roseman, Stephen R.
Ross, Ralph R., Jr.
Roulston, John A.
Rowell, William W.
Ruffing, Richard E.
Runnion, Jerome F.
Rusinak, Vincent R., Jr.
Russell, Patrick C.
Russell, William C.
Ryder, John L.
Sallee, Robert J.
Sanantonio, Ralph C., Jr.
Sasz, William L.
Saunders, Jack D.
Sawyer, Wallace B., Jr.
Schenk, Donald
Schmidt, Philip M.
Schmidt, Stephen S.
Schober, Wayne R.
Schroeder, John B.
Schuder, Raymond G.
Schultz, Warren M., Jr.
Schwengels, Forrest V., II
Seevers, James S.
Seifert, Charles W.
Sharp, Michael W.
Shattuck, Julian W.
Shepherd, William G.
Shuey, Gregory N.
Shumway, Robert A., Jr.
Siegfried, Robert B.
Sievers, Richard B.
Sigafoos, Walter H., III
Sindle, Roger A.
Singer, Edmund J.
Smith, Hal C., II
Smith, Joseph W.
Smith, Karl H. S.
Smith, Richard H.
Smith, Richard H.
Sorensen, Roger W.
Sotak, Michael A.
Squier, Craig C.
Staley, Robert S., II
Starkey, Richard N.
Steiling, Carl H., Jr.
Stephens, Dale F.
Stevens, Benjamin C.
Stevenson, Michael G.
Stewart, David A.
Stewart, Duncan B.
Stewart, Kenneth M.
Stidmon, Zackary.
Stier, Robert A.
Stitzer, Phillip L.
Stockton, Charles R.
Stodick, Leroy D.
Stokes, Ronald H.
Strickland, Jack L.
Strobel, David J.
Stubbs, Rodney E.
Sullivan, Gerard R.
Sullivan, John R. L.
Sullivan, John V.
Sullivan, Troy L., II.
Sutton, Donald A.
Swanger, Kenton N.
Swanson, John F.
Swedberg, Chad L.
Tacey, Gary R.
Taibl, Paul E.
Tanaka, Milton K.
Taverney, Thomas
Taylor, William W., Jr.
Tedor, John B.
Teeter, Gary W.
Teich, Richard J., Jr.
Templin, Ralph J.
Terry, James G.
Thomas, Edwin A.
Thomas, James W., Jr.
Thomas, Michael R.
Thompson, Gene S.
Thompson, James E.
Thomson, Stephen W.
Thomson, Stuart W.
Thorburn, David E.
Thrapp, Stephen R.
Thrower, Michael B.
Thurston, William H., III.
Tichenor, Charles K.
Toof, Jonathan A.
Torreano, Mark A.
Towt, Howard C.
Turchick, William A.
Uhls, Willis G.
Vail, Thomas M.
Vanamerongen, William G.
Vandekamp, John W.
Varhall, Gregory.
Vasek, Gary R.
Vazquez, Alfonso, III.
Veteto, Benny M.
Vihel, Richard S.
Voris, Russel E.
Vorwald, David M. J.
Wagner, Gordon F., Jr.
Wagner, Michael J.
Waldron, Philip K.
Walker, Russell C.
Wallace, Martin M.
Walsh, William J.
Watkins, John J., Jr.
Wauer, George G.
Webb, Jack B.
Weishaar, Henry A.
Welsh, John R., Jr.
Wentzel, Eric P.
West, James D.
Wevodau, Frederick H., Jr.
Whittenberg, Karl F.
Wierzbanowski, Theodore J.
Wiggins, James P.
Wiles, Roger L.
Wilhelm, Kenneth L.
Williams, Robert T.
Willis, Robert H.
Wilson, Robert J., Jr.
Wilson, Wayne D.
Windham, Donald R.
Wise, Francis C.
Wood, William B.
Woodside, Bertram J.
Worrell, Rowland H., III.
Wyngaard, Gerald F.
Yamamoto, Walter M.
Yoos, Charles J., II.
Zagzebski, Kenneth P.
Zauber, Glenn R.
Zubrod, Terry.
Zyroll, Thomas C.

The following midshipman, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon his graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Blank, Richard A.

The following cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Adam, George F., Jr.
Altemose, James L.
Bayer, John P., Jr.
Brown, Robert M., II
Broyhill, Ted K.
Burns, Robert A.
Curran, William M.
Dauth, Michael A.
Davis, Louis S.
Dienes, Nicholas S.
Donohue, Stephen P.
Havey, Michael E.
Hiatt, Victor E.
Hobbs, Edmund R.
Hoblit, Frederic H.
Mase, Roy W.
Miller, William S.
Murray, Malcolm M.
Newsome, Earl E.
Robertson, Lewis H.
Sands, Arthur C.
Swan, Peter A.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

East Cleveland Is Responding to Challenge of Urban Change

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, East Cleveland, a municipality in my 22d Ohio Congressional District, is a good example of what can be accomplished at the local level, with a minimum of Federal help, to meet problems which are being experienced in urban areas all over the Nation.

The story of East Cleveland was vividly pointed out in a recent article by Anthony Ripley which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, April 7, 1968. Believing my colleagues will be interested, I include the article which follows:

EAST CLEVELAND IS RESPONDING TO CHALLENGE OF URBAN CHANGE

(By Anthony Ripley)

EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO.—This aging suburb of 43,000 crammed into a three-square-mile area has become a testing ground for meeting the challenge of urban change.

Once only a toll stop on the road from Cleveland to Euclid, Ohio, and later the site of John D. Rockefeller's summer home, East Cleveland is undergoing dramatic change.

In 1960, it had a 2.8 percent Negro population. Today the percentage is 38.8. Few white families are moving to East Cleveland.

Ten years ago, 65 per cent of its white residents were retired. Today the figure is only 15 per cent.

With this change have come heavy pressures on city services and conversion of a number of time-worn houses from the settled ways of retirees to the pounding of young, growing families. The shock of this new wave of children extends through the school system.

East Cleveland has not tried to hold back the Negro tide. Instead, suburban officials say they are determined to meet the challenge it presents.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders notes an "unwillingness or inability of local government to respond" to problems brought on by high concentrations of low-income Negro families.

CAPACITY TO RESPOND

East Cleveland has such a high concentration. It also has a capacity to respond: a low tax rate, a city government generally regarded as progressive, a manageable size and a demonstrated sense of urgency.

Its responses thus far read like a list of recommendations for action by the riot commission: City officials have increased services and begun a series of immediate action programs with citizen participation.

The aim is to make the suburb a place where slums will be prevented and both whites and Negroes will be eager to move in.

Dr. John B. Turner, dean of the Department of Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University, was one of the first Negroes to move into a white neighborhood in East Cleveland. He is a member of the five-man city commission.

"It is a fascinating experiment—an important one for all of us," he said.

The raw material for the experiment is a suburb that travelers hardly notice as they drive east on Euclid Avenue 20 minutes from Cleveland's downtown Public Square. It could be just another anonymous extension of older East Side neighborhoods, with many of the double-decked two-family wooden houses that are almost a Cleveland landmark.

Home prices in the suburb start about $10,000. That can buy half a two-family house 50 years old on a 35-by-90-foot lot. These are potential slums.

UPPER-INCOME HOMES

Most houses were built between 1900 and 1930, but there is a small subdivision of upper-income homes built since World War II and some huge slate-roofed brick houses built by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. in the nineteen-thirties. Both are near the wooded 180-acre Forest Hill Park, which the Rockefeller family donated to the city. Prices range up to $75,000.

Several high-rise apartment buildings and garden apartments have risen since the war. They are an attempt to expand the city's tax base, which has only a scattering of industry besides the General Electric Corporation's Nela Park complex, headquarters of its lamp division.

Grant T. Apthorp was finance director in East Cleveland for 40 years when he took over as city manager in 1961. One of his first actions was to announce at a Kiwanis Club meeting that the city was changing racially and services would have to be stepped up immediately.

Since then, street lighting has been modernized and doubled. A housing code enforcement program was started and expanded with an $825,000 Federal grant. It will include resurfacing almost every street in the city. The pace of sidewalk and curb repair and tree planting has accelerated.

The city's twice-a-week garbage and rubbish pickup was extended to offer free service to all merchants.

But Mr. Apthorp and the city commission agreed more should be done.

Last May they asked Arthur D. Little, Inc., a management concern in Cambridge, Mass., to design a major program with three aims: to maintain a racially integrated city, to improve services and to build community leadership. Both Negro and white leaders asked for the study.

SURVEY OF CITY

The company immediately began a survey, with 250 residents helping sample 25 per cent of the city. Within two months it suggested a number of steps in a 161-page report. Among them were these:

A Community Renewal Program. It is now under way with a $150,000 Federal grant to examine needs and develop goals and set an action plan for the future. Such studies generally take two years. East Cleveland hopes to have it done in six months.

Urban renewal for a blighted commercial strip. Washington would not fund a $265,000 survey and planning application that is the first step in Federal urban renewal programs. The city hired architects at $50,000 to develop an immediate plan.

Neighborhood Workshop Program. Three workshops are operating and paid for by part of the code enforcement grant. Their aim is to involve resident's in planning the Community Renewal Program, to handle neighborhood complaints and increase contacts between whites and Negroes at all economic levels. Among topics they study are city health and welfare programs, recreation and job training.

A planning study for better schools. The East Cleveland Board of Education, which is separate from city government, has an $18,000 contract with the Little concern for such a study.

On April 13, the suburb is holding Easter egg rolls in the parks as neighborhood mixers. On April 20 it plans a citywide citizens convention, growing out of workshops. On May 26, a citywide open house is planned. Private homes in all price ranges will be open for all to visit.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on March 13, 1968, there were placed in the RECORD, on page 6367, portions of recent statistics prepared by the Federal Power Commission purporting to show the profits of privately owned electric utility companies. In part, this material cast the distinct but quite erroneous impression that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission allows electric companies in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to reap unconscionable "overcharges" from their consumers.

An article published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 17, 1968, repeated these accusations. I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed at this point in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FIGURES FOR 1966 RELEASED: PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC OVERBILLS FOR $13 MILLION

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—Statistics just released by the Federal Power Commission suggest that the Philadelphia Electric Co. overcharged its customers even more in 1966 than the previous year, according to Sen. Lee Metcalf (D., Mont.).

Metcalf, a champion of stricter State and Federal regulation of the privately owned power companies, created a stir last fall when he unveiled Federal data indicating Philadelphia Electric enjoyed an "overcharge" of $10,548,000 in 1965.

Last week the Montana Senator was back with new data from the Federal Power Commission for the year 1966—showing that Philadelphia Electric reaped $13,032,000 in operating income over and above the 6 percent rate of return deemed as equitable by many authorities.

The report, which Metcalf entered into the Congressional Record, showed that Philadelphia Electric had operating income of $65,888,000 in 1966, compared with $62,858,000 the year before.

He said this represented a rate of return of 7.48 percent for 1966. According to Federal reports here, the allowed rate of return for utilities in Pennsylvania is 5.9 percent, established by the Public Utility Commission in 1960.

Metcalf said Philadelphia Electric was one of 19 utilities whose "overcharges" totaled more than $10 million in 1966. The leader, by his computations, was Commonwealth Edison of Illinois, with an overcharge of $42.8 million.

Public Service Electric & Gas of New Jersey ranked fifth from the top with $15.4 million and a rate of return of 7.27 percent.

Metcalf told the Senate the profits of the power industry were "exorbitant," that they had risen from 7.08 percent in 1962 to 7.44 percent in 1966.

"The ineffectiveness of public utility regulation was recognized in the President's economic report last month," the Senator said. He noted the following reference in the report to the public utilities:

"Although their capital costs per unit of output have undoubtedly risen, their profits have increased at an exceptional rate."

The FPC data cited by Metcalf indicated that seven other utilities operating in Pennsylvania also had operating income well beyond the 6 percent rate.

The companies and the "overcharge" ascribed to each:

Duquesne Light Co., $9.3 million; Metropolitan Edison, $3.3 million; Pennsylvania Electric Co., $4.1 million; Pennsylvania Power Co., $1.6 million; Pennsylvania Power and Light Co., $1.6 million; United Gas Improvement Co., $576,000, and West Penn Power Co., $6.6 million.

"Overcharges" by New Jersey utilities, in addition to Public Service, included Atlantic City Electric Co., $2.3 million; Jersey Central Power & Light, $4.2 million; New Jersey Power & Light, $764,000, and Rockland Electric, $184,000.

Metcalf ascribed a $2.5 million overcharge to the Delmarva Power & Light Co. of Delaware.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the chairman of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, George I. Bloom, has issued a public statement, as a result of the news story, answering these accusations. In his statement, Mr. Bloom expressed his reluctance "to answer similar accusations earlier because it was not the responsibility of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission to defend the utilities." He said:

However, I think it is time for a complete statement—once and for all—in face of the insinuation that the state commission operates ineffectively.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Chairman Bloom's statement be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION CHAIRMAN BLOOM RESPONDS TO SENATOR METCALF'S STATEMENTS REGARDING ELECTRIC CHARGES

There is absolutely no truth to the latest in a series of unsubstantiated reports making it appear that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission allows the electric companies under its jurisdiction to overcharge their customers.

The newest of these reports appeared in a Philadelphia Inquirer story written by Jerome S. Cahill out of Washington, D.C., on March 17, covering statements made to him by Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana, relating to alleged overcharges based on misunderstood Federal Power Commission statistics.

Senator Metcalf is described as saying that eight electric utilities in Pennsylvania overcharged their customers in 1966, with the Philadelphia Electric Company supposedly overbilling some $13 million that year. He further indicated that this was due to the "ineffectiveness of public utility regulation."

I was reluctant to answer similar accusations earlier because it was not the responsibility of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission to defend the utilities. However, I think it is time for a complete statement—once and for all—in face of the insinuation that the state commission operates ineffectively.

While it is not my purpose to defend public utilities, as I said, it is my purpose to point out that the Public Utility Commission of Pennsylvania is administering its responsibility in accordance with the law, and the electric companies in the state are not being permitted to collect overcharges as claimed by Senator Metcalf.

The rate of return to the electric utilities is fair and reasonable, and earnings are not excessive despite Senator Metcalf's distorted view based entirely on FPC statistics—not state regulatory commission data.

On the contrary, the state's electric industry has reduced the annual bills of consumers by some $44 million since 1960. These reductions were made by the cooperative efforts of the industry and the Public Utility Commission as result of continued studies of quarterly reports the companies are required to file.

The overcharge contentions stem chiefly from misinterpretation of the statistics compiled annually by the Federal Power Commission from reports submitted by electric utilities throughout the U.S. It should be noted that FPC, which compiles the data for informational purposes only, has jurisdiction over wholesale rates, not retail rates dealt with by the PUC.

The FPC report for 1966 notes that its review of rates of return is not intended as an evaluation of the reasonableness of any electric utility earnings under applicable state regulatory standards.

FPC's method of calculating rate of return varies widely, and significantly, from methods of evaluation utilized by state regulatory commissions. The methods also differ distinctly from state to state.

Since such sharp distinctions exist between FPC's rate computations and those in Pennsylvania and elsewhere, no accurate conclusions as to rate of return can—or should—be drawn from the federal agency's data without consideration of evaluations used by the respective state or states.

The return to the majority of the power companies—based on the fair-value-of-plant formula prescribed by law in this state—runs slightly below or slightly above six per cent. Senator Metcalf, however, came up with a 7.48 per cent return for Philadelphia Electric by following FPC's completely different method of calculation.

At best, the claimed overcharges would have to be based on only the average depreciated original cost of the plant for the year 1966, in line with the basic factor used by FPC. This, of course, ignores entirely the fair return on the fair value of the used and useful utility plant—the basis on which rates are adjudicated by law in this state.

In arriving at fair value, the PUC must consider other measures, such as trended depreciated original cost, depreciated reproduction cost and the cost of capital.

The FPC report points out that no one rate of return is universally applicable, but the allowable rate of return will differ from one company to another and among different jurisdictions. Thus, it appears that Senator Metcalf either did not read this section or chose to ignore it.

Consideration given each company for its cost of capital will vary according to the company's capital structure and its historic and present cost of capital. Therefore, the Pennsylvania PUC makes it clear that the FPC report is not intended to be used for comparison based upon any assumed or fixed rate of return.

It is interesting to note that Senator Metcalf himself said in testimony on July 26, 1967, before the New York State Constitutional Convention's Committee on Economic Development, that perhaps a 7 to 7½ per cent return could be established by utilities as a proper basis.

He pointed out that the traditional 6 per cent return, reached by regulatory commissions and decisions of state and federal courts in a long line of precedent, is "perhaps inadequate in these present days of developing high interest rates."

In that connection, I call attention to the fact that the Federal Communications Commission recently found the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, in a nationwide rate case, entitled to a 7 to 7½ per cent rate of return on an average net investment (depreciated original cost) rate base.

I would also call to the attention of Senator Metcalf, and other critics of power rates, that the PUC's close scrutiny of electric utility quarterly report earnings is a solid safeguard against excessive returns. It has also been responsible for the multi-million-dollar rate reductions by electric utilities in recent years.

These quarterly reports bring to mind one other glaring misconception growing out of the FPC's statistical report. The news account quoting Metcalf said that, according to federal reports, the allowed rate of return for utilities in Pennsylvania is 5.9 per cent, established by the PUC in 1960.

That return was found after a formal rate case affecting a single company. There simply is no such thing as a fixed rate of return at a fixed time in the past, blanketing all electric utilities. The return of any public utility changes up or down in line with circumstances affecting its particular operating picture at a given time. This is why we make the quarterly report studies.

In view of these misunderstandings, I have asked that the Federal Power Commission consider revisions in the format of its report to make it more readily understandable for accuracy of interpretation. I've also asked it to emphasize the differences in the methods of arriving at rate base and a fair rate of return.

It is my hope that, in the future, any study of the FPC statistics be made in context with applicable rate-making standards of state regulatory commissions. In that regard, I urge anyone contemplating use of the FPC report to call on us for explanation of the Pennsylvania PUC's relation with it to end wholly erroneous, misguided and utterly false impressions.

Your Opinion, Please

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a mail poll of my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Michigan. Over 22,000 persons responded and gave me the benefit of their views of 15 vital issues. I am delighted with this response and encouraged that so many citizens would take the time to make their voices heard in Washington.

I would like to take this opportunity to make the entire membership aware of the results of this survey:

YOUR OPINION, PLEASE

(Second annual questionnaire results, Second District of Michigan, by MARVIN L. ESCH, Member of Congress)

[Results in percent]

1. Realizing that the war raises many complex questions and problems, which of the following general courses of action do you favor in Vietnam?

a. Continue present policy ---------- 7
b. Immediate withdrawal ---------- 23
c. Gradual deescalation and gradual withdrawal ---------- 34
d. Step up military effort ---------- 31

2. Would you favor neutralization of Southeast Asia by major world powers?

Yes ---------- 49
No ---------- 28
No opinion ---------- 23

3. Do you favor foreign travel restrictions as a means of lessening our balance of payments deficit?

Yes ---------- 30
No ---------- 63
No opinion ---------- 7

4. Do you think the Government has done enough to avoid riots in our cities?

Yes ---------- 13
No ---------- 78
No opinion ---------- 9

5. Should Congress extend financial aid to local law-enforcement agencies for such things as training and equipment?

Yes ---------- 53
No ---------- 38
No opinion ---------- 9

6. Do you favor legislation to control mail order gun sales?

Yes ---------- 70
No ---------- 26
No opinion ---------- 4

7. Should Congress adopt stricter penalties for those who deal in illegal drugs?

Yes ---------- 83
No ---------- 12
No opinion ---------- 5

8. Would you favor an expansion of private industry involvement in programs to train the unemployed for jobs?

Yes ---------- 89
No ---------- 6
No opinion ---------- 5

9. Should Congress pass a housing program which would encourage home ownership by low income families through private and nonprofit agency participation?

Yes ---------- 63
No ---------- 24
No opinion ---------- 13

10. Do you favor a national program to provide health services for young children of needy families?

Yes ---------- 62
No ---------- 30
No opinion ---------- 8

11. Should Congress provide financial aids so that all qualified, needy students could attend college?

Yes ---------- 52
No ---------- 40
No opinion ---------- 8

12. Do you favor collective bargaining for farmers?

Yes ---------- 37
No ---------- 37
No opinion ---------- 26

13. Should future farm legislation place greater emphasis on supply and demand rather than Government control?

Yes ---------- 77
No ---------- 9
No opinion ---------- 14

14. Do you favor an income tax increase as recommended by the President?

Yes ---------- 20
No ---------- 75
No opinion ---------- 5

15. Do you think the President and the Congress have done an adequate job of establishing spending priorities in a time of war?

Yes ---------- 11
No ---------- 75
No opinion ---------- 14

Arson in Washington

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I submit for printing in the Extensions of Remarks the articles relating to arson in Washington.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 22, 1968]

ARSONISTS SET THREE OF FIVE BLAZES, OTHERS PROBED: 5 & 10 BURNED OUT, WAREHOUSES AND APARTMENT HIT

(By Woody West)

The District's criminal arson squad and fire officials were investigating five fires in the city yesterday and early today—three of them arson cases and the other two suspected as such.

In a sixth fire, of undetermined origin, early yesterday, three persons were injured when they were forced to leap from upper floors of a 4th Street NW rooming house. One man was hospitalized. The most recent blaze, at 5 o'clock this morning, destroyed a three-story brick building at 2008 14th St. NW, and firemen rescued five persons from apartments on the second and third floors. There apparently were no injuries.

The Federated 5 & 10¢ Store, occupying the ground floor, was burned out. Firemen battled for nearly three hours to bring the blaze under control. The store had been looted during the riots that erupted early this month in the same area.

YOUTHS SEEN FLEEING

District Fire Capt. Robert Gourlay said the fire was definitely arson. He said several youths were seen fleeing from the area shortly before the fire was reported.

City housing inspectors declared the four apartments in the building unsafe for occupancy as firemen were wetting down the ruins. The rear of the building caved in during the fire.

Extensive damage was reported last night when fire engulfed a warehouse at 1321 7th St. NW, another area severely hit during the riots.

Police said the blaze, reported about 9 p.m., was set, apparently at the rear of the building, which houses the Acme Stove Co. and H. Colman & Sons Hardware.

About 20 minutes before the fire was discovered, police said a window had been smashed at a carry-out several doors away.

FURNITURE STORE FIRE

Arson also is suspected in a small fire at 1:20 a.m. today at the Giant Sales Furniture store, 1243 H St. NE. Police said burglars apparently entered the store by cutting a hole in a rear wall of the store and that witnesses saw a car leaving the area at a high speed shortly before the fire.

A fire in a barber shop at 5571 Central Ave. SE, apparently set early this morning to cover a burglary attempt, caused moderate damage when the seats of two barber chairs were slit and the stuffings set afire.

Inez Ballard, the owner, told police that sometime between 10 p.m. Saturday and 1 a.m. today, when the blaze was discovered, a portable television set, radio, electric clippers and other barber equipment were stolen from the shop. A rear door lock had been forced.

A vacant apartment was burned out, an adjacent carryout and a previously riot-burned liquor store were damaged yesterday in a Northeast fire. The fire marshal's office said the fire was set.

BLAZE SPREADS

The fire spread from the apartment at 1607½ Kenilworth Ave. NE to Georgia's Carryout at 1617 and then to the debris of Kenilworth Liquors at 1615 Kenilworth. Firemen fought the blaze, reported shortly after 2:30 p.m., for more than an hour.

The fire started in the apartment, which suffered major damage, fire officials said.

The fire early yesterday morning at the rooming house at 1722 4th St. NW apparently started in an unoccupied first-floor rear room and quickly spread up a stairwell to the second floor, where several rooms were damaged, and into the basement. It was discovered at about 3:40 a.m.

William Hargrove, 33, was reported in satisfactory condition at the Washington Hospital Center today, suffering from possible hip fractures sustained when he was forced to leap from a second floor window.

Gail Brooks, 18, who also jumped from a second floor window, and Cecelia Woodland, 49, who leaped from a first-floor window, were treated for cuts at the hospital center.

Cause of the blaze is being investigated.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 16, 1968]

STORES MAY BURN AGAIN, BARRY TELLS BAR GROUP

(By John Fialka)

The director of program operations for Pride, Inc., said yesterday that businesses destroyed during the rioting will be burned again if they are rebuilt without giving economic control to the Negro community.

Marion Barry, wearing his green Pride jacket, declared at a luncheon of the Federal Bar Association that it no longer will be "business as usual" for white businessmen in areas such as 14th Street NW.

"These things weren't burned down as a result of a natural disaster like a hurricane," said Barry.

"If they're built back the same way, they are going to be burned again," he added.

RULES FOR ACCEPTANCE

He suggested that white businessmen who want to be accepted in the "black community" should rebuild on a partnership basis, giving control of 51 percent of their business to Negroes.

A portion of the profits from such an operation also would have to be earmarked for the community, such as for providing more recreation facilities, the Pride leader said.

Barry complained that many studies of the Negro community, such as the one by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, were wrong because the Negroes interviewed had "run game" with the people who were studying them.

"That means to tell the white sociologist and white planners what they want to hear and not what we feel," said Barry.

He said the basic cause of urban disorders is not white racism but "economic insecurity in the black community."

The shopping area of 14th Street NW that was heavily damaged during the riots, Barry said, was a place where shoppers could "walk up and down the street and get shoddy goods."

Any urban planning to rebuild the area, he said, should include better stores, and a greater dispersion of liquor stores. "Some

intersections up there have a liquor store on each corner."

NO GUARANTEE

Asked by an attorney whether a businessman who complied with his rules could put a "soul brother" sign on his window, Barry replied:

"I can't guarantee anything because I'm not doing the burning, so I don't know." He added that a business that was community-controlled would be more likely to avoid damage in any future disturbance.

Robert Jackson, legal coordinator of Pride, said about 8 percent of the "dudes" who work for the organization were arrested during the riot.

Most of the arrests occurred, he said, "because they just hadn't heard about the curfew." Pride has about 1,200 youths on its payroll.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 18, 1968]

FOUR FRESH FIRES SET IN DISTRICT; ONE MAN DIES: TWO OTHER BLAZES ERUPT AFTER ARREST IN RIOT-TORN AREA

(By Walter Gold and William Delaney)

Six fires of suspicious origin—four of them listed as arson—erupted yesterday and early today, in riot-scarred areas of the city, claiming at lease one life, according to police.

The outbreak of scattered fires followed an afternoon of tension around 14th and U Streets NW, the area where the April 5 riot broke out.

During the arrest of a man on a narcotics charge there, he was cut on the hand, touching of false rumors that he had been beaten to death by police.

The arrest was followed within an hour by a two-alarm fire of "suspicious origin" at an already burned-out clothing store in the neighborhood.

During the night, after District government and civil rights leaders had attempted to calm that situation by securing the arrested man's release on personal bond, five other fires were reported in areas touched by the looting and arson that erupted in the city two weeks ago tonight.

RESTOCKED, REOPENED

The only major pre-dawn fire destroyed the Standard Drug Co. store at 1115 H St. NE., which had restocked and reopened only a week ago after the April 5 looting, causing about $200,000 damage.

Police recovered the body of one suspected looter from the charred building this morning and were seeking another who they thought they had heard screaming in the flaming store.

The tense situation at 14th and U Streets, followed the arrest of 28-year-old Kenneth Baggage of 2523 14th St. about 12:45 p.m. yesterday on a charge of violation of the Uniform Narcotics Act by possession of illegal drugs.

As police scuffled with Baggage on the sidewalk, he was sprayed in the eye with a chemical pacifier by police and also was struck in the head. Police said it was a bottle thrown from a crowd that hit Baggage, but several witnesses insisted that he had been pistol whipped by the arresting officer. One man in the crowd, James Edwards, was arrested for failure to move on.

FLYERS DISTRIBUTED

Within hours, after firemen arrived about 1:49 p.m., to battle a blaze at the Lincoln Clothing Store in the 1900 block of 14th Street, flyers entitled "Racist Cops Strike Again" were being distributed from the nearby Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee headquarters.

The arson squad today was still investigating the origin of the fire in the vacant clothing store, which had been burned out during the violence more than a week ago.

Groups gathered on the sidewalk to watch the fire and discuss the arrest.

The suspect, meanwhile was taken first to D.C. General Hospital, where he received two stitches in the head, and then to 13th Precinct headquarters.

RETURNED TO SCENE

He was arraigned about 7 p.m. before General Sessions Court Judge Charles W. Halleck and released in $5,000 personal bond assured by Washington Urban League chief Sterling Tucker, who took Baggage back to 14th and U "so the people could see him."

In the interim, Mayor Walter E. Washington—who had visited the scene of the clothing store fire—held a closed-door meeting at his office with Human Relations Commissioner Ruth Harris Bates and about six witnesses to the arrest.

According to police, black power activist and former SNCC leader Stokely Carmichael talked to the crowd during the afternoon.

A newsman observed SNCC workers cranking out copies of the handbill in their office and later distributing them.

The handbill accused the arresting officer, Pvt. Anthony Segaria, of pistol-whipping Baggage, and said Segaria and his partner, Pvt. William E. Larman, "fired indiscriminatedly into the crowd" that gathered.

Police spokesmen went on Radio WOL about 5:20 p.m. to deny the charges, and said a thrown object caused Baggage's injury. No shots were fired, police said.

DAMAGE PUT AT $200,000

The drug store blaze caused damage estimated at $200,000 and destroyed the building at 1115 H St. NE. The store reopened a week ago today after replacing nearly $15,000 worth of merchandise looted on April 5 during the rioting.

At daylight, firemen and policemen began probing the shell of the burned-out drug store. At least two policemen told The Star they were certain that one man and possibly two were screaming inside the store as the entire two-story structure was consumed by fire.

Police theorized that the men were would-be looters because officers found that the drug store had been broken into from a rear service door.

Minutes before firemen arrived at 2:42 a.m., one policeman heard a male voice inside yell:

"Let's get out of here, the roof is caving in!"

Police said that they had the building surrounded when they heard the voice but never saw anyone come out. It took more than two hours to bring the fire under control.

TRAFFIC REROUTED

One fireman was injured, not seriously, while fighting the blaze. Traffic on H Street was still being rerouted away from the 1100 block during this morning's rush-hour.

The Washington manager of the drug store chain, Jesse W. Skelly, who set the total loss of his stock at $100,000 and the loss of the building at an equal amount surveyed the debris and announced:

"I won't spend another damn dime on rebuilding this place."

Standard Drugs, which had six stores in the Washington area before the rioting, lost their entire branch store on 14th Street near Park Road during the outbreak. The family-owned business, based in Richmond, operates numerous stores throughout Virginia.

LITTLE DAMAGE IN ANOTHER

One of the other arson cases during the night caused little damage but aroused the attention of Mayor Washington when he saw fire trucks speeding past his home in the 400 block of T Street NW, he said.

Firemen quickly doused a small blaze in the office of a Save-More gasoline station at 11th and T Streets NW. Fire officials said that two gasoline-filled bottles were thrown into the office shortly after 10 p.m.

The first fire bomb failed to ignite, officials said. The unidentified Negro man who witnesses saw throw the gas-filled soft drink bottle into the office returned with more gasoline in a wine bottle and threw his second missile, which set the office door on fire. District firemen quickly extinguished that blaze.

As firemen were picking up their hose lines at 10:59 p.m., a blaze of "suspicious origin," possibly set, heavily damaged a grocery store and several upstairs apartments at 2263 12th St. NW, just a few blocks away. The store previously had been looted but not burned, officials said.

MINOR DAMAGE AT RESTAURANT

Another arson case was reported minutes later at 11:05 p.m., when someone threw a bottle of "inflamable liquid" into the R.X. Restaurant at 1426 North Capitol Street, causing minor fire damage.

As firemen were bringing the drug store fire under control around 5 a.m., another blaze was discovered two blocks away in a vacant house in the 800 block of 13th Street NE. Other firemen quickly controlled that blaze, which officials said had been set by an arsonist, in the first floor of the abandoned house.

The burned-out H Street NE drug store was covered by insurance, the firm's manager said. A policeman in the rear of the building discovered that the rear service door had been ripped open.

"There is no question that whoever was trapped inside had broken into the store within the last few minutes before the fire," said Lt. William G. Burchette of the 9th precinct.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 18, 1968]

TWO-HOUR DISTURBANCE: DOPE CASE ARREST STIRS UPROAR AT 14TH AND U STREETS

(By Carl Bernstein and Carl W. Sims)

A narcotics arrest at 14th and U Streets nw. shortly after 12:30 p.m. yesterday resulted in a street-corner confrontation between an angry crowd of Negroes and two white policemen.

Before it all ended two hours later, firemen had fought a two-alarm fire nearby, a spate of wild rumors swept the area, bottles and rocks were thrown at the arresting policemen, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee issued a handbill proclaiming "Racist Cops Strike Again."

Police Lt. John E. Burton, who is investigating for the Police Department, said police Pvts. Anthony Segaria and William Larman stopped outside a carryout shop at 1916 14th st. nw. "when they observed a fairly large crowd" assembled there.

Burton said Segaria entered the shop and saw a man "accept some capsules with white powder." Burton denied claims that Segaria followed the man into the shop because he was carrying a television set.

Segaria arrested a man identified as Eugene Baggage, 28, on a charge of possessing narcotics and led him outside, with Baggage still carrying the television set.

As Segaria and Baggage approached the police car. Burton said, Baggage "grabbed the capsules and put them in his mouth . . . The officer grabbed him around the neck to try to keep him from swallowing. Both fell to the street and had quite a struggle."

Both Segaria and Baggage tried to pick up the capsules, while Larman got out of the car to assist Segaria, Burton said.

Rocks and bottles were thrown at the policemen as Segaria and Baggage struggled, police said. Baggage was subdued when chemical spray was shot in his face. The crowd was held back at gunpoint by Larman.

Some time after Baggage had been transported from the scene, some persons began circulating the false rumor that Baggage had been pistol-whipped to the extent that he had been killed.

TREATED FOR CUTS

Baggage, whose home address was given as 2523 14th st. nw., was treated at D.C. General Hospital for a head cut that police said was caused by a rock or bottle thrown from the crowd. There were no other injuries, police said.

The fire at 1922 14th st. nw. broke out at 1:05 p.m., 25 minutes after the arrest and struggle. It burned out the interior of a building that had been damaged by fire during the second night of rioting here.

Firemen fighting the blaze were not troubled by the crowd that had witnessed the arrest. The Fire Department called in Lt. Sam Wallace, head of the police arson squad, to investigate.

Stokely Carmichael, black power advocate and former national chairman of SNCC, talked with many of the 250 to 300 persons in the crowd that had gathered outside the carryout shop. Several hours later, a handbill bearing the SNCC label was passed out reporting falsely that police had fired into the crowd. No shots were fired, officials said.

The SNCC handbill asserted that Baggage was arrested because police saw him with a television set. It said that "a white, honky, racist policeman creeped up behind a black brother . . . and started to choke him and drag him down the street."

TV NOT INVOLVED

Noting that Baggage was carrying a television set, the handbill said "the cops assumed that every brother who owns any type of equipment such as a television or radio has stolen it."

And, apparently referring to the rocks and bottles thrown at the police, the handbill said that "the brothers and sisters tried to protect the brother."

Police said there was no charge or investigation in connection with the television set, and that Baggage was arrested only in connection with the alleged possession of narcotics.

The arrest and fire scenes were visited later by Mayor Walter E. Washington, who talked with several persons and met later with four of their representatives who were waiting for him when he returned to the District Building.

The Mayor didn't comment on his conversations. The discussion with the persons who visited his office dealt generally with Negro-white tensions in the 14th Street area and with the problems of police-community relations, an aide reported.

BACK AT STATION HOUSE

After receiving two stitches for the head cut at the hospital, Baggage was returned to the 13th Precinct station, where he met Carmichael and Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League. Tucker said he and Carmichael advised Baggage to make no statements to police until he had consulted an attorney.

Carmichael posted $25 collateral for James Edwards, 41, no address listed, who was charged with disorderly conduct while Baggage was being arrested. Police said Edwards had "failed to move on" and had yelled at the arresting officers.

Baggage appeared before Judge Charles W. Halleck in the Court of General Sessions at 7 o'clock last night and was released in the personal custody of Tucker. The Judge set a $5000 personal recognizance bond on Baggage, for which the suspect is responsible if he fails to appear for trial. He was identified in court as a waiter.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 19, 1968]

OFFICIALS SUSPECT ARSON IN EIGHT CITY FIRES: THREATS TO STORES CHECKED

(By Alfred E. Lewis)

The city's post-riot uneasiness continued yesterday in the wake of eight fires within a 24-hour period that police and fire officials suspect were set by arsonists.

At police roll calls yesterday afternoon, precinct patrolmen were given lists of stores and offices to receive increased surveillance because owners reported receiving telephoned threats that their firms would be burned.

The police task was aggravated by a spate of unfounded rumors—many picked up by intelligence officers roaming the streets—of impending acts against property at various locations.

Police carefully checked the locations mentioned in the rumors and found all the areas calm. But two policemen were injured in arresting a suspected looter at the fire-damaged Woolworth's store at 3200 14th st. nw.

Lt. Gerald L. Kline and Sgt. Pat Yowell of the Tenth Precinct were cruising in the alley behind the store about 7:15 p.m., they said, when they saw a man run out with an armful of clothes.

Kline jumped from the scout car and grabbed him. The suspect, according to police, pulled a knife and cut Kline's left arm badly enough that it required 14 stitches at the Washington Hospital Center.

Yowell went to Kline's assistance and was punched and knocked around by the suspect before he and Kline disarmed the man and called for a patrol wagon.

Charged with two counts of assault on a police officer, burglary and carrying a dangerous weapon was Archie Mangum, 25, who gave his address as 1824 Monroe st. nw.

Kline went on sick leave. Yowell returned to duty after treatment for cuts and bruises.

Although city officials feel the post-riot situation is well in hand, the military late Wednesday moved a battalion (normally about 500 men from Ft. Belvoir—15 miles away from Washington—to Ft. Myer, just across the Potomac River in Arlington.

The Army acted after a crowd of Negroes threw rocks and bottles at two policemen making an arrest at 14th and U streets nw., Wednesday afternoon.

City officials said yesterday they were aware of the shift from Ft. Belvoir to Ft. Myer by the 403rd Military Police Battalion but were not consulted in the decision to move the troops.

Shortly before 2 p.m. yesterday, fire destroyed a 7th Street clothing store in one of 65 fires in the city between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Fire officials said they respond to about half that many fires in a normal 12-hour period.

The blaze that destroyed the Rodman's Men's Store at 1832 7th st., nw., was suspected to be the work of arsonists.

In this blaze, and in six others that occurred since 2 p.m. Wednesday, investigators found physical evidence—such as matches, rags and fragments of bottles—that led them to suspect arson. In an eighth fire, policemen said they observed looters in a drug store shortly before it was wracked by flames.

In the 7th Street fire, which took more than two hours to bring under control, an injured fireman was saved by firemen who passed a hose and oxygen mask to him in a room in which he was trapped.

The injured firemen, Pvt. Myer Kans, 27, apparently became separated from a group of firefighters and found himself blocked by rubble on one side and a steel door on the other.

Other firemen found an opening in some steel grating, through which they passed him the equipment while they trained their hoses on the sealed chamber. Finally, heavy equipment was brought to the scene and the steel door was removed.

Kans was to be kept overnight at the Washington Hospital Center, where he was treated for neck burns and smoke inhalation.

Other fires since 2 p.m. Wednesday which the Fire Department and the Metropolitan Police arson squad believe were deliberately set involved:

A store at 1922 14th st. nw., where a two-alarm blaze destroyed the building; the Standard Drug Co., 1315 H. st. ne., which was destroyed; a Howard University stadium storage shed also destroyed; the Sunbright Market, 2263 12th st. nw., heavily damaged, and a gas station at 1900 11th st nw., a restaurant at 1426 North Capitol st. and a vacant house at 808 13th st. ne., all minor fires that were quickly brought under control.

A ninth fire was reported at about 10:40 pm. yesterday. Two alarms were sounded for the fire which started on the back porch of 4017 Kansas ave. nw. It spread through the two-story building and the two adjoining apartment buildings before it was brought under control.

Witnesses told fire marshals that they had seen small children playing with matches around several trash cans shortly before the fire broke out. Fire investigators said no evidence of fire-bombing was found.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 19, 1968]

ONLY ONE NEW ARSON CASE

The District's new post-riot jitters eased considerably last night with only three fires reported and only one of those possibly started on purpose, fire officials said.

The previous 24 hours, there had been five blazes listed as arson.

James Brice, 49, died of smoke inhalation last night in a fire in an unoccupied house at 604 Massachusetts-av nw, which also seriously injured another man, Waverly Hagans, the Union Mission at 810 Fifth-st. nw., police said. Fire Department officials are investigating the cause of the blaze which they said apparently started in a pile of trash in the basement.

Police said a seven-year old boy apparently set an easter basket on fire while playing with matches and started a fire at 9 last night that damaged the rear of three row homes at 4015 4017 and 4019 Kansas-av nw.

In a fire at 2 p.m. yesterday that police and firemen believe may have been set by an arsonist, Rodman's Men's Store at 1832 Seventh-st nw, was destroyed. While fighting the blaze, Pvt. Myer Kans, 27, was trapped and slightly burned before he could be rescued.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1968]

ARSON FORCES FAMILY TO MOVE

(By Donald Smith)

"The Lord has been good to us," said Mrs. Annie Taylor, 64, yesterday as she stepped over fire hoses that snaked through the street and watched clouds of yellow smoke rising from the building where she has lived for eight years.

She looked around to make sure her four small great-grandchildren were following. They had been inside Mrs. Taylor's second-floor apartment with a 17-year-old cousin when the fire burst out in the basement of Rodman's Discount Clothing store below.

Buildings on either side of the store had been burned out. Fire officials say the blaze here, at 1828 7th St. NW, was the work of arsonists.

"The Lord has surely been good to us," Mrs. Taylor repeated, "But I'm not going to stay here another day. These fires ain't going to keep hitting around here like that and not get us."

COUSIN SAVES YOUNGSTERS

The children, ages 1 through 5, were carried out of the burning building by their cousin, Garry Michaux. He was watching television when he was warned by the shout outside of a passerby who had sighted the thick smoke.

One fireman was slightly injured when he was trapped behind a steel bar door inside the basement, but was finally rescued.

Pvt. Meyer Kans, 34, was treated for smoke inhalation and minor burns, and released several hours later.

Mrs. Taylor was in the next block at the United House of Prayer for All People, 1721½ 7th St. NW, where she is a cook, when the fire broke out.

The building is in an area that was badly hit by the looting and arson that brought federal troops to the District after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in Memphis on April 4.

DAYS OF TERROR

That Friday night, and the days that followed were filled with terror for Mrs. Taylor, the children, and their parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Turner. Mrs. Turner, who is Mrs. Taylor's granddaughter, and her husband were working when yesterday's fire started.

Despite fires that broke out on either side, their building was spared until late last week, when the store below was set on fire.

Mrs. Taylor decided then to move, but postponed it until she could find other housing. Yesterday's fire made up her mind. She is moving today, she said.

"I have a nice little place out there in Southeast," she said of her new apartment in the Barry Farms public housing development. "I'll miss living here, but if we stay, we're liable to go to bed and never wake up again."

Representative Henry P. Smith III Announces Results of 1968 Questionnaire

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, I submitted a 9-part questionnaire to every family in the 40th Congressional District of New York. This questionnaire deals with many of the critical domestic and international issues facing the Nation today.

I am pleased and proud to report to date I have received more than 16,000 completed questionnaires. In addition, I received hundreds of letters accompanying the questionnaires in which the people chose to give additional comments and opinions on these issues. This overwhelming response is clear evidence of the sincere interest of 40th District residents in the affairs of their Government.

The many views and opinions I have received from the residents of the 40th District will be of inestimable value to me in deciding which course of action I will pursue in the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of this House will find the results of my questionnaire both interesting and helpful. The following is a percentage breakdown of the final tabulated results of my questionnaire:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of the President's conduct of the war in Vietnam?	33.9	62.7	3.4
2. In North Vietnam, do you favor—			
(a) Intensified U.S. air attacks?	55.4	18.7	
(b) A bombing halt?	16.0	31.2	
(c) Maintaining air attacks at the present level?	10.1	24.0	
3. Do you favor U.S. trade with nations that are aiding North Vietnam?	9.7	87.4	2.9
4. Do you support the President's request for a 10-percent surcharge on individual and corporate income taxes?	24.6	73.1	2.3
5. Do you favor the administration's proposed "restrictions on foreign travel" as a means to improve our balance-of-payments situation	47.2	51.0	1.8
6. Should the Federal Government enact legislation to regulate all mail order sales of firearms?	72.1	26.2	1.7
7. Would you favor "block grant" Federal aid programs, providing lump sums to the States and municipalities for general purposes, e.g., health, leaving it to the States to determine specific projects in which the money will be spent (rather than specific Federal aid projects)?	40.6	54.2	5.2
8. On what level do you think the "war on crime" must be chiefly waged?			
Local	44.1		
State	15.1		7.4
Federal	33.4		
9. Would you favor a Government-guaranteed minimum annual income?	19.1	78.1	2.8

Farmers Want Bargaining Power

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Farm Journal, a respected conservative agricultural publication, has announced in its May issue the outcome of a survey of 5,000 farmers on bargaining power proposals.

In the subhead of their article entitled "How Farmers Vote To Use Bargaining Power," the Journal editors say:

You'll find *some surprises* here.

They were speaking for themselves in that comment. They also spoke for me. Although I have been sure that farm support of bargaining power was running high, I was surprised by the size of the majority for bargaining which the magazine reported.

The Journal reports:

1. Nine out of 10 favor new laws to give farmers more power to bargain on their own.

2. 85% believe the farmers should then organize into bargaining associations which will bargain with processors and buyers over prices and other terms.

3. 95% want a fair-play "marketing rights" law—one that will penalize buyers who discriminate against those farmers who join a co-op or bargaining group.

4. 70% want broader market orders that permit organized commodity groups to study the market, set grade standards, inspect, and do research and promotion to expand markets.

5. 68% think that farmers should try to force processors to pay higher prices and sign long-term contracts. (Almost all of the National Farmers Organization voters favor this.)

Because the Farm Journal poll is an extremely significant one, I ask unanimous consent that the report about it and an editorial on the subject be printed in the RECORD.

I do not necessarily agree with all the Farm Journal's comments, but they are thoughtful and significant and merit careful consideration.

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

HOW FARMERS VOTE TO USE BARGAINING POWER

(NOTE.—Let's go. And let's bargain with as little government interference as possible, say these 5,000 farmers. You'll find some surprises here.)

(By Claude W. Gifford)

It's no longer just a slogan—or an urge to "fight back," born out of farmers' frustrations.

Farmers are ready to get on with the hard choices that are necessary to make *bargaining power* work.

Here are the highlights from the farm bargaining poll which Farm Journal published in the March issue. These results are based on the 5000 ballots processed by our Research Department at press time (12,479 had been received).

Farm voters want—

1. Nine out of 10 favor new laws to give farmers more power to bargain on their own.

2. 85% believe that farmers should then organize into bargaining associations that will bargain with processors and buyers over prices and other terms.

3. 85% want a fair-play "marketing rights" law—one that will penalize buyers who discriminate against those farmers who join a co-op or bargaining group.

4. 70% want broader market orders that permit organized commodity groups to study the market, set grade standards, inspect, and do research and promotion to expand markets.

5. 68% think that farmers should purposely hold products off the market to try to force processors to pay higher prices and sign long-term contracts (Almost all of the National Farmers Organization voters favor this).

Farm voters don't want—

1. Nearly 8 out of 10 farmers say that when a bargaining group and processors agree on a price, the government should *not* be permitted to step in and veto the agreement. The government doesn't veto labor contracts between unions and industry, and farmers don't want it done in agriculture, either. At present, the Secretary of Agriculture *does* have authority to veto agreements reached by cooperatives.

2. 67% do not want farm prices and production set by a government board made up of representatives of farmers, processors and consumers. To do that would treat agriculture as if it were a "public utility" run for the convenience of the public—with a ceiling over all farmers.

3. 67% do not believe that it is right for members of a farm bargaining group to picket *other farmers* to try to get them to join or withhold their products. They think that should be a voluntary choice to be won by reason, persuasion and demonstrated results.

4. 61% do not want the government to hold elections choosing *which farm group* processors must bargain with in an area. A

bill setting up such elections is now before the Senate Agriculture Committee.

There are some surprisingly "get tough" bargaining sentiments in the vote.

Nearly half of those who voted are willing to have farm bargaining groups negotiate to have handlers and haulers buy or handle *only the products of members who belong to the bargaining group.* This would be an exclusive contract, or a "closed shop" type of arrangement. Three out of four NFO members voted for this, compared with 43% of the Farm Bureau voters.

58% agree that when two-thirds of the producers belong to a bargaining group, and these members vote to have processors check off their dues, that the check-off should be made from *non-members* as well. This is a "union shop" type of arrangement. Three out of four NFO voters favored this, compared with 56% of the Farm Bureau voters.

55% are ready to make commodity checkoffs for research and promotion compulsory *with no refunds* when two-thirds of the producers vote to do it.

And 52% would agree to have farm commodity groups set allotments and quotas on all producers anytime that two-thirds vote to do it. More Farmers Union members favored this than voters from other farm organizations.

Now for some other differences between farm groups (the tables show the total percent that "agreed strongly" and "agreed slightly" and include one-half of those who were "neutral"):

FARM ORGANIZATION

[In percent]

	Farm Bureau	Farmers Union	Grange	NFO
Fair play legislation	87	90	88	94
Cooperative selling	69	61	69	44
National market orders	79	78	83	73
Farm bargaining groups	86	89	91	97
Exclusive contracts	43	61	54	77
Voluntary checkoffs	70	63	59	58
Compulsory checkoffs	55	65	65	70
Holding products	61	84	70	98
Processor picketing	33	55	46	72
Farmer picketing	22	35	32	43
Seasonal volume control	68	76	74	86
Allotment supply control	49	73	61	70
Checkoff of member dues	66	73	73	80
Complete producer checkoff	56	70	70	76
Favorable legislative climate	91	94	91	97
Government certification	33	45	41	33
Government arbitration	38	54	49	45
Government veto	15	29	18	22
Government Marketing Board	28	41	36	24

REGION

	East	Central	South	Southwest	Great Plains	West
Fair play legislation	90	87	89	80	85	87
Cooperative selling	70	60	59	73	65	61
National market orders	83	75	78	74	75	82
Farm bargaining groups	92	85	92	85	85	92
Exclusive contracts	45	52	53	40	48	47
Voluntary checkoffs	61	65	68	68	67	61
Compulsory checkoffs	62	58	59	48	54	64
Holding products	56	70	80	67	73	71
Processor picketing	37	48	50	32	41	39
Farmer picketing	26	26	35	22	24	29
Seasonal volume control	69	71	72	56	67	75
Allotment supply control	44	55	60	49	60	52
Checkoff of member dues	71	68	68	64	67	69
Complete producer checkoff	65	61	62	53	57	66
Favorable legislative climate	96	90	94	89	89	92
Government certification	35	32	39	36	34	40
Government arbitration	42	44	44	33	42	19
Government veto	14	21	19	15	26	12
Government Marketing Board	17	29	31	27	37	26

Among farm organizations, NFO voters believe more strongly than other groups in exclusive contracts, check-offs, holding products, and processor picketing. However, the majority of the NFO voters are still opposed to picketing other farmers.

The NFO and Farm Bureau voters are about equally opposed to having the government involved in farm bargaining. Farmers Union voters, while opposed to government intervention, are less strongly opposed than other farm groups.

It might be surprising that larger farmers favor compulsory check-offs for research and promotion, while farmers with less than $5000 sales are opposed. Small farmers are also less willing to have bargaining groups restrain production.

Small and big farmers are about equally opposed to government intervention in bargaining activities.

Understandably, younger farmers are less likely to want allotment supply control. And they are even more opposed to government intervention than older farmers.

Surprisingly, no crop or livestock commodities are more "red hot" about bargaining than any other. They feel remarkably alike on the 19 farm bargaining choices.

BARGAINING, AS FARMERS WANT IT

We'll wager that many eyebrows are being raised today as people throughout the country read the results of the farm bargaining survey on page 24.

Perhaps they are finding that farmers are far more ready to bargain for prices than they thought. The poll indicates that farmers are willing to make the difficult choices that must be made before bargaining can work.

What the vote says to processors, Congress, Washington bureaucrats and to political candidates is: "You'd better wake up to the groundswell."

If there's one thing clearer than any other, it's the fact that farmers want to call the shots themselves. They are asking for a favorable climate from Congress in which to bargain—but they do not want the heavy hand of government in bargaining itself.

There are major differences between calling on the government and calling in the government. What we read into bargaining, as farmers want it, is this:

1. *Programs would be farmer inspired.* Farmers, working together, would shape the commodity bargaining programs they feel will succeed. They wouldn't need to depend on haphazard programs carved out of political compromise by Congress at the tag end of a session.

2. *Plans would be flexible.* If a program that farmers put together fails, they could vote it out and try something new. They wouldn't have to wait until Congress could get around to making a change—or suffer along with a plan that is harming their market, as we have from time to time with some Federal farm programs.

3. *Price and income would come from the market*—where it ought to come from. It's high time that the consuming public passes along to farmers—through the market—a little more of the higher wages and salaries that consumers have achieved through a legislative climate that has permitted them to exercise their power.

Farmers realize that subsidized consumer food prices and direct payments from the Treasury will eventually trap agriculture into becoming a public utility—with farming run politically for the convenience of the public.

4. *Farmers would elect their own commodity representatives to run their programs.* And they could vote them in or out each year, depending on the kind of a job they did. Farmers would participate on committees to bargain, promote, set production goals, determine grades, establish fair trade practices, and the like. Programs wouldn't be run by bureaucrats trying to build kingdoms; or by political hacks who need a job; or by people who are appointed by and serve at the will of the Secretary.

5. *Farmers would decide how much freedom they'd give up for the gain they hope to achieve.* Participation would be "democratically voluntary"—where two-thirds decide such questions as production control. It would not be "politically voluntary"—where the government dumps surpluses to force you into a program, and in doing so keeps a ceiling on farmers' opportunity at the market.

6. *Program choices would be realistic.* Referendums devised by commodity groups would give a real choice of directions. Federal farm referendums are often a joke—you can take controls at 75% of parity, or the same controls at 50% of parity; or you can either vote for a change in a Federal order or lose the entire order.

7. *It would be an exciting, fast-moving affair* with commodities vying with each other to see who could hatch the best ideas. Farm bargaining wouldn't be easy, but it would be invigorating. The accent would be on quality products to win markets.

Commodities, no doubt, would experiment with various kinds of supply manipulation—diverting part of the crop into secondary uses, spreading the marketing over the season adjusting grades to regulate the amount that can go into the primary market, culling, buying up surpluses, negotiating with processors for the amount of contracted acreage, and other such devices not now thought of.

We hope that official Washington will take the cue. Politicians have long despaired that farm programs are nothing but trouble; and they have complained that farmers never "get together." Well, here's a chance to let farmers wrestle with more of their own problems. That's what farmers want—and this poll indicates that they are remarkably together in general direction, regardless of farm organization, commodity, age, income or region.

Public Information in Government Policy

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, former Secretary

of Health, Education, and Welfare, told a Connecticut audience in May 1967:

I do not believe that the Government has the right to hide the facts or misinform. But the best defense against secretive bureaucracy is in vigorous, enterprising reporters working for courageous, responsible newspapers.

Senator RIBICOFF's words are well taken, but the main requirement is in industrious, straightforward Government information officers working for enlightened, public-spirited Government officials.

The subject of public information as it relates to Government policy is a complex one. An excellent discussion of this subject was presented by Mr. Carlton E. Spitzer, former Director of Public Information for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the Public Relations Journal of February 1968. Mr. Spitzer's article was condensed from "The Voice of Government," a book to be published this summer by John Wiley & Sons.

Mr. Spitzer's article follows:

PUBLIC INFORMATION IN GOVERNMENT POLICY

(By Carlton E. Spitzer)

There is a sharp and healthy change underway in the atmosphere of federal information programs. It was not too long ago that a federal information executive could safely instruct his staff that queries from press and public were to be answered only on a "need to know" basis.

Those days are over. We are not living in an era of the people's need to know, if such a restrictive concept was ever valid in the United States; we are living in an era of the people's right to know and desire to know. It is the job of the government information officer to respond to developing trends, anticipate public concern, and provide useful information, always protecting personal privacy and national security but opening all the doors and all the avenues he can and should open.

The press release is still an important element in the dissemination of information, although few write them well. But to limit action to a press release routine is to fall far short of the government's responsibility to itself and all citizens.

The goal should be to stimulate objective reporting, not to increase the volume of hand-outs. Writers, editors, publishers, and producers should be encouraged to visit Washington agencies, regional offices and program sites in urban and rural areas. As Senator Abraham Ribicoff, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare told a Wallingford, Connecticut, audience on May 31, 1967: "I do not believe that the government has the right to hide the facts or misinform. But the best defense against secretive bureaucracy is in vigorous, enterprising reporters working for courageous, responsible newspapers."

Surely, the next best defense is in vigorous, enterprising government information officers working for courageous, responsible public officials.

There is a need for government agencies to work more closely with state and municipalities which carry out federally-sponsored programs. Arguments against providing assistance from Washington have most often been based on the protection of states' rights and local initiatives. Experience shows, however, that federal-state-local cooperative efforts usually result in mutually respecting partnerships and much more accurate information on why some programs succeed and why others fail. With local participation, those who draft or administer federal programs are more acutely aware of state needs and the problems a city may have in adopting procedures that looked reasonable on Independence Avenue but proved impractical on Main Street, USA.

Information can be the key to how well federal programs are used. Local communities cannot take advantage of benefits they never heard of. Part of the answer, therefore, is to transfer information people from Washington to the regional offices of the major federal departments both permanently and on special assignments so that they can better serve local media and constituent state agencies. Misunderstanding has come mainly from a lack of information and a lack of empathy for the problems of others.

Cooperation on a rational basis—a multi-state basis—does nothing to interfere with a state's prerogatives or a town's response to a federally-sponsored activity. Actually, the presence of information people assures more accurate and helpful reporting locally and in Washington, and provides the kind of frank internal evaluation that makes Washington officials less inbred and more responsive to people's needs.

The presence of skilled information people in the regions also tends to reduce substantially the volume of institutional "facts and figures" releases from Washington. These releases are great for the working statisticians but do little to explain the worth of federally-sponsored (and almost always state-administered) programs in terms of human need and human achievement. A constant exchange of useful information on the local scene is essential.

Support for the public information function in Washington and perspectives about it vary from department to department, depending basically upon the attitudes of the secretary and his top staff. Some cabinet officers have demonstrated a constant concern for their own good press while largely ignoring the fundamental information needs of their agency. Other cabinet officers have been comfortable maintaining a passive posture, discouraging initiative in information activity and reacting to media interest only when pushed. The most effective cabinet officers have stressed quality performance, adequate planning, and participation in policy.

In government as in business, the role of information in planning, strategy and policy depends largely on the support of the boss.

John Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a memorandum to his agency heads and assistant secretaries, also recognized the need to recruit new talent. He stressed the creation of special programs for summer interns and personal visits to colleges and universities to attract outstanding young men and women to government information.

He wrote: "We must be totally interested in our recruiting and training programs because the future is not worth a nickel without them. Effective recruitment of talented people, their training and their development is the responsibility of the program chiefs."

It may be some comfort to the government information man to know that his problems are less than unique. Although each tends to be condescending about the other, the trials of the government information officer are painfully similar to the woes of the public relations director in business. Both feel second-guessed by their colleagues and short-changed on budget. Both appreciate the need for candor and realism to communicate effectively with their audiences and to maintain the respect of the media, and both have found it can be difficult to persuade their peers that candor is the best policy. Nobody wants to be wrong, and things don't always go right in anybody's business, so candor is often sacrificed for the half-truth and issues are sometimes clouded or ignored.

Government public information officers can be as guilty of propagandizing narrow causes and clouding issues as any huckster, and usually with far more serious consequences. Only the foolish or misguided would participate in such schemes because they are doomed to failure. The whole system of government in America is open and fragmented, and not all of the players in a government agency are on the same side, although they may occupy the same offices.

Leaking information is common, so public information men cannot act simply as creatures of the Congress or spokesmen for the current administration. Their moves and statements are scrutinized and challenged by a skeptical press and private associations of every kind; memorandums and plans are sometimes prematurely reported to Congress and outside groups by employees who may be unfriendly toward the trend of events.

Thus, information officers and their peers had best hold to the truth and remain faithful to the facts of any issue in order to survive. The government is commanded by circumstance to provide information, not propaganda.

Qualified government information people know that facts clearly presented build public trust in the federal government, the only government all Americans share. They also know that empty phrases don't register for long with the press or the public and that ducking around sticky issues is a dangerous and silly game for any government agency to play.

The American people understand that agencies involved in major national problems did not create the problems, but they do hold the agencies responsible for reporting on their actions fully and regularly. The record shows that Americans respond with strength and determination to discouraging news if the news is honestly presented and a course of action is outlined. But the American people, like good newspaper editors, rarely if ever forgive a lie.

A government information officer may have a difficult time applying this philosophy, but he has no right to participate in policy formation affecting the American people if he is unwilling to try.

Public information officers are not simply spokesmen for their own government agency, responsible only to their peers—they are the voice of government itself, responsible first to the people. They have a serious obligation to tell the truth, to present all sides of an issue. Their role is to be objective, not subjective.

Should a public relations man representing a commercial company distort the truth, the company's product sales may decrease, or its relations with the government may suffer, or its foreign investments may be adversely affected—all serious issues to the company, its employees, stockholders and suppliers. Should a government public information man distort the truth, the American people are deprived of information they should have in order for them to make judgments about their government.

The information officer must embrace candor and fight timidity. Government public information, like industry public relations, is often clumsy, reactive and paralyzed by controversy. Controversy may be uncomfortable, but it can be a powerful asset. Sometimes it is the only way to get front-page attention for a positive program, for the media still delight in negative and strife.

If government refuses comment at the moment of crisis and issues a careful statement a week later when other events are commanding headlines, the statement is likely to appear on page 30, not page one (if it appears at all), and government will have lost, perhaps forever, its opportunity for effective rebuttal or explanation. Years later government may find itself refuting allegations reported in the first story, its own belated comment never having registered on the public mind as anything more than a feeble defense.

As one industrial company president cautioned his colleagues a few years ago when faced with an anti-trust allegation: "If we're not guilty, let's say so today. When a man calls you a — — — on Monday you don't wait until Saturday to issue some feeble statement saying that your lawyers haven't yet studied how the man spelled — — —. Either you are one or you aren't, and you better let the public know where you stand when they can read your reply on the front page."

Most company presidents—and government officials—are not inclined to follow this advice. They still hide when trouble strikes and reporters call. As a result, stories that might have appeared only once, stating both sides of the question, are strung out for days, usually with one side, the side willing to talk with the media, making its point time after time in the public mind.

A quick response to a situation is essential for a successful information program. Usually the only way this can be accomplished is to have the information officer participate in all policy discussions and key meetings. When a crisis breaks, there is no need to "fill in" the information officer; he already knows the background and can act. That's his job.

The government information officer should be both a catalyst, showing the way toward constructive collaboration, and an analyst, evaluating and reporting what has been done, what is currently under way, and what is likely to develop. When the information officer fills this role, he automatically and significantly participates in policy formation as he should. His voice at the conference table is equal to all others. His counsel becomes a part of strategy and decisionmaking.

The crisis in our cities—and the awkward and often archaic approaches to meet this crisis—gives ample testimony that we must not only improve communications but streamline and improve our system of government. Meanwhile, the American people must be kept informed. It must be a recognized policy to keep citizens fully informed and candor and realism must be the chief ingredients of this policy in order to dispell public distrust of government and to create the kind of harmony and cooperation our nation must have to survive. Helping to form this policy is the job of government information officers.

Fear of press criticism about the use of public funds for information has been one reason among many that government officials often have been passive about information needs.

But the information lag—the difference between actual progress and what is known about it—is now so formidable and obvious that few editors and congressmen would seriously criticize the executive branch for spending reasonable sums for staff and programs to communicate effectively with the American people.

The Umpirage of Reason

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished president of Columbia University, Dr. Grayson Kirk, delivered an important address on the occasion of the Founder's Day celebration and the 225th birthday of Thomas Jefferson, at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville on April 12, 1968.

Pointing out that American society is in trouble, Dr. Kirk enumerates difficulties and identifies some of the sources of these difficulties. He suggests that fresh and imaginative thinking unbound to past approaches is needed for the solution of the staggeringly complex problems confronting the American people. Finally, Dr. Kirk recommends priorities in dealing with our troubled conditions.

Although I do not necessarily endorse his views in their entirety, I believe that Dr. Kirk has made an important contribution to the national dialog that deserves serious attention by concerned citizens. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Kirk'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:

THE UMPIRAGE OF REASON

(Partial text of address by President Grayson Kirk of Columbia University on the occasion of a Founder's Day celebration and the 225th birthday of Thomas Jefferson, at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., April 12, 1968)

So much has been written about Thomas Jefferson, and by men who have devoted years to the study of his life and thought, that your speaker today would be presumptuous if he were to attempt on this occasion merely to add another eulogy, or to make another appraisal, of that much-examined life. But there have been a few men who in the course of American history have achieved such towering greatness that their renown has continued to grow through the years, and we would be the poorer if we did not pause from time to time to pay our tribute to them and, in so doing, to draw from their lives renewed courage and, hopefully, greater wisdom as we struggle with the baffling problems of our own day. Such a man was Thomas Jefferson, and today, on the eve of the two hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of his birth, we would be remiss if we did not take the occasion to salute the memory of a man to whom all Americans owe an unpayable debt.

Of all the men of his time whom we would wish to have known personally, I am confident that Jefferson would be overwhelmingly the first choice. This is not because of our respect for his forty years of dedicated service to the public life of our infant nation, but because Jefferson, the man, was so utterly fascinating. Like many of his European contemporaries he epitomized in the astonishing range of his interests the new enlightenment of the Eighteenth Century. His intellectual curiosity was almost boundless. Whether the subject of inquiry was agriculture or architecture, geology or music, literature or politics, geography or history, Jefferson was well-informed. He could talk or write about all these fields with knowledge based on wide and systematic reading, and throughout his long life he always sought to learn even more.

But to this immense range of his intellectual interests he added another dimension that was peculiarly American. This was a constant concern for the practical application of all new discoveries on the rapidly widening horizons of man's thought. He wanted to bring these discoveries to the enrichment and growth of his country. It was for this reason that while the sheer, intellectual exercise of abstract philosophy was of little interest to him, the study of political theory and its practical implementation engrossed his attention throughout his life.

Perhaps it was the touch of Puritanism in his character that was responsible for this concern about practicality. He would not have thought of himself as a Puritan; he might even have denied the allegation, but he was frugal in his personal life, enormously self-disciplined even in early youth, and he displayed no small degree of Puritanism in his profound distaste for the decadence in morals and politics that he observed in the capitals of Europe.

Equally American was his unswerving faith in democracy, not merely as the best mechanism for solving the ancient problem of reconciling liberty and authority in government, but as a way of life. Given a widespread system of public education and a social and political system that interposed no artificial barriers to the fostering and recognition of talent, he believed that a natural aristocracy of ability was bound to emerge. The men of such a true *aristoi* could be counted on to lead our new nation onward to its destined greatness. His own life had exemplified this principle and he saw no reason to doubt its universal validity.

Still another quality was strongly, if not peculiarly, American. This was his confident trust in the future. Unlike his great antagonist, Hamilton, who was given to periods of deepest melancholy and pessimism, Jefferson was serene in the face of adversity, philosophical about his defeats, and buoyantly optimistic about the future of the society he had helped to build. Thus intellectually fortified, he had an enormous zest for life. He would have relished the words of Alfred de Musset:

"Qu'il est doux d'être au monde, et quel bien que la vie" (Sonnet à Alfred Tattet, 1838)

In the long pageant of American history, no man more richly deserves the affectionate gratitude of the people whom he served so well. In all honesty we can say of Jefferson what another Virginian, Woodrow Wilson, once wrote of Walter Bagehot:

"Occasionally, a man is born into the world whose mission it evidently is to clarify the thought of his generation, and to vivify it; to give it speed where it is slow, vision where it is blind, balance where it is out of poise . . ." (Essay on *A Literary Politician.*)

Today we are in desperate need of these Jeffersonian qualities in our leaders and in our national life. It is not too much to say that in many ways our society is in a more perilous condition than at any time since the convulsive conflict between the states a century ago. We seem to be in an era of transition from a past which we have abandoned to a future which we are unable as yet to comprehend but whose portents fill us with more dismay than anticipation. We have a multitude of contending counselors but we are unable to place our trust in any of them because we feel, almost viscerally, that they, too, are merely groping without great success to understand the new world about us, and still less do we feel that they have the wisdom to order its affairs to our satisfaction. Our nation is in trouble.

The enumeration of our present difficulties and dangers would ruffle even the calm temperament of a Jefferson. At home, disrespect for law and authority has reached such a level of acceptance that its natural concomitant, resort to violence, has almost achieved respectability. The old social sanctions of the church and family have lost much of their traditional force. Our young people, in disturbing numbers, appear to reject all forms of authority, from whatever source derived, and they have taken refuge in a turbulent and choate Nihilism whose sole objectives are destructive. I know of no time in our history when the gap between the generations has been wider or more potentially dangerous.

Honesty compels us to admit that we are threatened with a loss of our sense of national unity and with it our sense of direction. Our unity has been imperiled by our racial conflicts for which, despite good-will and honest effort, we can envisage no simple or easy solution available to us in time to avoid the danger of large-scale and continuing social disorder. Less imminently perilous but also damaging to our sense of unity is the generational gap to which I have just referred. Disunity is also being fostered

by the growing incidence of friction in the attempted resolution of disputes between industrial management and organized labor. When even our teachers and our governmental employees feel free to strike in order to try to impose their collective will upon our people, I cannot but feel that all is not well with our society.

Our sense of national direction has become blurred and indistinct because some of the old unifying goals, such as the winning of the West and the creation of a generally affluent society, have been largely achieved; others, such as the encouragement of the spread of our political institutions to other lands, have been abandoned because we have had to accept the fact that they were the product of a time when our enthusiasm exceeded our sophistication. Moreover, our newer announced goals—to eliminate the pockets of poverty remaining in our country, to assure full equality of opportunity for all Americans, and to mount vast efforts against the menace of Communism wherever it arises—these either have failed to kindle our imagination or they have evoked more disunity than agreement. Perhaps we can sum up the situation by saying that we have lost Jefferson's faith in the inevitability of progress and we have not as yet found a new unifying faith for our time.

Our posture abroad offers us little compensating comfort. The image which we have had of ourselves in the world as a highly moral, altruistic, peaceloving and progressive people has never been as widely accepted by other nations as we have believed or hoped. Other nations on occasion have tended to conclude that we have greater power than responsibility and greater impulsiveness than mature judgment. And some of our recent foreign activities, however much they may have been founded in a belief that they were vital to our national interest, have stirred other peoples in the free world into violent and belligerent opposition. So great a power as the United States can scarcely hope for affection from weaker peoples, but we do need to have and to hold their respect for our motives and our goals. At the moment, this house is in disrepair and while the vandalism done to it understandably has been encouraged by those who count themselves as our enemies, it would be an act of folly on our part if we were to ascribe all foreign antagonisms to their machinations.

Some solace, of course, can be derived from the fact that many of our current troubles are being shared in varying degrees by other countries. In many Western European states the family and the church also seem to have lost much of their ancient authority. Youth protest movements erupt from time to time even in authoritarian communist states. One senses in the countries of Western Europe, as here, a general unease, a feeling of drift and uncertainty as social systems lose their traditional rigidity and as political leaders struggle to cope with the bewildering problems of governing an urban, technologically advanced, industrial society.

Thus, in Western Europe, too, the old order is gone; it may not have been in actuality efficient or just, but it was to many people, and in retrospect, a time of power and glory which men remember with nostalgia or read about with yearning. Artzybashev once wrote that there never could have been a golden age in the past because the men of the time would not have been able to recognize it as such, but in many a European country the transition from the days of power to the present has been abrupt and brutal, and men still are stirred in their hearts more by a great cause than by the possession of dishwashers and television sets. There, as here, men need a faith to inspire them and to take them out of the routine of their daily lives, but in most of the democracies there is little such faith today. The goals of our time are too complex, too technical, too lacking in the unifying emotional appeal that gives men a pride in their heritage. Men may respect the political leader who is an able technician, but this is merely an act of sober judgment, and they respond emotionally to the charisma of a Churchill or a John Kennedy with an enthusiasm that no technician can command. Remembering Hitler, this can be a great danger, but it is one from which, despite our sophistication, we are not likely ever to be wholly free.

The unfulfilled need for inspiring leadership may be one source of our troubles today, but there are others, perhaps even more fundamental, which we may not ignore. Today, for example, our problems, urban, industrial and social, are so great in magnitude and so complex in nature that they can be dealt with efficiently only by a greater concentration of governmental authority than our democracy has been constructed to provide or our people are prepared to support. We have always said proudly that though our democracy may be a clumsy form of government, we accept this inefficiency as a reasonable price for the protection of our liberties. But today though we cling to our liberties with appropriate passion we demand from our government a degree of efficiency that our system was designed to make almost impossible. I do not conclude that we should now abandon our liberties in the interest of efficiency; the price would be far too great. But we cannot forever have our cake and eat it too, and we should not be afraid to remember Jefferson's counsel that each generation should be prepared to re-examine its political institutions and to re-shape them as might be necessary in order to meet more adequately the needs of the time.

There is yet another facet to the problem of effective governance in a present-day democracy. This is the influence of the new technology of mass communications. Part of the ancient mystique of leadership has now been eroded by the over-exposure of government officials. Charles de Gaulle, almost alone among Western leaders, has understood this principle and has avoided its pitfalls. By contrast, our leaders are expected to appear almost on call before the television camera, to hold innumerable press conferences, to issue a communique after every official meeting, and to share their thoughts, even if they may be fragmentary and half-formed, with everyone in the country. No leader can long survive such ordeals and emerge from them unscathed.

Moreover, this intense, day-by-day reporting brought nightly into the homes of all America necessarily is fragmentary. It can lead men to fix their attention upon the trees and forget the woods. It can stampede them into hastly and ill-formed conclusions that may not well serve the national interest. I have often wondered, for example, if the British people would have been willing to sustain the effort of the First World War if they had viewed nightly in living color the fantastic slaughter of their sons in the battle of the Somme.

Finally, effectiveness of leadership is complicated by the influence of mass communications in stimulating what is usually called the revolution of rising expectations. Visual reporting of mass violence in one city inevitably has its effect upon men elsewhere who feel that their plight and their needs are like those who have resorted to force to try to effect change. Also, it is becoming increasingly clear that governmental stability in new or weak countries may be in jeopardy for a long time because modern communications have led their peoples to demand more, and at a faster rate, than it is within the power of their governments to provide.

I do not cite these influences of mass-communications to condemn them. They are here to stay. I cite them only to illustrate the further complications which they have brought to the problems of modern government. They are instruments of tremendous power in democratic opinion-making. Somehow, we must learn to use them, and if necessary to control them in such a way as to make them serve the public good as well as the public pleasure.

But the troubles of contemporary society run far beyond the question of leadership in public life and the influence of mass communications upon public opinion and the political process. The plain fact is that we do not know how to solve the new problems that confront our society. They are too new, too complex, too immense in magnitude, and neither our experience nor that of other peoples is of much help to us as we grope for answers.

Take, for example, the problems of our cities. With rare exceptions, American city government has not been one of the more admirable features of our public life. Corruption, inefficiency and graft in local government are parts of our political legacy that we would like to forget. But now, beginning without a strong financial or organizational base, our cities have been swollen by masses of new migrants, beset by racial troubles, bedeviled by impossible budgetary needs, and haunted by the exodus of businesses and middle-class citizens to nearby suburbs. In the absence of new and fresh approaches, some of our cities in time may become almost ungovernable.

Let us look for a moment at one single facet of this problem of the metropolis, the matter of public welfare. The mass migration of largely indigent people to great metropolitan centers has created an administrative and financial nightmare for welfare agencies. In New York City we have today almost twice as many people on relief as during the depths of the depression. We have more dependent children than the entire population of Omaha or Akron. The cost of our city welfare programs now exceeds a billion dollars a year.

No one knows how much of this burden properly should be carried by the city, the state or the Federal Government. No one knows whether dependent mothers of large families, when there is no father present, should be left at home on relief to rear their children or whether it would be better to encourage the mothers to become employed and to provide for the children during work hours in Day Care Centers. No one knows how the vicious cycle of dependency, which threatens to go on generation after generation, can be broken. We do know that the present, improvised system is hopelessly inadequate and that is almost all we know. And yet ours is certainly the most affluent, and perhaps the best educated, society in history.

What I am trying to say is that, despite all our past successes, we have by no means demonstrated that our existing political structure, designed as it was for another day, has the capability to meet these new needs and to solve these new problems. This does not mean that I see any panacea in any of the other ideologies that confront us from abroad. My own ancestors were living nearby in Virginia before Jefferson was born, and I am old-fashioned enough to believe passionately in the importance of America, not only to ourselves, but to the world. What I do mean is that we must not allow our deep commitment to our past to freeze our thinking and to prevent us from dealing imaginatively with the problems of the present. I think Jefferson would be the first to agree to that common-sense proposition.

Among all our grave national concerns, how shall we select those to which we would give first priority? The clamor of the present is so insistent that easy agreement on such a matter is perhaps impossible. Each person will make his own list; hopefully, he will do so with only one criterion, the national welfare. The lists will differ, for that is the way of democratic societies, but the exercise is important. Having said this, obviously I now

have the obligation to indicate my own to you.

First on my list, in timing and importance, is the need for this country to extricate itself as quickly as possible from its current involvement in Vietnam. No other item on the national agenda can be dealt with effectively until this has been done. Not one of our great social, economic or political problems can be made manageable until this conflict can be brought to an end.

This is so because our present policy has produced among our people more bitter dissension than any issue since the tragic War Between the States. Abroad, it has given a valuable hostage to those who regard themselves as our enemies, and it has obliged us to sustain a serious loss of esteem among those who are our friends.

This is not a time for recrimination. Our policies have been made by sincere, honorable and patriotic men who do not deserve the calumny to which they have been subjected; they have been drawn almost inexorably into a tragic situation. Our national debate should not be based upon personalities but upon an assessment of the situation solely in terms of the present and future welfare and security of our country.

One developing by-product of our involvement is alarming but little-noticed. This is the evil effect which may come from the present tendency, born out of hostility to the war, to elevate civil disobedience into a civic virtue. It is difficult to disagree with the observation made recently by Judge Charles Wyzanski who wrote:

"Every time a law is disobeyed by even a man whose motive is solely ethical, in the sense that it is responsive to a deep moral conviction, there are unfortunate consequences. He himself becomes more prone to disobey laws for which he has no profound repugnance. He sets an example for others who may not have his pure motives, he weakens the fabric of society." (*Atlantic Monthly,* February 1968).

The longer the present controversy continues, the greater will become this peril; it is one that could be around to haunt us long after the occasion which produced it has disappeared.

Nations as well as individuals can make mistakes. No matter how well intentioned an original course may have been, things do not at times turn out as planned. When this occurs, it is often wiser to face the changed situation squarely than to seek vindication through stubborn persistence in a course that appears to offer ever-fewer possibilities of final gains to match the costs involved. Given all the complexities of our present posture in Vietnam, it is my own unhappy conclusion that it is not possible for us to derive from this conflict, no matter how it is finally settled, enough long-range benefit to the security and welfare of our country to justify the effort we have made or may be called upon to make. Therefore, though sadly, because of the fiscal and human costs we have incurred, I am obliged to conclude that a first priority item on our national agenda ought to be an honorable and orderly disentanglement from this well-meant but essentially fruitless effort. The United States will be the greatest power in the world long after Vietnam has been forgotten; it will be a still greater power if it has not suffered the impairment of its own national unity and morale by undue persistence in a course which offers so many hazards and so few compensating rewards.

The second item on my own list is the urgent achievement of greater economic and fiscal stability at home. Our government must be made strong enough to protect its balance of payments, strong enough to halt the vicious, inflationary, wage-price spiral. It must be able to take a firmer hand in resolving equitably the conflict between a powerfully-organized labor force and a naturally resistant management, and it must be strong enough to resist the natural political impulse to gain popular favor by ever-more lavish spending upon matters that may be only peripheral to our national well-being. a technologically advanced society must be more of a welfare state than the one which Jefferson governed or envisioned, but we are in trouble if we allow our social expenditures to rise at a rate faster than our growth in productivity. Moreover, we weaken the heart and core of our country when we permit people to become unnecessarily dependent upon the largesse of government. Even the Romans found bread and circuses to be useful as a temporary expedient but fatal in the long-run.

As the ground is cleared by progress toward these first two great policy objectives, other items fall into place in proper sequence. The provision of equality of status and opportunity for all Americans must be a perpetual concern of our society. It may never be perfectly achieved, and it may not be achievable in time to prevent us from much trouble, but it is the only goal suitable for a democratic people, and we must bend our best energies toward it.

To make this goal effectively achievable, a fiscally stable government underpinned by a dynamic economy must undertake greater expenditures for the support of research and education. There is little opportunity in an advanced society for the uneducated to find jobs and income enough for the proper support of their families. And it is better in every way for the country to spend money on education, and on the research that will create new jobs, than upon welfare. No man can feel a part of a society when he is dependent for his living upon its charity. In such a situation he becomes abject and inert, or bitter and rebellious, and these are both signs of trouble.

Finally, a fifth goal must be the rationalization of our governmental structure and processes to make them adequate to the needs of our day. We will never draw into career positions in the public service men who are capable of manning the controls of today's society until we are willing to pay them salaries commensurate with what they would gain in ordinary professional life. Only thus can we assure the supply of talent we need; only thus can we have reasonable protection against the danger of corruption and graft. It is a sad commentary upon our shortsightedness that outstanding men, called to high office, can only accept at the price of great personal financial sacrifice; it is equally regrettable that the government today can secure the services of first-quality experts in many fields only by the device of making contracts with non-profit organizations specially created for the purpose.

But able personnel can be easily frustrated in their effectiveness by improper structure and faulty processes. We need today another Hoover Commission to study these matters in the Federal Government, and we need them equally in the states and in our cities. We are trying to operate a complicated and sensitive society with mechanisms devised for the needs of a simpler day. Perhaps I can illustrate this point by the parenthetical observation that the University budget for which I am responsible is ten times as great as the entire Federal budget which Thomas Jefferson took to his Congress for approval. Here again, we should remember the admonitions of Jefferson who foresaw the problem even if he could not foresee the nature of the society that has grown out of matrix he did so much to fashion.

The title for these comments this morning was taken from Jefferson's Third Annual Message to Congress. There he spoke eloquently "of cultivating general friendship, and of bringing collisions of interest to the umpirage of reason rather than of force." In the years ahead we shall have need to remember this counsel. If we fail to heed it and drift further into sterile and divisive conflict, we shall all be the poorer for it, and we shall not, in the end, be worthy of our heritage.

Special Report Is Made on Law Enforcement Crisis

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, recently, I sent to all news outlets in Oklahoma's Second Congressional District the following special report to be followed by a constituent questionnaire:

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CRISIS

The Second Session of the 90th Congress adjourned for an Easter recess with most members both shaken and deeply concerned by the riots and disorders which have hit scores of our cities—with the loss of many lives and millions of dollars in property damage throughout the country.

Veteran members of the House who served through World War II could not recall having seen the nation's Capital so heavily patrolled by troops during the most trying wartime periods of this century.

Curfews, imposed as early as 4 o'clock on several afternoons, were an unprecedented experience.

Arrests for curfew violations, looting and other law violations during the emergency in Washington were in excess of 5,000. Grade school children and men and women of all ages were involved in the looting.

The Washington Post shattered some false impressions about the looting by reporting that the average looter arrested was 29 years of age and earned aproximately $85 to $95 a week—which didn't leave much validity to the theory that unemployed teenagers are the major riot problem.

The general Congressional view is that we face a challenge to law and order that is unprecedented in its scope and its danger in this country.

At local, state and federal levels, government must move to strengthen law enforcement and respect for law among our citizens—and every citizen must make it his business to contribute constructively to the effort.

THE FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

At the federal level, it is our job to help state and local law enforcement agencies do the best possible job. Toward that end, the President has requested and the House passed last August the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, to provide federal assistance to the states and cities in planning and carrying out programs to streamline and modernize their police and court systems.

This bill is expected to be approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and reported for action in the Senate at an early date.

Another valuable tool for control of any future violence of the kind we have experienced in recent days is a law making it a federal offense to cross a state line for the purpose of inciting a riot.

The House originally approved this measure in 1966, and again last July. It received the endorsement of the President in his State of the Union message in January and finally won Senate approval last month.

The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act and the Riot Control measure will provide valuable new tools to law enforcement—but *the major job remains one of attitudes and improved effort at all levels.*

ONE APPROACH

When I was County Attorney in Muskogee, the Chief of Police and Sheriff joined me in

sponsoring a Junior Officers Corps among grade school and junior high school boys.

We had several thousand members of the Corps in Muskogee County, with units in almost every community, and regular meetings were held to discuss law enforcement problems and methods and to develop a positive attitude toward law and order among the boys. Trial Judges, Highway Patrolmen, FBI Agents and other officers joined in the program.

Public spirited theater owners in Muskogee made a monthly Saturday morning movie available to the Corps, and helped the program maintain enthusiasm and interest.

We were convinced the program not only substantially reduced juvenile delinquency, but also helped develop a better attitude among our citizens.

AN OKLAHOMA EFFORT

Our State has been more fortunate than most in the recent wave of riots and disorders, but I don't believe anyone will question the need for work on the problem of general respect for law. Leaders in law enforcement, with whom I visited on this subject last fall, are in general agreement on this point.

In a few days I will mail to every District Attorney, Sheriff and Chief of Police in Northeastern Oklahoma a proposal for a general revival of the Junior Officer Corps program, with information on the successful experience in my home country.

I hope the idea can be used, and will have the support of civic clubs and organizations throughout our area.

The support and cooperation of federal officers will be encouraged, and I feel sure will be extended.

Basically, however, we must win this campaign in the homes, schools, and at the local level, and it must be everybody's business to win it.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION?

1. *Law enforcement.*—Aside from the measures discussed in this report, are there other steps you believe the Congress should take to improve the quality and effectiveness of law enforcement and constructively deal with the national situation?

2. *Federal spending.*—Last year Congress reduced the proposed federal budget by more than $5 billion. On April 9, the House cut the first appropriation bill—appropriating funds for the Post Office and Treasury Departments—by $700 million. If you favor further cuts in federal spending, please indicate the areas where you believe the cuts can best be made:

☐ Defense	☐ Public Works
☐ Health	☐ Foreign Aid
☐ Welfare	☐ Veterans Benefits
☐ War on Poverty	☐ Research
☐ Agriculture	☐ Space
☐ Education	

3. *Taxes.*—The House Committee on Ways and Means is considering several measures aimed at deficit reduction and which would increase federal revenue. The best known of these is the President's proposal for a 10% surtax on the federal income tax, which would raise individual income tax payments by 10%.

Do you believe increased revenue is needed? Yes ☐ No ☐

If you believe additional revenue is necessary, do you believe the income tax surtax is the best way to raise this revenue? Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have suggestions on preferable ways to increase federal revenue? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. *Vietnam.*—Several weeks have passed since President Johnson ordered a limited cutback in our bombing of North Vietnam, and at the same time extended a new offer to discuss terms of settlement of the war in Viet Nam. Prospects for serious negotiations remain somewhat uncertain. With these developments in mind, what do you believe is our best course of action now in Viet Nam?

Note: The questions above involve matters of major concern which are pending before Congress. I would appreciate having your opinion on these issues, and hope you will mail the completed questionnaire to me—either signed or unsigned—at this address.

Editorial in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser Comments on Lowering of Voting Age to 18—Senator Randolph Introduced His First Resolution To Grant Franchise to Citizens 18 and Older in 1942

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, since 1942 when I introduced my first resolution to extend the franchise to our citizens of 18 years and older, the cause has been a continuing one.

During the first session of this Congress, I introduced my eighth joint resolution proposing such an extension of franchise through the process of amending the Constitution of the United States.

Editorial Page Editor Wendell S. Reynolds of the Huntington Advertiser, Huntington, W. Va., wrote a helpful editorial on this voter subject in the April 17 issue of that newspaper. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

LEADERS OF SENATE LAUNCH MOVE TO LOWER VOTING AGE

The proposal of the Wilson Cabinet of Great Britain to lower the age of majority from 21 to 18 may stimulate interest in the movement gaining impetus in this country for fixing the voting age at 18.

The British proposal would give millions of young people the right to marry without parental consent, to make wills and to own and sell property, but not yet the right to vote.

On the other hand, Majority Leader Sen. Mike Mansfield and Minority Leader Sen. Everett M. Dirksen joined a number of other cosponsors the other day in introducing Joint Resolution 8 in the U.S. Senate to give those 18 the right to vote.

The action brought enthusiastic response from Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., who had introduced his first resolution on the subject in 1942 while a member of the House of Representatives.

He also introduced his eighth joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment granting the franchise to all citizens 18 or over.

Sen. Robert C. Byrd, D-W. Va., asked unanimous consent for holding Sen. Randolph's resolution at the desk for two weeks for additional sponsors.

In discussing the resolution Sen. Randolph inserted in the Congressional Record a number of reports on the advisability of lowering the voting age and presented a number of reasons that had influenced him in his prolonged fight for the amendment.

He cited this "partial list of those responsibilities which our 18-year-old citizens now share with the rest of society:

"They share the burden of fighting our wars.

"They share the burden of paying our taxes.

"They stand responsible in adult, not juvenile, courts of law.

"They stand responsible for the welfare and the lives of their own wives and children.

"They stand responsible for the lives of their fellow citizens traveling on our streets and highways, for we allow them to operate motor vehicles.

"They bear the burden of the future of their families, for we allow them to make wills and to purchase insurance.

"They bear the burden of the financial consequences of their own actions, for we allow them to be sued.

"And they are, finally, responsible for their own ultimate social future, for we allow them to choose their own professions."

Different people will take different views of these reasons and as Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R–N.Y., pointed out in commending Sen. Randolph for his efforts, the 40 senators favoring the resolution do not come even close to the two-thirds necessary for submitting a constitutional amendment.

Possibly the greatest obstacles to the amendment are the high record of accidents by young automobile operators and the erratic conduct of so many extremists on college and university campuses.

Too often those with the least brain power put the most volume into their voices and tend to discredit the much larger number who devote their time to thought and sensible action without exhibitionism.

Undoubtedly most 18-year-olds of today are better educated and have a better understanding of national and world problems than their grandparents did at 21.

To them it seems unjust that they should be deprived of a part in the government until they reach the arbitrary age of 21.

Many older citizens, however, remain doubtful.

Call It by Its Name

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial of April 13, 1968, entitled "Call It by Its Name," by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor, the Tulsa Tribune:

CALL IT BY ITS NAME

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The day after Martin Luther King's murder a young Negro girl skipped gaily past the White House, waving a bright blouse and shouting to the guards: "I stole this. Shoot me! Shoot me!"

The sad fact is that some day soon someone must shoot her, or a system of chaos, terror and economic paralysis will fasten itself on this great and beautiful country.

America cannot operate if any person can loot a store, confident that there will be no reprisal as long as he or she can outrun a middle-aged cop.

Nor can the country operate long under a system of legislative blackmail. When such a normally level-headed citizen as Whitney Young, head of the Urban League, indicates that the country can expect nothing but flames unless Congress passes a packet of additional civil rights legislation this becomes government-by-torch.

When the extremely un-funny Negro

comedian, Dick Gregory, makes out a list of "black-power" demands and asserts that until all are met the Democratic Party may not meet peaceably in Chicago an absolutely basic and fundamental civil right, that of citizens to gather together to choose political candidates is threatened.

Martin Luther King falls before the bullet of a cowardly, hidden sharpshooter. This is an outrage. A young white boy in Tallahassee suffocates after a fire bomb is thrown into his father's store. This is an outrage. A white Pittsburgh steel worker on his way to the mill is dropped by a sniper. This is an outrage. A Negro baby in Chicago dies in its crib as the building burns. This is an outrage.

Americans cannot afford to think about black outrages or white outrages. We must get deep-down mad about outrages—period.

One of the worst features of the wild days following the King assassination was the refusal of many leading politicians to call things by their right names. When Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant erupted in an orgy of looting New York Mayor John Lindsay described these districts as "up tight".

"Up tight" is hippie for "nervous" or "distraught". When the mayor of a great city pretends skylarking gangs who clean out liquor stores and bear off television sets are prostrated with grief he passes beyond credibility. There is a difference between kneeling down to pray and busting in to prey.

This country is on the threshold of a vicious reaction. A double-standard of law in which the people of one race are required to obey laws while the people of another race may ignore them if they choose only works if those doing the ignoring are in the majority.

This was the great evil of the Old South—the repression of Negroes by laws unfairly administered by the majority. It gave rise to the civil rights movement. Civil rights implied a just demand for equal treatment under law.

But the Negro "militants" are re-embracing the unequal treatment theory with the proviso that their own leadership now assume the ancient role of the lynchers and night-riders. Stokely Carmichael's shoot-the-honkies bit is old-fashioned Klansmanism.

This is unspeakable, of course. But, worse, it is suicidal. If America should ever descend into total race warfare there's not the slightest doubt about which side would win. But who wants that kind of America?

This country might take one more "long, hot summer". But not another. If the police and the national guard ever really lost control there would arise informal white armies. Vigilante law is effective—make no mistake about it. It is just not dainty about the difference between the innocent and guilty.

And then—as the heat lightning turned into thunderbolts—a lot of important things would be forgotten.

Most Americans would forget those thousands of Negroes, once barred from white collar employment, who are doing splendidly in responsible jobs. They would forget those young Negro students who are laboring at their books instead of camping in the hallways.

In the fury at the senseless burning, looting and killing it would be easy to forget that the road to justice was unfinished and that many legitimate Negro demands for widened opportunities and improved education had been unfulfilled.

The shooting of Martin Luther King was a grave setback. The idiotic reaction, involving a carnival of irresponsibility, was graver still. We can recover yet—but only if we start calling things by their right names.

Looting is not anguish—it's robbery. The sniper is not a redresser of balances—only a murderer. And to injure a man you never saw because a man of his race injured a man of your race is criminal bigotry.

It's just that simple.

Planned March of the Poor

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I submit for printing in the Extensions of Remarks an article, entitled "Plan for March of Poor Listed," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 22, 1968.

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

PLAN FOR MARCH OF POOR LISTED—ABERNATHY HEDGES ON CAMP-IN SITES

ATLANTA.—A full timetable for marchers coming to Washington for the Poor People's Campaign was announced yesterday by the successor to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

The Rev. Ralph Abernathy, who now heads the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, hedged again on announcing locations where campaigners would "camp-in" in tent and frame dwellings during the demonstration, which starts with an advance party of negotiators in Washington April 29.

A Washington coordinator, Anthony Henry, however said Saturday the campaigners would attempt to use the Mall for their "City of Hope," whether permission is granted or not. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall indicated last week permission would probably not be granted.

THREE-PRONGED MARCH

Abernathy will launch each phase of the three-pronged March to the Nation's Capital—from the South, the Midwest and the Northeast.

Planned by King to pressure the Johnson administration and Congress to take action to help the nation's poor, particularly in Negro ghettos and on tenant farms, the active campaign will begin May 2 at Memphis, Tenn., from the spot at the motel balcony where King was slain by a white sniper April 4. Abernathy will place a memorial plaque on the Lorraine Motel balcony.

King's brother, the Rev. A. D. King, told his congregation at Louisville, Ky., yesterday that "We are going to Washington and disrupt Washington so it cannot function unless it does something about the black folk." If violence comes, he said, it "will come only on the seed of white racism and this is not our fault."

Here is the timetable announced for the campaign:

April 29—Abernathy heads 100-man delegation of Negroes in talks with government officials to present their demands.

May 2—Abernathy lays memorial plaque in concrete of Lorraine Hotel balcony, leads march toward Marks, Miss.

May 4—March arrives in Marks to help local residents prepare mule-drawn wagon train which will wind its way through the South to Washington.

May 6—Second caravan leaves Jackson, Miss., in church buses for stops in Alabama to recruit more demonstrators.

May 7—Wagon train caravan, the main Southern contingent, begins trek to Washington via Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia.

May 8—Chicago caravan leaves for Washington.

May 9—Boston caravan leaves for Washington.

May 12—First caravan reaches Washington.

May 13—Construction of shanty town begins in "prominent place" in Washington.

May 16—Chicago caravan arrives in Washington.

May 17—Boston caravan arrives in Washington.

May 18—Southern caravan reaches Washington.

May 21—Major demonstrations begin.

May 30—Mass march through downtown Washington with all caravans and "thousands" of local Negro residents.

New Jersey Press Support for Monday Holidays

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, support for H.R. 15951, the uniform Monday holiday bill recently reported by the House Judiciary Committee, is mounting with ever-increasing intensity in all sections of the Nation. Before the Easter recess I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several editorials and news articles, taken from various Illinois newspapers and the national press, attesting to the popularity of this legislation. Today I am pleased to include in the RECORD editorials which recently appeared in two New Jersey newspapers, the Asbury Park Evening Press, and the Atlantic City Press. These editorials bear further witness to the support which the uniform Monday holiday bill enjoys. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press, Apr. 11, 1968]

PUTTING SENSE IN HOLIDAYS

The long campaign to put some sense in our national holidays has moved a step nearer realization. The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives has approved bill HR 15951 which calls for the Monday observance of four nationally celebrated holidays. The four holidays are: Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Columbus Day, and Veterans Day, (formerly known as Armistice Day).

These four holidays that presently fall on different days of the week each year would be celebrated as follows: Washington's Birthday would fall on the third Monday in February; Memorial Day on the last Monday in May; Columbus Day on the second Monday in October; and Veterans Day on the fourth Monday in October. Under this system everyone could easily recall the day of the week upon which each of these holidays would fall without frantically searching the calendar.

Bill HR 15951 is a good one. It should pass, and everyone interested in clearing up the confusion surrounding our holidays should see that Senate and House concur in translating this bill into law.

[From the Atlantic City (N.J.) Press, Apr. 8, 1968]

A NEW MONDAY HOLIDAY BILL

Atlantic City's Chamber of Commerce is continuing efforts to persuade New Jersey's congressional delegation to make some of the national holidays regularly fall on Monday.

The purpose is so that resorts and the public alike might count on three-day holidays instead of leaving the incidence of them up to the vagaries of the calendar.

Action of the Chamber is far from an idle gesture, for a new Monday holiday bill

has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee.

This measure, H.R. 15951, introduced by Rep. Robert McClory, R-Ill., calls for observance of Washington's Birthday on the third Monday in February. Memorial Day on the last Monday in May, Columbus Day on the second Monday in October and Veterans Day the fourth Monday in October.

Several similar measures were introduced last year, but got lost in the shuffle of pressing current events.

However, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which has favored a Monday holidays bill for some time past, reports growing sentiment for such a set-up.

Executive Vice President Arch N. Booth of the U.S. Chamber recently extended that body's congratulations to Massachusetts and to Gov. John A. Volpe for becoming the first state to adopt the concept of uniform Monday holidays.

Booth wrote Volpe:

"We salute the Massachusetts Legislature for passing the Monday holiday bill, and you for signing it into law. It is our hope that your trailblazing action will signal the Congress to proceed promptly with federal legislation and, at the same time, encourage other states to start planning their moves toward Monday holiday observances.

"When this bill goes into effect in 1969, I am sure the people of Massachusetts will see clearly how practical and advantageous it is to celebrate the holidays on Monday. Both employes and employers will benefit, in more ways than one."

Massachusetts provides three Monday holidays—Washington's Day in February, Patriot's Day in April and Memorial Day in May.

The trouble with a state holiday bill, for a state that draws tourist trade from other states, like New Jersey, is that unless a number of other states also set up a Monday holiday system, resorts would not benefit much by the change.

Massachusetts, however, also attracts a lot of tourists, and probably felt some benefits would result, other than longer holidays for residents of the state.

If there is a long delay in getting a bill through Congress there is an alternative—a coalition of states passing identical Monday holiday laws. Even if only Pennsylvania and New York joined New Jersey in such a plan, it should prove mutually beneficial.

There is also precedent—Daylight Saving Time used to vary in opening and closing dates with a bloc of tourist states joining in a longer season.

Any Monday holiday plan will no doubt face the usual opposition from traditionalists—but where could you find more tradition than in Massachusetts?

Clarence Mitchell—Prime Mover

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 18, 1968, a significant meeting was held in the hearing room of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Present were a bipartisan group of Senators, who were sponsors and supporters of the then pending civil rights bill, and representatives of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. It was my privilege to attend that meeting, the purpose of which was to consider alternative strategems to achieve Senate approval of the bill. I should add, parenthetically, that the bill at that point was a worker-protection bill only.

One of the representatives of the Leadership Conference who was present at that meeting was my good friend of long standing, Clarence Mitchell, the able and effective director of the Washington Bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. It was Clarence Mitchell who earnestly and eloquently urged upon us the need of adding a fair housing section to the bill. Clarence cogently expressed his conviction that cloture could be attained in due time on a bill that included provisions for fair housing. He was right.

Mr. President, I am delighted that the Washington Post, in an editorial published on Easter Sunday, April 14, has paid a well-deserved tribute to Clarence Mitchell for his major role in bringing about the enactment of the civil rights bill. I heartily second the Post's kudos and ask unanimous consent that its editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PRIME MOVER

The real heroes of legislative battles are often unseen and unsung. Too often the kudos and hurrahs go to those who are most visible, while the prime movers go unpraised. A special salute is in order, we think, to Clarence Mitchell for the part he played in bringing the latest civil rights bill to enactment—and for the part he has played in the adoption of every civil rights measure for more than a decade past. Clarence Mitchell is the director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP and the chief lobbyist for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. It was he who persisted, when others faltered, in conviction that a full-scale civil rights bill with a bona fide open housing provision could be enacted in this session of Congress. It was he whose faith in Congress and the American people steadfastly thwarted and denied failure. All Americans are in debt to him.

Welfare Pension Plan Legislation

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 one of our outstanding labor leaders presented a provocative statement on the need for more effective fiduciary standards relative to private welfare and pension plans. Mr. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, testified before the General Subcommittee on Labor regarding the increased importance of these private plans in that a larger percentage of negotiated wages constitute the employer's and employee's contributions to welfare and pension funds. Mr. Abel also pointed out the inadequacies of too many plans where employees lose their vested interests because they have transferred from one job to another.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this need for congressional action in a very important area of our economy.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF I. W. ABEL, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO, BEFORE THE GENERAL LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON H.R. 5741 AND H.R. 6498, THE PROPOSED WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN PROTECTION ACT OF 1967, APRIL 10, 1968

Mr. Chairman, I first wish to express my appreciation for being able to appear before you on behalf of the proposals embodied in identical bills, H.R. 6498 and H.R. 5741, introduced by you and Chairman Perkins, for a "Welfare and Pension Plan Protection Act."

I appear on behalf of over one million members of the United Steelworkers of America who have a vital interest in these proposals. The bills would establish new safeguards to assure receipt, by those entitled, of the benefits due them under welfare and pension plans. Any measure which would help to assure, without crippling qualifications and conditions, that pension, insurance and other welfare plans pay the benefits called for to the persons entitled would be welcomed by the Steelworkers Union. Such legislation would be a boon, of course, for the members of my Union and the millions of workers represented by other unions. In addition, it would be perhaps an even greater boon for the millions of unorganized workers of the land who are covered by unilateral employer plans and do not have unions to protect their interests under such plans.

The specific provisions of the bills before you have been discussed with the Subcommittee by Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, Director, Department of Legislation of the AFL–CIO, in the light of the policy directive adopted by the AFL–CIO at its convention last December. It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee of the AFL–CIO Executive Council which developed this policy. The convention resolution enunciating the AFL–CIO policy was filed with the Committee by Mr. Biemiller. The union I represent wishes to be recorded as associating itself with the AFL–CIO policy and with Mr. Biemiller's statement.

There is no need for me to restate the points made by Mr. Biemiller. Instead I should like to review briefly some of our Union's pertinent experience in this field and to point out to you some problems which we have encountered. We believe these problems are sufficiently serious to require legislative action of the sort proposed by the Dent and Perkins bills and by other significant proposals which are pending before this Congress.

STEELWORKERS' PLANS

The United Steelworkers of America has been active in negotiating social insurance benefits for its members for 20 years. In all, the Union has been instrumental in the establishment of about 2500 insurance plans, 1500 pension plans, 500 supplemental unemployment benefit plans and 350 extended vacation plans. These plans have disbursed perhaps $2.5 billions in benefits to our members. And reserves accumulated run to even larger amounts. Our efforts to provide security for our members while unemployed, during sickness and after retirement have been rewarded by a large measure of success. And that success is not suddenly to come to an end.

The collective bargaining contracts, including pension, insurance and other benefit plan agreements entered into by the Steelworkers, are with individual companies. Sometimes there may be several contracts with a single company, each covering a plant or some other subdivision of the company. We also have a few pooled pension plans covering the employees of several employers.

In our District 29, running from Toledo up to the Soo, we have a pooled pension

plan in which over 20 small employers participate. There is a separate pension agreement with each of these employers, none of whom has any connection with any other. They are not members of an association or group for bargaining purposes; the only tie between them is that all have contracts with our Union. Pensions are portable between these employers. But, as far as we know, no employee of any one of these 20-odd employers has ever been employed by another. Moreover, in addition to these differences from the usual multi-employer plan, the employees of each employer have a potentially severable interest in the pooled fund. In contrast, therefore, to multi-employer plans generally, our pension plans covering more than one employer have the same problems as single employer plans, and the same need for the same kinds of safeguards as the typical single employer plan.

PROBLEMS UNDER STEELWORKERS' PLANS

In our efforts to provide, through collective bargaining, pensions, insurance and other benefits for our members we have run into serious problems. First of all, in the past dozen years production and maintenance worker employment in the basic steel industry has fallen by about 10 percent in spite of a substantial increase in production. The retirements on pension were much less than the decline in employment. And the places where old employees retire are not necessarily the points at which there are unemployed members. As a result, we have had thousands of members losing their jobs after a substantial period of employment, with all rights accumulated towards a pension forfeited.

We have attempted to avoid the worst cases. Under most of our agreements any employee whose job disappears because of lack of work or technological displacement and who is 38 years old and has 13 years of continuous service has the right to a pension based on his service to the company, payable when he reaches age 65. Further, older employees with long service may receive an immediate pension (with a make-up to compensate for the later beginning of Social Security) under these circumstances. If service is 30 years or longer, an employee may retire on a regular pension irrespective of his age.

Vesting

These contractual provisions have been most beneficial to our members. But they do not go far enough: 40 years is too old; 15 years is too long. No age should be specified for vesting, and the service required, measured at the time of termination of employment rights, should not exceed 10 years. And termination of employment for any reason should activate the vested right.

We recognize that inclusion of a right in a contract is not enough. Funds to implement the right are needed. In this we have not always been as successful as in the contract language establishing the right; employees do not, unfortunately, in every instance collect the full value of the contractual commitment.

This is an area in which legislation is badly needed. And the original legislation should contain the ultimate objective, even if full achievement is staged gradually. There should be a clear and unmistakable legislative definition of the goal, and of the means to assure payment of earned benefits.

Despite the accumulation of pension funds, at least on paper, there are substantial problems in securing adequate monies and responsible management under many plans. In some cases, after negotiating satisfactory provisions, we find the companies blithely disregarding their commitments as illustrated below:

(a) In one company with some 1300 employees there has been a failure to meet, by almost $1,000,000, the costs as calculated by the company's actuary. While the pension fund has assets sufficient to meet its obligations for several years—if operations continue, 8 or 10 years from now the situation could be bleak for plan beneficiaries. After much delay we were able to secure from the employer a commitment to make good the deficit—by 1973. But before payment under the commitment was to begin, and not covered by it, a new deficit of $124,000 was incurred. Mr. Chairman, we do not believe the bills before you would rectify such a contingency.

(b) In another case a company with between 200 and 300 employees has an obligation to pay a certain number of cents per hour into a pension fund. The president cheerfully admits failure to pay what is called for by our agreement. He is quite willing to increase his current commitment by an amount sufficient to liquidate his deficiency in a relatively short time—and promptly defaults on his new obligation. When pressed by our representatives to make good, he threatens to close his plant by means which promptly communicate his threat to our members in his employ. They are alarmed and the company's obligations remain unsatisfied. The bills would not rectify this situation.

(c) In still another case a company has invested all of its pension fund, except a small cash balance, in its own common stock. Its unrealized profit on that stock is almost as much as the original cost—a happy development not unconnected with the fact that the pension fund's holdings constitute about 10 per cent of the outstanding common. If circumstances should require disposition of a fraction of these holdings, the apparent value of the fund's assets probably would suffer severe deflation. The company recently agreed to take steps to correct this dangerous investment policy, but it will take many years. Section 14 of your bill, Mr. Chairman, would prevent accumulations of such unsound portfolios.

(d) Then there is the Pittsburgh company bought out by one of the great buyers and sellers of subsidiaries. Our pension agreement with this company was implemented by a pension fund of which the Mellon Bank was trustee. The new owners of the company promptly removed Mellon as trustee and substituted some officers, former officers and another individual closely connected with the parent corporation. The new trustees immediately sold the high-grade securities in which Mellon had invested the fund assets and brought very high-yield notes which appear to our inexpert eyes as highly speculative. The high yield on these securities, so long as paid or accrued, reduces the actuarially determined pension contribution requirements, so that on paper the transaction has improved the company's profit position.

We were able a few years ago to secure a commitment from the company to cover the contingency that the subsidiary might be sold or scrapped—the usual fate of the small companies swallowed by this particular giant. Under the commitment the company would be required to pay into the pension fund in a single sum any excess of book values of pension fund assets over their values as appraised by the First of Boston Corporation. But this agreement expired several months ago and the company refused to renew it. If we wind up with a fund consisting largely of these high-yield marginal securities, the ultimate pension prospects for our members may be in jeopardy.

It appears, Mr. Chairman, that your bill would place direly needed curbs on such abuse of elementary obligations of fiduciaries.

(e) There are ways in which a pension fund can be lost to a particular group, which no bill proposed thus far would prevent. Over 15 years ago we entered into a pension agreement with a company having some 3000 employees. The company accumulated a substantial pension fund to implement our agreement. Then it was purchased by a much larger company and the pension fund was absorbed into that of the parent company. After a few years the purchasing company was required, following anti-trust proceedings, to divest itself of the smaller company. In doing so, however, it returned only a portion of the pension fund. Neither the anti-trust action nor the process of disgorgement of facilities and assets reached to the pension fund: the purchasing company kept a substantial portion of the pension fund which should have been returned. Thus, the employee's pension rights are not as well protected as they were.

In this era of mergers, consolidations, and trades of companies, more thought needs to be given to the protection of the rights of the employees and the benefit funds in which they have invested their wages and their lives.

CONTRACTUAL GUARANTEES

When we entered upon our first major pension agreement, with Bethlehem Steel in 1949, we secured a commitment on a minimum funding standard for the pension trust. It was not an adequate standard, but many of the other basic steel companies refused to follow that lead. The largest of all—the United States Steel Corporation—insisted that it would not be limited in any way whatever in determining whether it would fund pension liabilities at a high level or low level or not at all. And our agreement leaves all decision-making on finances to the unilateral action of the corporation.

However, we obtained contractual provisions with these companies whereby they guaranteed payment of pension benefits under the plans. These guarantees had the backing of the assets of these companies.

In light of this guarantee we had confidence that the great steel corporations would adopt adequate pension funding programs. For the most part, they have. But there are today among the top companies of the industry some which have pension fund assets which are even less than the liability for pensioners who are currently in receipt of pensions. And at least one of these companies is, according to the financial press, not free from the danger of insolvency. While the solvency of the fund is not in question, the gyrations in United States Steel contributions to the pension fund from which our members will be paid their benefits suggest that the stability of that fund is not necessarily the controlling criterion of size of contributions.

REQUIRED REMEDIES

The condition which I have described require a variety of remedies; some are provided for in the bills before this Subcommittee, but other very important ones are not covered by such bills.

Funding

I do not believe that the duty of policing the adequacy of the financing of pension plans should devolve exclusively on a union under any pension agreement negotiated by it. There should be legally set minima binding on employers. Unions may wish to go beyond those minima under certain circumstances and be successful in incorporating higher standards in pension agreements. Where this is done those standards should be legally binding on the employer as the lower statutory standards, and enforceable in the same way.

Fiduciary responsibility

Further, we suggest that those in control of a company having a pension plan be declared by statute to have a fiduciary relationship to the pension plan. Willful failure without good cause to comply with the financial obligations of the pension agreement should be specifically declared a violation of trust for which liabilities attach, as prescribed in the proposed bills.

We endorse those proposals to raise the

standards of conduct applicable to persons who manage the pension funds. Inclusion of such standards in a federal statute should be of great help in elimination of some of the unfortunate practices which I have cited.

Enforcement

I would suggest that the right to enforce statutory standards under the proposed legislation should be vested not only in the Secretary of Labor or in beneficiaries and participants under a plan, but also in the labor union which is a party to a pension agreement. Under our labor relations statutes, a union enters into an agreement as the exclusive bargaining representative of all employees in the bargaining unit, whether or not they are members of the union. Moreover, the union is exclusively responsible for enforcing the rights of the employees under the agreement. Clearly, the union is particularly qualified to enforce and implement statutory standards designed to protect and supplement rights created by the agreement negotiated by the union.

Preferred bankruptcy claim

As noted above, under a number of pension agreements negotiated by the United Steelworkers, the company assumes obligations as guarantor of pensions apart from any contributions which it makes into a pension fund. In case of insolvency this guaranty may not be of much benefit to participants because pension obligations do not have adequate preferred status under bankruptcy laws.

Where a company commits itself in a pension agreement with a trade union to make certain contributions to a pension fund, and where it is mutually agreed that the payment of such contributions is the sole obligation of the employer, there is, of course, no additional company guarantee. But in the absence of a specific limitation on the employer's obligation, any excess of liability over pension fund assets for accrued pension rights of employees, should be given a status in any bankruptcy proceedings second only to unpaid wages. Such preferred status should specifically be extended to the value of deferred vested pensions on which, when bankruptcy proceedings are instituted, payments are not yet due. Where the assets of the bankrupt firm are sufficient to provide all or part of the vested deferred annuities, the method of preserving such assets for that purpose should be spelled out.

Reports

The annual reports to the Labor Department should carry the amount of the annual contribution recommended by the actuary for the plan for the year reported on; the actuary should be required to certify that the contribution recommended has been determined by generally accepted actuarial practices; there should be a comparison on an identical basis between the amounts of liabilities and costs in each pair of consecutive valuations so that the adequacy of the contribution can be judged; and whether the contribution was paid in cash, securities, IOU or other form should be recorded.

Under the existing Department of Labor practice an employer may make a consolidated report for all of its pension funds. The plan operated pursuant to our agreement with the company may be one or two or one of a dozen in the same company. In a consolidated report we cannot determine compliance with our own agreement or the condition of the fund in which we have a vital interest. The rules should require separate reports on each separate plan. Where a plan covers employees represented by a union as well as other employees of the company, the report should provide sufficient detail to enable the union to determine the pension cost and other relevant experience relating to its members.

REINSURANCE, FUNDING, AND GUARANTEES

Our organization has experienced a number of pension plan discontinuances in which, because an employer's liability was limited to his contributions to the pension fund or because his assets were inadequate, employees or former employees who had satisfied the requirements for an immediate or deferred pension received only a part or none of their vested benefits. We have even had some situations in which the pensions of pensioners already on the rolls had to be cut.

These situations have occurred not only in single-plant companies, but also in subsidiaries of large companies and in single plants of multi-plant companies. The fact that the parent company or other plants of the same company continue in operation has not provided any protection in these cases because the contract related only to the single plant which was discontinued.

The reinsurance of pension obligations against the contingency of discontinuance of the pension plan is a highly desirable objective.

We are strongly in favor of such a measure. Its desirability should not, however, lead us to overlook the extremely complex elements which enter into this problem and the conditions which would be required for successful and equitable reinsurance.

In the first place, it is our view that reinsurance must be based upon and supported by an adequate statutory funding requirement. In addition, the legislation should not limit the employer's obligation to the pension fund assets plus his reinsurance premium.

It seems to us that in the discussion of pension financing, insufficient attention has been paid to the advisability of making the company's general assets a pledge for the security of pensions. The "Cabinet Committee" report, for example, termed the proposal to have employers guarantee the full payment of all vested rights in the event of plan termination as a "far-reaching change in the character of the employer's legal obligation . . ." Yet this is the obligation which is specifically assumed by all our major basic steel employers whose pension agreements with us provide that: "Any pension properly payable pursuant to this Agreement shall continue to be payable, notwithstanding the termination or expiration of this Agreement."

Moreover, our experience has been that many smaller employers are willing to give such a guarantee under our pension agreements in preference to a funding commitment. Reliance upon the assets of a small company, however, may be unwise, and in such cases our policy is to include in the contract a requirement for the accumulation of a pension fund.

It is recognized that to require a company to guarantee immediately any increase in benefits to employees who have completed or will shortly complete eligibility for a pension might seriously deter many companies from improving pension benefits. Our large employers in basic steel, can, aluminum and fabrication have not been averse to assuming such a guarantee, even when benefit levels were almost doubled in 1965. With the smaller companies, on the other hand, the Union has often found it necessary to provide for regular funding, with a limitation of the company's liability to the monies in the fund.

However, there is no reason why the two financing measures cannot be used together—a gradually increasing guarantee by the company of vested rights which is supported by a fund increasing at a specified rate. In this way, the liability for vested benefits will gradually be covered by the assets of the pension fund and the company's residual liability under its guarantee will be correspondingly decreased.

We believe that a reasonable and flexible combination of these two financing measures should be required by statute. In order to insure against the possibility that these two financing arrangements might be inadequate to cover all accrued liabilities, a reinsurance arrangement should be established, with appropriate provisions to protect the integrity and solvency of the reinsurance fund.

It has been suggested that full funding be defined as adequacy of the fund to meet the liability for pensions to all employees and former employees entitled to an immediate or deferred benefit under the terms of the plan. Under this definition, the potential rights of employees who have not yet completed requirements for a deferred pension are disregarded. This approach represents a step backward in the concept of full funding of pension plans which, under the most acceptable of the current views, requires funding towards coverage of all pension obligation. Consistent with these views, the Regulations of the Internal Revenue Service with regard to termination of pension plans provide that contingent liabilities as well as matured liabilities must be fully taken care of before any return of funds to the company is possible.

All accrued pension rights, whether or not they have matured to the point of being vesting rights, should be the concern of the reinsurance arrangement.

CONCLUSION

There are few things so tragic in the lives of employees and their families as default on welfare and pension benefits to which they are entitled. The right to these benefits are earned and paid for by the employees during their working years. Substantial portions of negotiated economic packages, which otherwise would be paid to employees as wages, are earmarked under our agreements to finance these benefits.

You, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the Subcommittee are to be commended for conducting these hearings to develop additional protections for participants and beneficiaries of welfare and pension plans. Intensive studies and investigations have demonstrated the great need for legislation to assure payment of earned benefits when due. There is elaborate legislation on the books to regulate banks and protect the savings of depositors. The need to safeguard the "savings" of employees and their families under welfare and pension plans is equally great. Accordingly, we urge prompt enactment of laws which will deal not only with the substance of the bills pending before this Subcommittee, but also with the funding, vesting, guarantee and reinsurance principles discussed above and in the statement submitted by the AFL–CIO.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to state the position of the United Steelworkers of America on this most important subject.

The Measure You Give

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks the Palm Sunday sermon of the Reverend Charles Edward Berger, Th. D., D.D., rector of All Saints' Episcopal Church, Chevy Chase, Md. Dr. Berger has an important message for all Americans who are trou-

bled by the recent outbreak of disorders in our land.

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

THE MEASURE YOU GIVE

(Text of sermon preached at All Saints' Episcopal Church, Chevy Chase, Md., by Rev. Charles Edward Berger, Th. D., D.D., on Palm Sunday, April 7, 1968, at the 9 and 11 o'clock services)

The extraordinary conditions in our city and in our country have forced so many changes in our schedule and have required so many announcements in our service that I cannot give anything approaching full-scale treatment to the last of the series of sermons on "Difficult Sayings of Jesus." But I want to give a whole set of difficult sayings, which appears in St. Luke, and which ends with a particularly appropriate saying of Jesus, which in the context of this hour, strikes me as especially difficult. I refer to the 37th and 38th verses of the 6th chapter of St. Luke: "Judge not, and you will not be judged; condemn not, and you will not be condemned; forgive, and you will be forgiven; give, and it will be given to you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, will be put into your lap. For the measure you give will be the measure you get back."

Measure these for difficulty! For which is the more difficult just now? Withholding judgment on the act of the assassin, on the actions of the Stokely Carmichaels? On the burners, on the looters, on those who interfere with firemen as they try to extinguish the flames, and then reset the fires after they have been put out? Do you find it harder not to condemn whoever decided to let the looters loot, to instruct the police not to use their weapons to stop the theft of perhaps millions of dollars' worth of the property of others? Is that what's hardest, or is it forgiveness? Do you find it more difficult to forgive those slave-traders who first brought slaves to this hemisphere, more difficult to forgive those racists who have perpetuated the problem then begun, or more difficult to forgive the mirror-image racists who speak of violence in the same breath with black power? Giving may be something you find especially difficult. They are *all* hard—so hard that many of us simply give up. But the really threatening statement of Jesus in this group of them is the summary: *the measure you give will be the measure you get back.* It's enough to make a sensible, sensitive person tremble: you will be judged by the standards you use in judging others. You will be shown no more generosity than you show. You will be forgiven no more than you forgive, condemned no less than you condemn. *The measure you give will be the measure you get back!*

This can hardly be called "Gospel," good news. It is very bad news—especially bad news. It is so brutal that if it were the last word of Christ we would have to accuse him of divine brutality. It doesn't give us even a prayer—not a ghost of a chance for salvation. It's the hardest and harshest kind of rule—as threatening a set of words as could be devised. Not for a moment are we justified in calling it *good* news!

But it is not the last word of Jesus. It belongs to his clarification of the meaning of the commandments which we fail so miserably in trying to obey. The good news comes later—comes in the prayer, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," comes in the faith that through the life and death of Jesus, God has acted to save the unforgiving, judgmental, condemnatory likes of us. We can bear hearing so difficult a word of Jesus as that the measure we give will be the measure we get not because we are so charitable in our judgments of others, but because God is prepared to hear Christ's plea and to forgive. We believe that the Father heard Christ's prayer, and the resurrection was his affirmative reply. Yes, he will forgive and save us, despite our unworthiness.

But how uncomfortable, how disturbing, how difficult to contemplate that saying remains. The judgment you give will be the judgment you get. The measure you give will be the measure you get back. . . .

Congratulations to Graduates

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Each year it is my privilege to congratulate the hundreds of students in the Second District of Michigan who are completing their high school education. In this time when education is so important, their accomplishments should be recognized by the community and the Nation.

At the same time, I encourage all young people who have the ability and the desire to continue their education in one of the excellent colleges, universities, community colleges, and technical schools of our Nation. The Federal Government has extensive programs of student aid and it is my privilege to insure that all graduating students are aware of the options open to them.

My letter and certificate are printed hereafter in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you upon your pending graduation. High school graduation is a happy time for celebration, but it is also a significant achievement which will hold great meaning throughout your life.

Enclosed is a copy of "The American Creed" by William Tyler Page—a creed which helps to give me direction in my work. I hope you will use it as a guide in planning and carrying out your future activities.

Also you'll find with this letter a pamphlet outlining continuing educational opportunities. This may be of help if you have not already made decisions about college. If you have decided to continue your education, you may find some helpful tips in the area of financial assistance.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can ever be of assistance to you in any way. Best wishes for every success.

Sincerely,

MARVIN L. ESCH,
Member of Congress.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

(By William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Presented to [each student] with congratulations upon graduation from High School. May the highest ideals of American citizenship guide you in a life of success, happiness, and achievement.

MARVIN L. ESCH,
Member of Congress, Second District of Michigan.

Rights for the Disadvantaged

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a fine editorial, appearing in the April 15, 1968, issue of the Watertown Daily Times, edited and published by John B. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson gives editorial recognition to the need for priorities and conservation of resources for the Vietnam war and the war against poverty by limiting or delaying spending for other less vital aspects of the American life. The editorial follows:

RIGHTS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Four national religious leaders are asking for an economic bill of rights for the disadvantaged, first cost $10,000,000,000. On the day that the federal taxes are due, some critics may not enthuse over the idea that there should be this further financial commitment although the need for this sum and greater sums is clearly apparent. Much has been said about the difficulties in dividing the national resources between the war in Vietnam and the war on poverty in the United States. Has anyone made a genuine effort to conserve resources for the Vietnam war and the war against poverty by limiting or delaying spending for other aspects of American life?

The other day bids were received in Albany to install mile point markers in Jefferson and Lewis counties at the cost of $22,410. Other bids would spend $22,000 for similar markers in Clinton and Franklin counties. A third bid of $20,000 was for St. Lawrence county, for a total of $64,000. How about postponing this kind of spending until programs of more elevated social purpose are accomplished?

As much as we dislike the alewives, the pressure is on to get another $100,000 to start a control program July 1. Alewives have been around a long time, and as disgusting as they are along the shores of the Great Lakes, they could be tolerated for a while longer were this money, together with other similar items, to be spent on accomplishing something in the ghettos of America.

The anti-air pollution people are loud and long in their clamor for monies, arguing for billions of dollars. What good is clean air for disease-ridden housing?

What is the figure for billboard control on the highways? We don't like the billboards any more than the next person, but aren't the needs of the disadvantaged greater than roads without billboards?

What about the highways themselves? A moratorium on them would permit the use of many millions to achieve better life and opportunity for the disadvantaged.

The other day one of the under secretaries in the Commerce department wondered if Americans were going to fritter away their resources for color television sets in the face of this huge social need by the Negroes and the other poor. The American people will sacrifice their ambitions to buy color television sets just as soon as government will sacrifice its ambitions to misdirect quantities of the national resources toward unnecessary objectives in periods like the present.

Don't blame the Vietnam war for soaking up all the money. Remove sums from outer space, surveying the bottom of the Atlantic ocean, a trip or two to the North Pole or the South Pole, and these amounts, with those sequested here and there from non-priority projects, and the fullscale "extraordinary action" recommended by the religious leaders could be organized and launched with more money to spend than there would be mechanisms to spend it.

Recently a small community of 2,867 in Missouri was planning to commit itself to a bond issue of $140,000,000, the money to be spent on a new aluminum factory which would employ 800 people. Whether the nation needs any more aluminum factories at this time is for the experts to decide, but the laymen are quite aware that aluminum is in surplus supply today. The point is how many communities are there which are willing to bond themselves for $50,000 per citizen, man, woman and child, for a direct undertaking in behalf of the disadvantaged? If communities were so disposed, they probably would be able to benefit many more than the 630 who would be working for an aluminum company which in the end would be the chief beneficiary.

If the moment in history has arrived for government to address itself primarily to those who are in the lowest economic status, then it should delay projects in behalf of those who are much better off. How many lake property owners today are ready to pick up their own dead alewives, drive for a few more years along the roads with their layers of billboards, pass up the opportunity to go to the theater under the Council of the Arts, agree that before they worry about breathing polluted air, they will worry more about tobacco. We can get along for quite a spell not seeing those mileage markers on the roads, including those medallions that measure the distances down to one-tenth of a mile.

These are not the happiest thoughts on income tax day, April 15, 1968, but money is being spent for all these purposes together with innumerable others, none of them having anything to do with the economic bill of rights for the disadvantaged.

Before It Is Too Late

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, those who counsel us to imitate the economic philosophy of the British would do well to read up on the history of Great Britain. Ray Tschimperle, editor of the Weekly Valley Herald in Chaska, Minn., provides a brief and valuable summary as a beginner. I include his recent editorial at this point in my remarks:

BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

The history of Great Britain during the past quarter century is reminiscent of the inevitable end of a man who lives by the advice of a quack doctor. By the time the last dose of quackery has been administered, the patient is too sick to know what has killed him.

For years, Great Britain blazed a meteoric path along the road to a welfare state under the guidance of textbook theorists and socialists. For years, the "progress" of Britain along this road was held up as a shining example to the United States. Cradle to the grave security became the ruling political philosophy of Britain. That philosophy is now bankrupt. No more is heard of British progress. Postmortems have taken the place of progress reports. The economic doctors of the time are but names in the history books.

Experts now are busy analyzing the "British decline." According to one authority, an associate professor of history and humanities at a leading university, one of the many major problems facing Britain today is her reluctance to face up to the fact that "she no longer is a major worldpower." This is something like telling the luckless victim of the quack doctor "you're dead brother." Before it is too late, we might well question some of the economic medicine we have been swallowing in our own country.

Resolutions Drafted by the National Association of Pro America

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have had an opportunity to meet with the southern California chapter of Pro America in San Diego County, and I have found that this is a dedicated patriotic group, striving for a better America, and constitutional government.

The National Association of Pro America has drafted a set of resolutions on many of the issues now pending before the Congress, and I include these in the RECORD for the attention of the other Members, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRO AMERICA

DISARMAMENT

Whereas the people of the United States of America, under terms of the Test Ban Treaty and the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, have allowed their representatives to commit the nation to a program of general and complete disarmament; and

Whereas the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provides that the United States will follow a definite step-by-step schedule of reductions in arms and armaments (which is steadily being accomplished) in direct contradiction to one of the main purposes of our federations of States under the Constitution, namely, defense against foreign foes; and

Whereas at a time when the United States is confronted with an enemy which has openly declared its intention to rule the world, and has relentlessly pursued that goal since its inception, our armed forces and armaments are to be replaced by a so-called "United Nations Peace Force", which is in fact a World Army, therefore be it

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America call for repeal of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, abrogation of the Test Ban Treaty, and the abrogation of any other treaties and agreements which will disarm the United States and subjugate the United States to a United Nations World Army.

MASS MEDICATION

Whereas individual liberty and freedom of choice in private pursuits to the extent that the welfare and liberty of others is not jeopardized, is inherent in the principles and concept of constitutional government in the United States, and

Whereas involuntary mass medication denies the right of free choice to the individual; and

Whereas Mass Medication unconstitutionally injects the State into the private sector, which is a dangerous and foreboding practice;

Therefore, be it resolved that no power be granted the State to practice mass medication and invasion into the private lives of individuals for health reasons, except for protecting the public health from communicable dangers.

LIMITING OF THE APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has, to the grave concern of vast numbers of our citizens, interfered in the fields of education, crime, subversion, religion, apportionment of voting districts within the States, and voting qualifications; and

Whereas this unconstitutional interference and federal control will have serious and far-reaching consequences, destroying our federal system and affecting the life of every individual, and changing the traditions, customs and culture of our entire society; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States, Article III, Section 2, after setting forth the types of cases in which the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction, says: ". . . The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make."; therefore be it

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America petition Congress to exercise its constitutional authority to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in the above mentioned fields.

INVASION OF PRIVACY

Whereas another year for the census taking of population will arrive in 1970; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America states that the proper function of the census is to determine the apportionment and representation of the States in the House; and

Whereas refusal to answer questions of a personal and private nature has resulted in penalties; therefore

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America beseech the Congress to limit the 1970 Census to the Constitutional purpose of collecting population data only.

CRIME AND RIOTS

Whereas crime, racial, juvenile, and Communist-inspired and directed guerrilla warfare in the United States has become a challenging problem; and

Whereas the United States Supreme Court and Justice Department continue to reinterpret our laws governing crime and criminals, thereby emasculating said laws and causing concurrence in the lower courts; and

Whereas this leniency toward crime is creating disregard for law and order generally; and

Whereas the present administration appears unable or unwilling to cope with this growing menace except through continued expenditures; and

Whereas crime increases in direct proportion to the amount of money spent; therefore

Be it resolved that the National Association of Pro America urge all communities; cities, counties, states—to assume their inherited obligations and responsibilities in the activities within their boundaries, making the concept of "self-help" in the American tradition desirable and attainable; and

Be it further resolved that a more articulate reaffirmation of America's religious and moral heritage be stressed.

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Whereas sensitivity training is conducted in groups employing the method of criticism of self and of others with the stated purpose to increase social sensitivity and behavioral flexibility; and

Whereas because Sensitivity Training promotes group-centered thinking or conformity, the participant becomes psychologically dependent upon the group and can rarely solve his own problems; and

Whereas sensitivity training is being used in various forms in business, industry, government and civic organizations, schools and youth groups for all ages, as well as

in churches, known under different names such as T-Groups, Leadership Training, Group Dynamics, etc.;

Therefore be it resolved: That the National Association of Pro America recommends that the public make a concentrated effort to investigate the probable serious dangers inherent in this type of program.

OBSCENITY

Whereas the newsstands of America are being flooded with obscene literature unfit for the youthful reader; and

Whereas law enforcement officials have repeatedly testified that there is a direct relationship between crime and the distribution of printed filth; and

Whereas the United States Investigation Committee on Juvenile Delinquency has reported that 75% to 90% of all obscene literature eventually reaches the hands of teenagers and younger children; and

Whereas present law is not conducive to successful prosecution of smut peddlers who are profiting millions of dollars while degrading our society and culture;

Therefore be it resolved: That the National Association of Pro America call on their duly elected representatives in the State legislatures and in Washington to present legislation to strengthen the antiobscenity laws;

Be it further resolved that the above action be aimed directly at the pornography industry and in no way attempt to regulate the reading habits of any individual, banning no books except those adjudged by a jury of our peers to violate the moral standards of our nation.

HOLIDAYS

Whereas there is a movement to ask the United States Congress to make all nonreligious holidays fall on Mondays or Fridays regardless of their proper dates; and

Whereas these patriotic holidays have been established by Congress of the United States to honor the memory of our country's great men and great historic occasions; and

Whereas such degrading of our history will but add to the growing indifference and disrespect that is noticeable in many of our citizens even now; therefore

Be it resolved: That the National Association of Pro America urge that rather than tamper with dates of traditional historic and patriotic events, we make an effort to see that more emphasis be placed upon the significance of these dates and their celebration.

U.S.S. "PUEBLO"

Whereas on January 23, 1968 the North Korean Communists seized the U.S.S. *Pueblo* in international waters; and

Whereas a military vessel is considered territory of a nation just as an embassy is, making this seizure an act of war; and

Whereas the National Security Council, consisting of five men, rather than the Department of the Navy, is said to be in charge of such communication ships; and

Whereas messages were being relayed to the National Security Agency and thereby to the National Security Council, during the considerable time while the ship was under attack; and

Whereas the National Security Council was also in command of the U.S.S. *Liberty* when it was attacked in the Mediterranean Sea on June 8, 1967, without provocation or warning, apparently due to confused communications from the National Security Council, but with the loss of thirty-four U.S. crewmen and great damage to a defenseless ship; Therefore

Be it resolved that the National Association of Pro America demand an investigation concerning who was responsible in these cases, and if necessary, that direction of such military operations be taken from the National Security Council and restored to the Armed Services as the Constitution provides.

CONTROL OF THE OCEAN FLOOR AND MINERAL WEALTH

Whereas the proposal by President Johnson that the "Control of the Seabed and Ocean Floor" be given to the United Nations; and

Whereas the United States government and numerous states derive millions of dollars in revenue from oil recovered from the ocean floor; and

Whereas the seabeds off the coasts of America are a vital part of both our economy and safety; and

Whereas because of a powerful, unfriendly undersea fleet with a keen interest in the ocean around our coasts, it is vitally important that we maintain control over submarine territory adjacent to our shores;

Therefore be it resolved: That the National Association of Pro America protest any agreement that our government might make to commit our oceanic wealth to the United Nations and URGE that our underwater territorial rights and mineral resources be protected.

REGIONAL TREATIES UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Whereas by secret agreement in 1946, the Undersecretary for Political and Security Council Affairs has always been a Communist; and

Whereas according to the United Nations Charter, Chapter VIII, Regional Arrangements "The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security"; and

Whereas our military plans are probably made known to Russia and North Vietnam through this Communist United Nations' officer; and

Whereas the present Vietnam conflict is being fought under the SEATO regional arrangement; and

Whereas the United States is committed by other regional treaty arrangements such as NATO and OAS to a possible future military involvement;

Therefore, be it resolved by the National Association of Pro America that the United States of America denounce these regional United Nations' treaties, rescinding the enabling legislations, and resume our policy of winning wars, including the present one in Vietnam; and

Be it further resolved that we reaffirm the 1966 Resolution urging the withdrawal from the United Nations as dictated by our national best interests and honorable commitments.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION ON QUEMOY AND MATSU

Whereas President Johnson has intimated through a State Department spokesman that the United States is considering giving up the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, which has been aided financially through Nationalist China; and

Whereas these islands are not the property of the U.S., but belong to Nationalist China, whose defense is their responsibility; and

Whereas it would bring no relief to the government of Nationalist China if the soldiers who have been defending these islands should be withdrawn, but instead would bring a threat because Red Chinese soldiers could be released from their mainland posts and the ports of Amoy and Foochow would be free for use as a springboard for attack on Nationalist China; and

Whereas the possession of these islands is a vital part of the defense of the Eastern Pacific and all areas in between to the very shores of our mainland coasts;

Therefore be it resolved that the National Association of Pro America urge that the United States not desert Nationalist China in the defense of their vital island outposts.

Time To Question

HON. JAMES V. SMITH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, April 22 in Oklahoma is the date of the big '89 celebration. This year marks the 79th anniversary of the April 22, 1889, Oklahoma land rush, and would have been the 39th time the event has drawn thousands to Guthrie where the townspeople go all out to play host. Some 75,000 persons were expected at the American Legion-sponsored 3-day festivities.

But the celebration has been called off.

The reason: "The way things are since Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated."

Many public officials question the wisdom of bringing together great numbers of persons at this time, and more especially if the crowd is "demonstrating."

At this point I insert into the RECORD the following editorial from the April 6, 1968, Daily Oklahoman of Oklahoma City, Okla.:

ASSASSINATION'S TRAGIC SEQUEL

It was a tragic commentary on the nonviolence espoused by Dr. Martin Luther King that his assassination at Memphis should have had a sequel in bloodshed and violence elsewhere.

It was an ironic earlier upshot that the first urban riot of the approaching summer should have received its impetus from a demonstration that Dr. King and his followers intended to be peaceful. The surging violence his death precipitated in scattered cities was a bleak augury for the long, hot months ahead.

Floyd McKissick, national director of the Congress for Racial Equality, says that nonviolence "is now a dead philosophy." But it has long been apparent that the circumstances underlying the original concept of civil disobedience were undergoing drastic change.

Earlier in the movement, Dr. King and his followers had been successful in controlling his massive demonstrations. As long as this was possible, the marches occurred within the constitutional limitations of peaceable assembly and served the useful purpose of conveying to the white conscience the justice of the civil rights cause.

But extreme black militants more recently have been infiltrating and commandeering the movement, giving it a youthful and often criminal element it couldn't control. This was apparent at Memphis where youthful hooligans converted Dr. King's intended "non-violent" demonstration into an occasion for looting and mayhem. His hurried exit attested his inability to control events.

The underlying premise of non-violence is destroyed when its leaders concede their inability to keep the demonstrations within the bounds of peaceable assembly. If the movement has reached a point at which its own leaders are beginning to question whether non-violence is possible, the law-abiding majorities of both races are entitled to ask the law enforcement agencies whether violence is preventable.

What is responsible for the changing conditions of violence which sometimes make it difficult to distinguish between the practical results of peaceful advocacy and incitation to riot? Negroes have been successful in getting a great many new civil rights laws enacted since Dr. King began his campaign

of civil disobedience. In this regard there should be less racial unrest rather than more.

Of course, the underlying evils of prejudice, unequal housing, education and employment remain. But at any rate these conditions are little worse and probably better than they were five or six years ago when it was possible to arrange a "non-violent" demonstration without incurring the imminent risk of its becoming a riot.

Certainly a factor in the changed situation is the frequent reluctance of the enforcement agencies to deal effectively with lawlessness when it occurs in the context of "civil disobedience." To look the other way when looting and burning are taking place is to invite still greater lawlessness at the next convenient pretext.

It may be true, as Floyd McKissick suggests, that Dr. King's philosophy of non-violence died with him at Memphis. It may be true, on the other hand, that the concept lost its validity when Dr. King lost control of his demonstrators.

Plainly, the time has come to question the wisdom of such massive demonstrations as the one planned soon in Washington. In the altered circumstances surrounding "non-violence," it could result in a tragedy greater than Dr. King's untimely passing.

The Importance of Communications

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as our society and our world become more and more complex, it is increasingly important that we communicate effectively.

It is essential that governments know how to communicate with people and people with their governments; it is essential that individuals know how to communicate with one another and that groups and organizations have the ability to communicate effectively, both among themselves and with their governments.

The subject of communications was discussed recently by Mr. Lloyd Wendt, editor of Chicago's American, in an address at a career conference of Theta Sigma Phi in Chicago. Mr. Wendt's timely remarks were reprinted in the April 1968 edition of the Quill, the magazine of Sigma Delta Chi journalism society.

Mr. Wendt's remarks follow:

ARE WE COMMUNICATING SUCCESSFULLY?

(By Lloyd Wendt)

(NOTE.—These thoughts were expressed by Editor Wendt recently when he addressed a career conference of Theta Sigma Phi in Chicago.)

Recently an eminent educator declared that today's newspapers fail the public because they do not communicate and, in fact, they merely confuse the reader.

How do I know this? I read it in a newspaper.

I suppose I am committing one of the prime sins often attributed to newspapermen when, in my opening sentence, I used the expression "eminent educator." This is an exaggeration and a rather loose construction. In a strict sense, the gentleman I refer to is either eminent, except in his own limited, esoteric circles, nor am I sure he is an educator, except by his own prescription.

Our friend (and, here again, you see that I am in semantic difficulty) has a certain prominence in a somewhat introverted group of social scientists who specialize in the evaluation of popular media. So possibly this person might be called eminent. He and his colleagues have helped to develop a peculiar terminology by which they obfuscate their rituals and exchanges of signals as did the medicine man in the primordial tribal societies. Since our hero helps to initiate neophytes into the mysteries of this signalling art, I suppose he could be called an educator.

And, if I may further digress, I would not care to be tagged with any denigration of his cult when I refer to its "peculiar" terminology. I do not by any means use peculiar as meaning queer: but rather as meaning "one's own." We all know, of course, that the derivation of peculiar is from pecus, meaning cattle, going back to the days when cowhides were used for money—thus, peculium,-private property, and pecunia,-money: and also pecuniary. So, peculiar, in this sense, means not queer terminology, but "one's own."

If any of you should assume that I am referring to Marshall McLuhan in this discussion, I can assure you that I am not. It is true that he diffuses a great deal of pernicious nonsense about the popular media, but, for the most part, he is understandable in his perverse way. He also is quite obviously eminent and quite possibly an educator since he is on a university faculty and is so recognized by his peers.

No, I am indicating a contemporary communicator who appears to be in the Osgood/Suci/Tannenbaum school of communication. I refer, for example, to their definition of a sign or word in "The Measurement of Meaning." I quote:

"The meaning of a sign has been defined as a representational mediation process, a complex of reaction divisible into some unknown but finite number of components. This learning theory construct has been tentatively coordinated with our measuring operations by identifying this complex mediation reaction with a point in a multi-dimensional space. The projections of this point onto the various dimensions of semantic space are assumed to correspond to what component mediating reactions are associated with the sign and with what degree of intensity."

If you should feel that I have left something out—or put something in—I can admit to you that I have the same feeling, but I didn't. It's unexpurgated, the sort of thing today's newspapermen must cope with.

I guess I come from a simple, empirical school, that believes in using headlines to get attention, and believes in saying what you mean. We newspaper people use headlines to get the reader's attention: television and radio have other ingenious and more nefarious devices, but all of us are trying to reach the greatest possible number of people each day, which is something many critics of the press don't seem to understand.

In my opinion, newspapers are doing an excellent job of solving practical communication problems and, after you read Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, you realize that we do have problems.

Again, I make a pragmatic evaluation. More people buy newspapers today than ever before: more than loaves of bread or bottles of milk. In 1967, according to *Editor & Publisher International Yearbook*, daily newspaper circulation increased by 163,700 to an all-time high of 61,560,952.

Ah, say some critics, but that is exactly the objection: you say "more people buy". That is what is wrong! Newspapers try to get bought! They try to attract the interest of people and therefore they hit a low, common denominator.

This might in some ways be true. If our forefathers had thought of it they might have taken care not to create a democracy in the first place because you always take that chance with the common denominator: also they might not have embarked on a capitalistic society, had they known how hard it is to sell at a profit.

A few years ago when I was visiting *Pravda* in Moscow I was rather amazed at the calmness in the news department. No excitement, no hurry, and in *Pravda* few headlines and not much news.

I spoke to one of the editors about this, and he said quite frankly that they had no problem to hurry to publish any news because first the government and party officials had to pass on it anyway. *Pravda* doesn't have to rely on its saleability, and therefore lacks some of our communication problems. But I am an unreconstructed populist: I think the people are quite bright and that if we talk to them in their own language and tell them the truth we'll wind up with quite good government and a quite good society, and we'll sell a lot of newspapers. In other words, I think newspapers communicate well because people find us as vital as bread and milk. We speak the language of the people and they want and need us.

A few years ago I read a book called "Understanding Media" by Marshall McLuhan, and this just about wrecked my newspaper career because for a while I accepted the popular misconception that McLuhan knew what he was doin'. When he said that newspapers were a hot medium and television was cool, I bought that because I came from a generation which thought that hot jazz was the greatest thing going and that a cool cat was something dragged out of a refrigerator. But later I realized that McLuhan didn't mean what I thought he said. Actually he disapproves of hot media because there is no personal involvement in it. When a newspaper reader reads words and forms pictures and emotional and intellectual response inside his brain, he is not really participating as much as when he sits before a TV set eating popcorn and drinking beer. That's what I get from McLuhan.

I have now come to the conclusion that McLuhanism is greatly over-rated. I'd like to quote from Joseph Wood Krutch's article in a recent American Scholar, since he says it so much better than I can:

"Mr. McLuhan is the first to extol inarticulateness and illiteracy as the virtues of a dawning new day. And that is transvaluating values with a vengeance."

Krutch suggests that the reason that McLuhan is wrong in so many of his conclusions is that he is wrong in some of his "facts" on which they are based. Par ex: In describing the Renaissance camera obscura, McLuhan wrote in "Understanding Media": "But early spectators saw these images (in camera obscura) upside down. For this reason the lens was introduced—in order to turn the picture right side up." This, of course, is completely false. The lens was not introduced for the purpose of turning the image right side up. As a matter of fact, as everyone but McLuhan knows, even though you use a lens in a camera, the image is upside down. That was why the young lady tied a rope around her mini skirt when her picture was being taken. She knew the photographer would see her upside down. If McLuhan is no better at communications than he is with optics, perhaps we should start ignoring him.

A few days ago I read a report from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, titled: "A Center Report/The Message of the Media." The title should provide some warning: The editor of the article at least had been McLuhanized. But I was happy to discover that the report was based on the comments of people like Nick Williams, editor of the Los Angeles *Times* who, I think, understands communications. Williams did not disappoint me. He said: "To be successful, a newspaper must be edited at two equally necessary levels and for two equally necessary purposes. It must do some things editorially to attract a massive circulation, and do them very well: and it must do some things to achieve prestige. The first, of

course, must collide with the second, and success comes with the ability to avoid collision . . . . . in writing intelligently about public affairs, we are writing not for the bulk of our readers, but for the elite among them."

I recommend those observations to all of you, and especially to people who want all papers to be like the New York *Times*.

Mass media is under an obligation to be mass media. In the United States we cannot impose readership upon all loyal members of the party, as does *Pravda*. We must win readership, readers of all educational and economic levels and many environmental and cultural backgrounds. Generally, a good editor understands what are vital interests and issues to the greatest possible number of persons. He relies on the connotative as well as the denotative values in reaching these people: so the good editor understands and appreciates the environment and motivation of his readers, just as does the good politician. The good editor makes sure that his media reaches the public he seeks: he makes sure to get attention: then he gives them the message. He mingles what he knows they ought to have with what he knows they want. He is honest and as objective as possible. And he always remembers that if you don't reach them you can't teach them.

In this country we are continuing to reach them, almost with greater success than any country outside Finland. In the process of reaching I think we also elevate people because we have a free press, a competitive press, a responsible press. Maybe we should do better with the elevation process, but on the whole I think our mass media, newspapers, radio and television are doing rather well.

You asked me to answer the question: Are we communicating successfully? I think it's about time I answered the question. My answer is "Yes."

Another Year of Farm Prosperity

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, nonfarm people have come to realize that the farm "prosperity" the administration loves to talk about is without the slightest relation to reality. John Weber, editor of the Murray County Herald in Slayton, Minn., provides some hard evidence in support. I include his recent editorial on this subject at this point in the RECORD:

ANOTHER YEAR OF FARM PROSPERITY

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and President Johnson himself keep telling the nation's farmers how well off they are under the present administration, but recent figures released by the USDA lead us to wonder how much longer farmers will be able to afford the "prosperity."

According to the USDA figures, Minnesota farmers had the highest cash sales of farm products in history last year—but their net income dropped by eleven percent. In short, the old cost-price squeeze got to us again, and this time more seriously than ever before.

How much longer can people of rural America afford to go on thinking that democratic administrations represent any kind of a solution to their problems? How much longer can they afford this type of prosperity?

Much of agriculture's troubles last year are attributed to a sharp reduction in federal farm program payments and corresponding increases in the costs of production. Does this sound like the nation's capitol and the administration offices are filled with friends of the farmer?

Another four years of this type of federal help and leadership and there won't be an average of 18 farmers per township in Murray county—and if the present trend continues they won't be netting as much as they did 20 years ago on a quarter section of land.

Amend Veterans Training Act

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, two of my Minnesota colleagues have joined me in introducing H.R. 16594, in an attempt to amend the farm cooperative on-the-farm college training program for veterans as authorized in the 1966 session of Congress.

This section requires that eligible veterans spend 12 hours weekly in the classroom to earn college credit. For this the veterans receive $105 per month, while the veterans in vocational courses receive $130 per month for on-the-job training.

Farming today must be run as a business if it is to be a profitable investment. The average farmer is now required to have an investment of over $73,000, and frequently, he markets over a quarter of a million dollars in produce annually. Thus, the greatest skill and training is needed in financing and accounting. I think this change in agriculture is very well stated in an editorial from the Coatesville, Pa., Record, from which I would like to quote a paragraph.

Not only does it take a small fortune to buy the land, implements, and building improvements to start farming, it takes a continuing annual investment that would startle the ad-man's wife out of her wits, to think that the farmer is managing a gross income a digit or so bigger than her husband's salary. Of course, the marketing consultant may have over-stated a bit when he talked about affluence. We don't know many affluent farmers. But we do know a lot who are sophisticated—who can talk with authority about animal husbandry and genetics, the latest developments in fertilizers, hybrid seeds, crop rotation, internal combustion motors, theories on irrigation, capital gains and estate taxes. If that suggests that farming has come to be a science for which a lot of special training and continuing study is required, then you've seen the point the ad-men have been missing.

The 12-hours-per-week requirement is really the inflexible element for the young farmers. It is primarily because of this weekly evening hour provision that there are only three veterans enrolled in this program in the entire United States out of the over 300,000 which are eligible. My own State of Minnesota has none. Yet, there is a great need for this advanced schooling. This can be accomplished by cutting the weekly hourly requirements for evening classes to 6 and 9 hours, with a proportionate reduction in the monthly compensation.

In addition to the need for becoming knowledgeable with the most modern accounting and banking procedures, there is a need for greater detailed information of legal procedures and instruments. These young farmers are also vitally interested in the area of public relations. Many of these men are convinced that the present farm organizations will have to merge into one organization in order to speak with a single voice that is both eloquent and persuasive.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to make a study of the implementation of this on-the-farm cooperative job-training section of the Veterans Educational Assistance Act in their own districts so that they can become familiar with the extent of the need for this program.

A Friend of the Consumer

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, the interests of the American consumer have been a major concern of the Federal Government. Historic legislation, such as the truth-in-packaging bill, has been signed into law and the resources of the executive are being brought to bear.

A consumer education program has now been established. In many ways, it is an outgrowth of a program set up in 1962 at Lincoln High School in Yonkers, N.Y. The founder of that program, David Schoenfeld, is now Director for Consumer Education of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

Recognition of the important role of this program and the talents of its director was made in a New York Times article by John D. Morris. I present the article herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

U.S. AIDE TEACHES CONSUMER LORE: HE HELPS MISS FURNESS TO PROMOTE EDUCATION

(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, April 14, 1968.—Betty Furness, President Johnson's special assistant for consumer affairs, is relying largely on a brawny, brainy former college wrestler to develop and direct an expanded consumer education program for her office.

David Schoenfeld, 44 years old, six feet tall and weighing 215 pounds, has been on the job since Jan. 1 and hopes to have the program well under way within a few months.

So far, he has spent most of his time touring the country and making sales talks to educators, businessmen and other community and state leaders.

"Basically," he explained in an interview, "my job is to promote consumer education."

One of his main goals, he explained, is to promote the establishment of consumer education courses "from kindergarten through the university level."

CITES FAVORABLE REACTION

Another, with equal priority, is for schools and other community organizations to provide consumer education for adults, with special emphasis on teaching low-income and elderly persons.

The reaction to his sales talks, he said, has been "100 per cent favorable." Surprisingly, he added, he has sometimes found businessmen to be more interested than educators.

"The intelligent, ethical businessman wants an educated consumer," he remarked.

Mr. Schoenfeld's official title is director

for consumer education of the President's committee on consumer interests. Miss Furness is chairman of the cabinet-level committee, which functions something like a board of directors for Federal consumer activities.

His abbreviated definition of consumer education is "the preparation of the individual for the art of everyday living so that he gets maximum utilization and satisfaction from his income."

MULTITUDE OF SUBJECTS

This covers a multitude of subjects from buying food, clothing and other necessities to combating fraud and deception. Budgeting and money managing, purchasing and maintaining an automobile, renting an apartment, buying a house and determining the cost and value or shortcoming of consumer credit are among the many other topics.

Mr. Schoenfeld, teacher of economics and consumer education at Lincoln High School, Yonkers, N.Y., for the last six years, was a part-time consultant to Miss Furness and her predecessor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, for three years before taking his present full-time job. Miss Furness succeeded Mrs. Peterson last May.

At Lincoln High School in 1962, Mr. Schoenfeld set up what Mrs. Peterson and others have described as a model consumer education program. A novel aspect of the now thriving program is the blending of practical consumer matters into courses in standard subjects.

For example, a mathematics class may work on problems of credit, interest rates and banking. Or an English class may analyze the meaning and nuances of words used in commercial advertisements.

Aside from continuing his promotional travel, Mr. Schoenfeld plans to establish his office as "sort of a clearing house" for information on consumer education.

COMPILES BIBLIOGRAPHY

He is now working with the American Library Association on a comprehensive bibliography of books and other teaching materials. He also plans to establish guidelines for courses and curricula in schools and universities and for adult education programs.

He said he expected to cooperate with labor unions, the United States Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity and various other public and private groups.

Sales, rentals and exchanges of books and other teaching materials such as film strips and charts are some of the cooperative ideas he has in mind.

At present, his staff consists of a program assistant, Mrs. Olinda Brown, and a secretary, Mrs. Helen B. Johnson. He has the authority to hire four more professional assistants and hopes to do so by July at the latest.

Mr. Schoenfeld was a member of the intramural wrestling team at Brooklyn College, where he earned a bachelor of arts degree in economics. Friends report that he also excells in archery, swimming, fishing and bridge.

He holds a master of business administration degree from the University of Southern California and has done further post-graduate work at Manhattan College, City College of New York and New York University. He was born in New York City, is married and has four children.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 91st day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Our Debt and Foreign Giveaway

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, for years and years I have protested against excessive American giveaway in its foreign aid programs. Whether by outright grant or long-term—40 years with nominal interest—loans, we have wasted much of our wealth.

I think it is terribly wrong to take money from American citizens by taxes—which they can be jailed for not paying—and then give it away to foreign nations many of whom have no debt at all, and all of whom have vastly less debt than we do in the United States. Yet this is precisely what administration after administration has done, ever since the days of the Marshall plan, which started on the right foot but never should have been allowed to become an integral part of American foreign policy.

The figures are deeply disturbing, as an advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co. in the April 29, 1968, issue of U.S. News & World Report points out. I include this information at this point in the RECORD so that others may have ready reference to a total of foreign aid that is at least twice as much as it ought to have been. This sort of program ought now to be ended and our foreign "adventures" of this type confined to contributions to such international agencies as the World Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Export-Import Bank. Direct bilateral foreign aid from the United States to individual foreign nations is not only wasteful, it simply does not make us friends.

The article follows:

NO WONDER WE'RE BROKE (AND GETTING WORSE)

Here is what you, the American taxpayers, have authorized your government to give or "loan" to other nations, 1945 through 1966. This was not to win the war (you had already paid for that, too) but since the Second World War's end.

And if you think it might have been an investment in the future, look down the list and see how many dependable *friends* you can find. Yet we are still giving away more billions—billions we haven't got, billions we have to borrow (and pay interest on) to give away, billions we desperately need at home.

Here are your gifts. What has it all accomplished?

[Source: Agency for International Development]

Albania	$20,400,000
Austria	1,198,000,000
Belgium-Luxembourg	2,004,900,000
Czechoslovakia	193,000,000
Denmark	920,500,000
East Germany	800,000
Finland	134,400,000
France	9,409,600,000
Germany (Federal Republic)	4,997,400,000
Berlin	131,900,000
Hungary	31,500,000
Iceland	84,000,000
Ireland	146,500,000
Italy	6,092,900,000
Malta	6,100,000
Netherlands	2,470,400,000
Norway	1,236,000,000
Poland	554,500,000
Portugal	$519,100,000
Spain	2,004,300,000
Sweden	109,000,000
United Kingdom	9,044,900,000
U.S.S.R.	186,400,000
Yugoslavia	2,863,900,000
Europe regional	2,735,000,000
Australia	275,300,000
New Zealand	27,700,000
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	125,400,000
British Solomon Islands	400,000
Tonga Island	300,000
Canada	36,300,000
Vietnam	4,590,100,000
Burma	100,600,000
Cambodia	341,100,000
China (Republic of)	4,899,500,000
Hong Kong	41,900,000
Indochina undistributed	1,535,200,000
Indonesia	834,600,000
Japan	3,972,900,000
Korea	6,676,700,000
Laos	473,400,000
Malaysia	47,500,000
Philippines	1,925,000,000
Ryukyu Islands	340,600,000
Thailand	1,089,200,000
East Asia regional	731,800,000
Afghanistan	346,400,000
Ceylon	101,500,000
Cyprus	19,300,000
Greece	3,749,400,000
India	6,769,200,000
Iran	1,752,000,000
Iraq	102,700,000
Israel	1,104,500,000
Jordan	572,800,000
Lebanon	87,900,000
Nepal	97,800,000
Pakistan	3,079,800,000
Saudi Arabia	209,100,000
Syrian Arab Republic	73,300,000
Turkey	5,039,800,000
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	1,133,300,000
Yemen	41,800,000
Central Treaty Organization	52,800,000
Near East and South Asia regional	1,082,300,000
Argentina	758,600,000
Bolivia	460,600,000
Brazil	3,185,700,000
British Honduras	4,400,000
Chile	1,242,200,000
Colombia	834,800,000
Costa Rica	149,000,000
Cuba	52,100,000
Dominican Republic	320,100,000
Ecuador	279,600,000
El Salvador	108,100,000
Guatemala	209,200,000
Guyana	24,400,000
Haiti	108,800,000
Honduras	88,500,000
Jamaica	44,300,000
Mexico	1,068,200,000
Nicaragua	133,100,000
Panama	173,000,000
Paraguay	106,200,000
Peru	678,900,000
Surinam	10,100,000
Trinidad and Tobago	52,200,000
Uruguay	119,400,000
Venezuela	392,200,000
Other West Indies	3,700,000
Regional	83,100,000
Latin America regional	997,600,000
Algeria	179,400,000
Botswana	7,400,000
Burundi	6,700,000
Cameroon	27,200,000
Central African Republic	3,500,000
Chad	5,500,000
Congo (Brazzaville)	2,200,000
Congo (Kinshasa)	351,000,000
Dahomey	9,700,000
Ethiopia	317,500,000
Gabon	5,800,000
Gambia	600,000
Ghana	174,800,000

Guinea	$75,700,000
Ivory Coast	28,800,000
Kenya	57,200,000
Lesotho	1,100,000
Liberia	241,600,000
Libya	200,000,000
Malagasy Republic	9,600,000
Malawi	11,800,000
Mali, Republic of	18,700,000
Mauritania	3,000,000
Morocco	584,100,000
Niger	10,600,000
Nigeria	190,300,000
Rwanda	5,500,000
Senegal	21,500,000
Sierra Leone	32,500,000
Somali Republic	52,200,000
South Africa, Republic of	150,600,000
Southern Rhodesia	7,000,000
Sudan	108,400,000
Tanzania	50,000,000
Togo	12,000,000
Tunisia	487,900,000
Uganda	21,000,000
Upper Volta	6,800,000
Zambia	36,100,000
East Africa regional	18,400,000
Regional USAID/Africa	1,300,000
Africa regional	76,000,000
Nonregional total	6,462,800,000
Total, all countries	122,358,500,000

As we said the last time we published such a list—any sane American can write his own editorial on this subject. Or obituary.

Peace Hopes Don't Change Tax Needs

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Houston Chronicle, in an editorial on April 14, made the very important point that the possibility of Vietnam peace negotiations does not at all lessen the urgent need for favorable action on President Johnson's tax surcharge proposal. Quoting from the editorial:

> Heavy spending in Vietnam, about $2.5 billion a month, would not be ended completely if all hostilities ceased.

The editorial goes on to say:

> The President's chief economic adviser has pointed out that the hoped-for ceasefire would have little immediate impact on spending and total economic activity.

In my opinion, this situation places a special responsibility on all Members of the Congress. The tax measure has been before the Congress for many months. There has been ample time for discussion of all aspects of the President's proposal. In the words of the editorial:

> The time for endless debate is over. Constructive fiscal action is needed now.

Because of the great importance of this issue to all Americans, I insert the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE HOPES DON'T CHANGE TAX NEEDS

As peace hopes for Vietnam have risen, interest in the nation's financial problems has fallen. There have even been some suggestions that the possibility of peace negotiations lessens the need for action on taxes.

That is not the case. The spending rate of the federal government has not been trimmed one iota by the possibility of negotiations. Heavy spending in Vietnam, about $2.5 billion a month, would not be ended completely if all hostilities ceased.

The troops there, now more than half a million, would still have to be maintained and supplied; the expenses of the pacification and redevelopment program would not stop.

The President's chief economic adviser has pointed out that the hoped-for ceasefire would have little immediate impact on spending and total economic activity. Regardless of how the negotiations proceed, Arthur Okun, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, believes that the money needs of the government in the coming fiscal year will not be altered much.

This brings us back to the unpleasant situation which has faced the nation for about six months. If the 10 percent surtax is not enacted by Congress and federal expenditures are not trimmed, we are going to have another $20 billion deficit in the fiscal year starting July 1.

Heavy government borrowing to cover a similar deficit this year has helped to push up interest rates and the high level of spending has added to the inflationary fires.

Inaction on the part of the House of Representatives, particularly in regard to the tax bill, is the main problem at the moment. Following the Easter recess, the House will have to decide if it wants to accept the Senate approved tax and spending measure or initiate action of its own. The time for endless debate is over. Constructive fiscal action is needed now.

The Slob Society

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently carried an editorial on the littering of the countryside and on some of the underlying causes of that unfortunate phenomenon. This message is especially meaningful to all of us with the coming of the spring and summer, when America will again be out of doors and on the move. I commend it to the attention of all and I am accordingly pleased to insert the full text at this point in the RECORD:

THE SLOB SOCIETY

How many beer cans along the highway did you count on your way to work today? The number is on the increase. And when cans are made of aluminum, they won't rust away. They remain as a permanent memorial to modern society.

Every now and then, a plea just has to be made reminding about litter along the highways. And along the streets and the railroads and anywhere else.

The advertising fraternity does a useful job with its ads proclaiming that "every litter bit hurts." Sociologists blame the litterbug habit on all sorts of things: On the affluent society which pretties every purchase in a multiplicity of packaging—all of which must be discarded before the product can be used. Or on the cities with their compressed populations. Or on the "underculture" of America—the careless people, so-called, who just don't care how the scenery is cluttered up.

But way down deep, it all goes back to personal habits of neatness and cleanliness and appreciation of beauty and of order. Do Americans want to admit that the Russians have these qualities, and the Germans, and the Scandinavians, but they don't? Visit a Soviet subway and you won't find a cigarette butt, not even a discarded candy wrapper. And not a beer can, anywhere. Think about it!

The Tax-Free Racists

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, much of the high-echelon maneuvering behind the rioting, looting, and racial disorder in the United States is attempting to place the blame on the people.

Why do the many "red ribbon" committees and reports seek to blame only "white racism" and fail to even mention the role of the violence financiers—the tax-free foundations and those revolutionists who hide behind fancy titles, emotional slogans, and some who even pose as religious leaders.

The tax-free syndicate boys are buying riots and looting—purchased violence and fear—to further their selfish goals.

No wonder they and their cronies are so quick to shut off reasonable discussion and fair dissent with such lies and smears as bigot, extremist, radical, and racist.

They, and not the American people, are the extremists, fascists, and racists. And they seek to wash their hands of conspiratorial guilt by placing the blame with the law-abiding American taxpayers.

So that our colleagues may know who is paying for the violence in our land, I include the UPI release of April 18 and the Allen-Scott Report of April 19 and other articles:

[From the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, Apr. 18, 1968]

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS NOW AID CIVIL RIGHTS DRIVES

ATLANTA (UPI).—The nation's wealthy, private foundations are beginning to open their pocketbooks more than in the past to finance civil rights programs, including those of some of the militant black power groups. They tend, however, to attach strings to the use of their money.

Led by the Ford Foundation under McGeorge Bundy, the white-controlled philanthropic foundations have funded some direct action programs that a few years ago they would not consider.

Today, foundation money accounts for major portions in the national budgets and plans of several big civil rights and black power groups, ranging from 25 percent of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund's budget to a $175,000 grant to the militant Congress on Racial Equality (CORE).

"Before Bundy, you couldn't get in at the Ford Foundation to see the time of day," says NAACP's Jack Greenberg, head of the Legal Defense Fund.

SCLC GRANT

Just after the first of the year, the Ford Foundation announced a $230,000 grant to Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). James Harrison, finance director for SCLC, says it was the first such grant in SCLC's 10 years.

The SCLC grant is for leadership training

of 10 black ministers each in 15 big-city ghettoes. They will be taught how to seek federal and state funds and use them in ghetto projects.

It was Ford's fourth major grant to Negro organizations within the last 12 months. In addition to the $175,000 to the Cleveland CORE chapter for voter registration and youth training, Ford gave $430,000 to the Urban League and $300,000 to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), both general support grants to be used at the discretion of the two groups.

Ford also gave a $47,000 grant to the A. Philip Randolph Institute to train Negroes as apprentices in breaking down craft union discrimination.

GROWING INVOLVEMENT

The Taconic Foundation, the Stern Family Fund, the Field Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation are other big-money foundations with growing involvement in civil rights.

Civil rights and black power groups are pleased with the new source of money and expect it to grow.

"The foundations, even those that were far afield a few years back, are beginning to reshape their thinking to include civil rights," says the Urban League's William R. Simms. "They are doing now what they should have been doing 10 years ago."

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, Apr. 19, 1968]

ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: ROCKY'S RAMROD BACKING POOR PEOPLE'S INVASION

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Indiana businessman J. Irwin Miller, chairman of the Rockefeller for President Committee, is the rising star to watch on the fast-changing political horizon.

In his new political role, Miller's long-range objectives go far beyond his announced intentions to win the Republican presidential nomination for Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

Political associates say that the strategy of Miller, who also has close ties with President Johnson, calls for trying to obtain the presidential nomination for Rockefeller even through a "new party" should the New Yorker fail to capture the major GOP prize.

Miller, the first layman to ascend to the presidency of the politically-powerful National Council of Churches, believes public opinion can be molded and mobilized in such a way as to make anything possible in the field of politics or foreign policy.

One of the key organizers of the 1963 "civil rights" march on Washington, Miller is a long-time champion of using the massive tactics of the late Martin Luther King to change the nation's racial, political, moral, and social landscape.

"Nonviolence tormented the American majority so hard it couldn't stand it," Miller told an interviewer of a national publication. "But when people see violence they are relieved. It lets them off the hook in respect to their own guilt."

Significantly, Miller has given his private backing to the coming "poor people's army" invasion of Washington, which King planned before his assassination and which now is scheduled to take place in mid-May.

PREPARING THE WAY

While Miller, chairman of Cummins Engine Co., of Columbus, Ind., is known for the modern church buildings he has helped to finance, it isn't generally known that he also started his own church.

Following a 1955 break with the Disciples of Christ (former Campbellites) church in which his grandfather once preached, Miller and some friends decided to start a new church which would concentrate on pushing the ecumenical movement.

The new church structure, built in a former cornfield near Columbus, is based on a hexagonal motif that symbolizes the Star of David.

Critics claim the Bible-quoting Miller, who can read the New Testament in Greek, started the new church to develop a new political religion, which eventually would be closely connected with the United Nations.

Miller is now serving on two important commissions set up by President Johnson. The President reportedly recently told White House aides that after Vice President Hubert Humphrey his choice as a successor would be Gov. Rockefeller.

Both Sens. Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., and Robert Kennedy, D-N.Y., were ranked after Rockefeller by the President, according to a White House insider.

One of the presidential commissions on which Miller is a member is studying the role of big business in rebuilding the slums and the other is about ready to make its report recommending that the Post Office Department be run by a private corporation.

If enacted by Congress, the recommendations of either commission could bring vast changes in the federal government and in the types of social services now provided to the public.

In 1965 Miller served as chairman of a special presidential panel that recommended liberalization of U.S. trade with Communist Russia and Eastern European nations. Those controversial proposals, which were transmitted to Congress by President Johnson, were shelved because of the Vietnam war.

In the 1956 campaign Miller supported and contributed heavily to former President Eisenhower's re-election bid. Later in 1959, Miller and his political allies sought the secretary of commerce position for him, but Eisenhower said no.

Friends say Miller still has his sights trained on a cabinet post and would take one in any liberal administration, regardless of party.

Miller is a registered Republican and close friend of New York Mayor John Lindsay.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 12, 1968]

NEGRO VETERANS GET GRADUATE STUDY AID

PRINCETON, N.J.—The Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation announced yesterday it will provide grants to Negro ex-servicemen to attend graduate schools in government, community organizing, teaching and other public service fields.

The fellowships, named after Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., will be financed initially through a Rockefeller Foundation grant of $200,000.

Eventually about $2.5 million will be used to provide about 500 scholarships a year.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 11, 1968]

STUDY COURSE ON KING PRODUCED FOR SCHOOLS

(By Ernest Holsendolph)

Officials of the District's Model School Division have obtained an "instant" new curriculum on the late Dr. Martin Luther King and the civil rights movement to be used beginning today.

At the request of Asst. Supt. Norman Nickens, the Educational Development Center in Cambridge, Mass. in two days has compiled and printed four booklets and two tapes on the life of King, the movement and Negro culture.

Yesterday afternoon the material was distributed to the sub-system's 19 schools and 16,500 students, many of whom live in the 14th and 7th Streets riot areas.

In addition, the youngsters were asked to express in writing their reactions to the violence and looting.

Today discussions on the material were to begin with a viewing on educational station WETA of the Public Broadcast Laboratory television special seen last Sunday.

"As educators, we are always searching for what is relevant to the students," said Nickens, "we can think of nothing that is more meaningful to our students, now than the events of the past week."

Mary Lela Sherburne and her innovation team, which conducts a continuous in-service program for elementary school teachers, on Monday produced a two-page guide to class discussions of King's death, the civil disorder and the significance of the events.

In an introduction to the guide, Nickens wrote: "In times of crisis children learn rapidly; therefore make use of the events of the weekend to help them learn.

"Do not fail them by lecturing when they need to talk," he concluded.

"The new material was needed to help the children—they were confused and frightened by all the events," Mrs. Sherburne said.

"We feel we have a job to do, to bring about a sense of stability and then to begin the task of building self-respect among the children," she continued.

Included in the material compiled for the model schools are pictures of King and his wife and children. There are stories about King's youth, when he was just 4 years old and already aware and very resentful of segregation.

In one instance young Martin was deprived of two favorite playmates, both white, when the white parents decided the boys were becoming too fond of one another.

In another episode King tells of the day he and his father walked out of a shoe store when the shop owner ordered them to sit in the back of the store until white customers were served.

Peter Dow, director of the social studies project in Cambridge, said the quick work was a "first" for his organization.

"We ordinarily take up to three years to study a curriculum idea before moving," he said.

He said his organization is at work on long-range curriculum program relevant to inner-city children, but that the emergency work had been done at the request of the District.

The project cost about $15,000, with about two-thirds of the cost defrayed by the Eugene and Agnes Meyer Foundation of Washington.

From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 18, 1968]

UNIVERSITY OK'S RIGHTS WORK PLAN

STORRS, CONN.—Trustees of the University of Connecticut have voted to free up to 25 of its faculty members each semester to work full-time in civil rights programs.

The trustees' action yesterday, expected to cost the university about $150,000 each semester, was described by University President Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. as "unique in this country."

Also included in a plan approved by the administrators was a proposal to set up a university council charged with recommending specific civil rights programs and policies for the 15,000-student university system.

The board's vote coincided with the climax of a drive on and near the main campus during which 1,100 signatures were collected on a petition urging "quick and visible progress" in eradicating "white racist attitudes" within the university community.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

BRANDO TO DEVOTE TIME TO CIVIL RIGHTS

HOLLYWOOD.—Actor Marlon Brando, stepping out of starring roles in two motion pictures, says he will devote his full energies to civil rights.

The announcement came four days after Brando appeared at the Oakland (Calif.) funeral of Bobby Hutton, 17, a militant Black Panther killed in a gun battle.

Until recently, Brando was set for starring roles in Elia Kazan's "The Arrangement" and a Western, "Sundance Kid and Butch Cassidy." But the actor said yesterday, "There

are issues facing us with which I think everyone ought to concern himself first and foremost. I don't feel that I can do two things successfully at one time."

A spokesman for Warner Bros.-Seven Arts, where "The Arrangement" will be filmed, said Brando was "devastated" by the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

[From the Washington Post]

WILL THE U.N. TAKE OVER NEW YORK?

Secretary General U Thant has met with Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City, Arthur Goldberg, United States ambassador to the United Nations, and representatives of the Ford Foundation to discuss the need for expanding U.N. office space. He has his eye on a collection of tracts owned by the city and Consolidated Edison just off the U.N. boundaries.

More space is needed for U.N. agencies and the secretariat, Thant said, tho it already has a skyscraper secretariat, a conference building, and a general assembly building.

The U.N. is fulfilling the law which decrees that bureaucracies expand in inverse proporton to constructive work accomplished. With a good deal more space, the U.N. should be able to get even less done.

Human Rights Year and the European Nations

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in 1948 a historic document came into being that expresses man's deepest belief about the rights with which every human being is born with and which no government is entitled to deny. This document is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations.

To implement the objectives of this Declaration, the United Nations has designated 1968 as International Human Rights Year and has invited all of its member countries to make intensive efforts to realize the aims of the Declaration.

On October 11, 1967, President Johnson issued a proclamation designating 1968 as Human Rights Year and called upon all Americans and all government agencies—Federal, State, and local—to "use this occasion to deepen our commitment to the defense of human rights and to strengthen our efforts for their full and effective realization both among our own people and among all the peoples of the United Nations."

International human rights can be compared to the civil rights movement within the United States. Each is based upon the dignity of man to maintain his own freedom as guaranteed by the laws of the land. While we endeavor to provide this dignity to our American citizens, the European nations are still determined to curtail the self-determination of their own citizens.

On the occasion of this International Human Rights Year, the Assembly of Captive European Nations has issued a memorandum calling for all humanity to grant these God given human rights to those who are still under the control of alien governments.

Mr. Speaker, because of the timeliness of this memorandum, I would like to incorporate its text as part of my remarks and bring the observations of the Assembly of Captive European Nations to the attentions of my colleagues in this honorable body. I feel certain that the objectives outlined in this memorandum will meet with the approval of all just people who desire to see equality of mankind throughout the world.

The memorandum follows:

[A memorandum from the Assembly of Captive European Nations]

HUMAN RIGHTS AND A EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT

In these days of swift historic changes, the problem of Europe has become submerged by crises and complex issues in other parts of the world. It has, however, been the firm belief of the Assembly of Captive European Nations that a general relaxation of world tension is incumbent upon a Europe united in freedom. A Europe cleft in two would continue to generate perennial strife and contention hardly conducive to achieving the over-all objective of binding Europe's wounds and "making it whole again." It is unlikely that workable long-range solutions to the world-wide conflicts can be found and implemented until the problem of Europe finds a satisfactory solution.

Yet the quest for "normalizing" the situation in Europe is confronted with a number of endemic problems. A Europe divided and composed, side by side, of legitimate governments and of regimes ruling by force alone would know no lasting peace. Genuine stability and respect for human rights can be achieved only when all the members of the European family of nations are represented by freely elected governments which deal with one another in mutual respect and not from fear. The situation in Europe would not be "normalized" by recognizing the *status quo*. Such a move would defeat the very object of trying to foster a valid European settlement and would inject into European developments an element of permanent uncertainty.

There are, however, currently available options, which could help stimulate change and lead to a Europe reflecting the basic needs and aspirations of all the people in the area.

A key to a Europe based on respect for human rights is self-determination. One of the major forces shaping the events of our time, self-determination allows a people to decide under what type of domestic institutions they desire to live and what alliances they wish to enter into. A country free to shape its own destiny and exercising full national sovereignty represents a component of stability on which a larger regional grouping can be built. Conversely, a nation deprived of its rights to charter its future and prisoner of an unpopular self-perpetuating system is a constant source of internal ferment and upheavals.

In ACEN's view, it is therefore deemed essential that an integrated Europe be built on and around the principle of self-determination. As self-determination is an integral part of fundamental human rights, observance of these rights would generate a climate in which the rule of law would take precedence to force and vested interests.

The year 1968, proclaimed Human Rights Year by the United Nations as well as by the President of the United States, offers fresh opportunities for helping foster fundamental human rights in East-Central Europe and thus bring closer the day when the peoples of East-Central Europe will again sit together as equals with the other nations of Europe.

THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

The International Year for Human Rights opens up new vistas for a closer look at the pressing problem of fundamental human rights in East-Central Europe and for a timely initiative to make the implementation of these rights an objective of Western policy.

Key meetings on human rights scheduled for 1968 provide a ready forum for such an initiative by the West. There is the United Nations Conference on Human Rights, to be held April 22–May 13, in Teheran, Iran, followed later in the year by special meetings of the Council of Europe and other international bodies. The United Nations calendar on observances of the Twentieth Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights also indicates heightened interest in a just and impartial application of the rights of man to people in all parts of the world.

Any Western initiative in bringing the issue of human rights in East-Central Europe to international attention would be amply justified on both moral and legal grounds.

Under the United Nations Charter, all member states "pledge themselves to take joint and separate action" to promote "Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. . . ."

These fundamental human rights were systematically clarified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the U.N. General Assembly on December 10, 1948. By voting for the Declaration all member states in effect assumed collective and individual responsibility to help safeguard man's inherent right to freedom, dignity, and equal justice.

That human rights and fundamental freedoms including the sovereign right of each nation to live under a system of government of its own choosing is succinctly set forth in Article 21 of the Universal Declaration, which says:

(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

In the debates in the United Nations on the Covenants of Human Rights, the right to self-determination has often been called the foundation on which all other rights rest; if self-determination is denied, no other right is secure.

Yet as 1968 ushers in the Twentieth Anniversary of the Universal Declaration, suppression of free speech, free press, and free assembly reflects the continued contempt of the Communist regimes for the rights of East-Central Europe's 100 million people. At the same time, recent developments in East-Central Europe indicate that the time is propitious for assisting the people in their quest for the restoration of their basic rights and freedoms.

The Communist system is confronted with built-in problems and deep-seated strains. Czechoslovakia has recently become the scene of a vigorous vocal protest against the regime's repressive policies. The struggle for liberalization reached a climatic moment at the stormy Fourth Congress of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union held in Prague at the end of June, 1967. Some authors sharply condemned the Party's domestic and foreign policy, its interference in the internal affairs of the Union, curtailment of the freedom of opinion, and strict censorship. Party leadership responded with swift retaliatory measures. In Poland the growing opposition of the intellectuals to the regime has been brought into sharp focus in recent court trials of writers and university professors, and by

mass students demonstrations against censorship of literary works. The Warsaw demonstration of February 5, 1968 resulted in 50 arrests.

These and similar developments throughout the Communist orbit mirror the urgent need and rising demand for freedom of thought and expression, denied by the regimes to the intellectuals and other citizens alike. It is significant that although the intellectuals remain economically dependent on the regime's favor and caprice, they dare question the official ideology. Moreover, they are furnishing the masses with a "consciousness" of injustice—a crucial motivating force of change.

The intellectuals in the captive countries must be made aware that their humanist protest is supported by the free World. It is therefore deemed essential that the plight of the intellectuals—who also speak for the peasants and the workers—be fully aired at meetings and conferences held in conjunction with the International Year for Human Rights.

The growing demand for economic expertness has given rise in East-Central Europe to social groups whose professional interests conflict with those of the Communist elite. Technological progress has often been known to undermine the sociopolitical position of the groups in power. Recent developments in East-Central Europe have shown that a regimented political system, such as the Communist state, is increasingly hard put to adjust itself to the demands of the dynamics of change. Since the Communist state apparatus has failed to make substantive changes within its existing institutions, the new conditions attendant on economic expansion are placing severe strains on an apparatus evolved from a rigid ideological order.

With the gradual departure of the "Old Guard" and the advent of a new generation of more pragmatic East-Central Europeans, the lever of Western economic superiority could be used more effectively than ever before. In helping stimulate the trend toward change, however, it should be made clear that the intent and objective of Western policy is to provide assistance to the East-Central European peoples and not to the Communist regimes as such.

APPEAL FOR WESTERN ACTION

The fate of East-Central Europe, and its inevitable impact on European and international developments, is of vital interest to the free world. If the East-Central European peoples remain confident in the restoration of their fundamental human rights, they will continue pressing with renewed vigor for further change and liberalization. To help maintain their morale, it is essential to bring their plight to full-scale international attention at appropriate world forums.

For the past 14 years, the United Nations Human Rights Commission has addressed itself to the task of preparing covenants that would transform the Universal Declaration into a binding convention and endow it with the proper machinery to insure the implementation and enforcement of human rights.

In the absence of operative United Nations covenants, it is of special importance that the free world continue to exert its political and moral influence on behalf of the East-Central European peoples.

The International Year for Human Rights provides a ready opportunity to raise the issue of the denial of self-determination and the violation of fundamental human rights of the 100 million people of East-Central Europe.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations therefore appeals to the free nations of the world:

(a) To raise the question of the implementation of human rights in East-Central Europe at the United Nations Conference on Human Rights in Teheran, and at all meetings and commemorative assemblies held in conjunction with the observance of Twentieth Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(b) To use every opportunity to press the Soviet Union and the Communist regimes of East-Central Europe to restore to the peoples of these countries the full enjoyment of the rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Universal Declaration;

(c) To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national sovereignty and individual freedom and dignity;

(d) To help foster a positive program aimed at the integration of a Europe composed of free sovereign nations, represented by freely elected governments responsible to the will of the people.

The Grade School Dropout Who Made Good

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the very inspiring story of a very unusual man in my congressional district.

This gentleman is Ted F. Kuckelman, who retired recently for the third time, at the ripe age of 79, and who has already accepted a new position.

Mr. Kuckelman, who will be 80 years old on July 18, retired last month as executive director of the Westland Chamber of Commerce, which he organized 5 years ago. Last week, he accepted appointment as executive secretary of the Belleville Area Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Kuckelman first retired at the age of 67, after a long and successful career in sales work. He then became executive secretary of the Wayne Chamber of Commerce, and retired from that position after 7 years, at the age of 74.

A most excellent synopsis of Mr. Kuckelman's fascinating life appeared recently in the Associated Newspapers, under the byline of Joyce Hagelthorn, who interviewed him after his retirement. A few weeks later, an article in the Belleville Enterprise Roman announced his appointment to the Belleville job.

I include both articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a fitting tribute to my candidate for "Mr. Senior Citizen of 1968":

THE GRADE SCHOOL DROPOUT WHO MADE GOOD: TED KUCKELMAN, 80, GOING ON 39, IS STILL PACE SETTER FOR ENTHUSIASM AND EXAMPLE

(By Joyce Hagelthorn)

For a grade school dropout, Belleville's Ted Kuckelman has done right well for himself.

Almost everyone has written about the Westland Chamber of Commerce executive director, he said, but no one has ever written that Ted Kuckelman is really a grade school dropout, and a third-grade dropout to boot.

The almost eighty year old man that no one can keep retired is rather proud of his scholastic career, "because it kind of bears out the truth in that story of Abe Lincoln." With his famous laugh that turns his face into that of a mischievous boy, he said Lincoln's fame wasn't necessarily due to his being born in a cabin, but that he left that cabin.

It all began on July 18, 1888, when Ted Kuckelman was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, a town that saw little of him, for he was destined to grow up on a farm in Kansas. He was the first of nine children.

"Talk about being raised," he said proudly, "I was raised in a really strict home. My mother was the boss. My dad used to get a little hot under the collar but my mother was the cucumber. She was a planner. She'd fix it so we kids had a job to do every day . . . a different one. If we set the table one night, then someone else would do it the next night. You know we didn't have silverware . . . we had knives and forks."

Young Ted started to school like everyone when he was about six years old. He attended a little country school which was about two miles from his home.

"That school sat on about an acre of land," Kuckelman reminisced. "On opposite corners of that acre of land stood a couple of little houses and when you had to go out to one of those little houses you raised your hand," he grinned.

The school was heated with an old pot-bellied stove that could get hotter than blazes, he said, and on the darkish days the gloom was lifted by coal oil lamps.

"We only went to school in the winter time when you couldn't farm," he noted. "All of the boys who lived on farms had to help out their dad, and the girls had to help cook and clean in the house.

"You know," he continued, "every kid grows up with a hero. Next to their dad they've got to have someone they admire more than anyone . . . some man. Well, I got to the third grade and that is when I met mine. I learned more from that third grade teacher than I had learned in the two years previous, and he made me want to keep on learning all of my life. I really thought he was something."

The next year, however, found Kuckelman's father in ill health and the very young boy had to drop out of school to help keep the farm going.

"I don't remember it as being so bad," he said. "I had learned to love to read, and after I would get through with my work I would literally devour any book I could get my hands on. I've always been a voracious reader, and as I grew older, I used to always suggest that when someone wanted to meet me somewhere, he should meet me at the library. That way I could sit and read for a spell if he were late."

The boy grew into young manhood and married his childhood sweetheart when he was twenty-three.

"Five days after we were married, I suddenly woke up," Kuckleman said. "I sat up as if something had exploded in my head . . . and on that day my life changed completely. I knew that I didn't want to spend the rest of my life farming. I knew there had to be something better . . . something different. And I wanted it. So I kissed my bride goodbye for a while, and I climbed aboard a little train and went to Kansas City where I got a job with the B. F. Goodrich Company.

"I guess that was the first instance of selling myself, because they gave this farm boy a job. First I had to take training, and then they sent me out on the territory where I learned how to sell, and pretty soon they transferred me to Denver."

Kuckelman leaned back in his tiltback chair in the Westland Chamber of Commerce office and looked up at the citations and awards adorning one complete wall.

"Do you realize," he asked, "that I had never even seen a car until I was seventeen,

but I knew, I knew there was something wonderful out there in the world just waiting for me."

From Denver he was sent to Toledo and in the next few years he made almost every major city in the United States. And he was successful.

He had one son, Walter, who now lives in Birmingham, Mich., and Kuckelman is the grandfather to two and the great grandfather to three.

It was sometime during his many transfers that Kuckelman realized his need for additional schooling. He enrolled in the Dale Carnegie Institute, where he became imbued with the Carnegie philosophy and using it as a firm foundation, built his own on more expansive terms.

"You can't be successful," Kuckelman related, "unless you love your job. Actually, you can't be successful in any walk of life unless you love. Do you know what love means?" he asked as he swiveled around in his chair and without waiting for an answer, continued, "love means to sacrifice. Love means giving . . . giving until it hurts, whether it is in your work, or your daily life. If you love your work then you are bound to be enthusiastic. After enthusiasm comes truth."

"You know," he waved his pencil above his desk, "no deal is a good deal unless both parties benefit. If you make a deal and you get three fourths of the benefits then you have nothing to crow about. You've lost."

When Kuckelman finally retired from the sales work he loved, it was only by coercion.

"They caught up with me," he grinned. There I was sixty-seven years old when the company had a merger—which is actually organized confusion—and in that confusion someone happened to look down a list and saw that I was 67 years old. They made me retire."

He didn't retire for very long, however. It was immediately after his forced retirement that he became the Executive Secretary of the Wayne Community Chamber of Commerce where he served for 8½ years. It was during this time he lost his wife, and for three months he wandered around Kansas and Nebraska just sort of visiting around."

Upon his return he took up his mantle as a dedicated volunteer. The list of organizations he belongs to is a prepossessing one, but almost too lengthy for a weekly paper to publish. In each organization he has successfully served in an official capacity.

He is extremely proud of his honorary life membership in the Knights of Columbus and in the Elks Lodge. This membership was the first life membership issued for the Plymouth Lodge No. 1785.

"You have to be pretty old and have joined pretty young to get that one," he grinned.

It was shortly after his return from Nebraska that Kuckelman organized the Nankin Chamber of Commerce in February 1963.

Kuckelman believes all problems that descend on man are of his own making, in some form or other.

"Whenever you violate the rules of nature, you are in trouble," he said. "Even though you may not even be aware you are violating them. It's important to spend a lot of time studying and determining what those laws are, and then make sure you live by them."

"You know," he said thoughtfully, "everything starts with you. Each morning when you get up you should look in the mirror and say to the face looking back at you, 'If it's to be, its up to me." It's a great slogan, and it works every time if you really believe it."

"You've got to remember and always be aware that whatever happens to you is your own doing. The objectives you have make you. I've always claimed that if you want something bad enough and hard and long enough you will get it."

And Ted Kuckelman, dearly loved, highly respected, dedicated volunteer and successful businessman has shown that being a grade school dropout doesn't necessarily have to defeat one. Probably because he wanted something bad enough and hard enough and long enough . . . and he got it.

BELLEVILLE CHAMBER APPOINTS KUCKELMAN

BELLEVILLE.—Ted F. Kuckelman, a dedicated community leader and successful businessman and organizer, has been appointed Executive Secretary of the Belleville Area Chamber of Commerce.

The appointment of Kuckelman, long-time resident of Belleville, was announced by Justin Emerson, president of the Chamber of Commerce.

He succeeds Merrill R. Bird, who submitted his resignation last February, effective April 1, after five years at the helm of the Chamber.

Kuckelman, who has twice retired during lifetime from successful ventures, will be 80 years old on July 14.

His love for fellowman and especially his adopted community (Belleville) prompted him to again busy himself with the affairs relating to the well being and future of his fellow citizens and business leaders.

Born in Cincinnati, Ohio on July 14, 1888, Kuckelman has held a variety of roles throughout the United States. In each he has brought improvement and happiness to people and areas that he has served.

He recently retired (March 30) as executive secretary and organizer of the Westland Chamber of Commerce.

A banquet honoring Kuckelman, known as "Mr. Western Wayne County," will be held April 30 at the Wayne-Ford Civic League Hall, located on Ford Road in Westland. The dinner is a testimonial in recognition and appreciation for his many untiring efforts at the helm of the Westland Chamber.

He is an internationally known Rotarian and one of its leading speakers and boosters.

Kuckelman was also the organizer of the Wayne Chamber of Commerce. His list of organizational accomplishments would fill many pages.

And now, when most men of his age definitely retire, Ted Kuckelman's unceasing desire to be of some use to those around, he has consented to accept the post of the Belleville Chamber of Commerce.

The Chamber office is now located in the Professional Building, 150 Main Street. Residents and merchants are asked to drop in and meet and welcome "Ted."

Fly on Your Own

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the problem with the balance of payments is painfully familiar to us all and probably has been one of the most frequently discussed subjects on this floor as of late. We can scarcely pick up a newspaper these days or listen to a news broadcast which does not touch on the problem in some way. As we have more problems than we really need these days, it is nice to come across solutions even if they only partially alleviate the situation.

One obvious way in which Americans can help swing the balance of payments in our favor is to fly American air carriers whenever possible. We are a generous nation by nature and tend sometimes to be rather apologetic about self-serving methods but why should not our people use our own carriers? They are, after all, the finest and most experienced in the world.

There is a very commendable editorial on this subject published recently in the Washington Daily News. I recommend it to this body and include it in the RECORD:

FLY ON OUR OWN

United States airlines flying overseas are putting on quite a campaign to convince American travelers that, if at all possible, they should use a U.S.-flag airline.

Self-serving? Yes. But also an argument that today definitely is in our country's best interests considering the woeful deficit in our balance of international payments.

The statistics on air travel to and from Europe are most interesting. Fifty-one per cent of U.S. citizens flying the North Atlantic do so on foreign airlines, but only 29 per cent of Europeans flying to or from the U.S. use American carriers. And American citizens represent 63 per cent of the travelers.

Almost all the foreign airlines are owned by their governments and the records show startlingly high usage by nationals of their flag carriers. For example, on travel to the U.S., 76.3 per cent of the Belgians coming over use their air carriers, 75.5 per cent of the French, 84.5 per cent of the Swedes, 91.1 per cent of the Dutch, and so on. The per cent of usage of their airlines by other nationals is comparably high.

Some foreign airlines have pointed out that by purchase of U.S.-manufactured planes they have poured more money into the U.S. than they have taken out thru fares from U.S. travelers. And that likely is true in some instances.

But today the U.S. is in a real crisis in its balance-of-payments situation. And any device or practice possible that can keep an extra dollar at home must be used.

Such, it seems to us, is the case now as to what airline to use, if you must go abroad. It is estimated that two-thirds of your money spent for a ticket on a U.S.-flag airline stays at home while, for a foreign-flag airline, two-thirds of it goes abroad.

Americans can start becoming less nationalistic about a lot of things, including foreign air travel, once again when, and if, our international payments are brought into balance.

Unemployment Compensation Resolution

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 1229 which provides for emergency funding of unemployment compensation benefits to our ex-servicemen and Federal employees.

A number of returning veterans from my congressional district have experienced difficulty in receiving their weekly compensation checks to which they are justly entitled, and which are so necessary to help, in the transition period from military to civilian status.

I hope the Senate will act on this matter expeditiously so that no further delays may be encountered. The adoption of this resolution should alleviate the difficulties being experienced by many individuals who must depend upon these moneys for proper sustenance.

Las Vegans Send 30 Tons of Soap To South Vietnam

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to inform my colleagues that Las Vegas, Nev., has achieved another first. Not only for the city, or the State of Nevada, but a first for the whole Nation.

I have been informed by the committee in charge of Operation Soapbar that some 30 tons of bar soap have been shipped to South Vietnam to make life a little more bearable for its citizens.

Operation Soapbar was a Las Vegas community project coordinated by local citizens through the Marine Corps civic action program in which each citizen of Las Vegas was asked to donate a bar of soap.

The purpose of Operation Soapbar was humanitarian—that the people of South Vietnam may raise their health standards, and ultimately be able to educate and protect themselves from Communist aggression.

Probably the most significant feature of Operation Soapbar was the fact that it was carried off with no financial aid from any source. All labor, equipment, and professional services were donated.

When the project began, the area literally blossomed with soap collecting gimmicks. Collection barrels were distributed countywide.

One businessman matched all donations that came through his doors. A movie theater made the admission to a matinee a bar of soap. A gas station, beauty parlor, and carwash offered services for a bar of soap. Donations of soap from local hotels and motels could be measured only in hundreds of pounds. Local news media and advertising groups kept Operation Soapbar before the southern Nevada public constantly.

Billboards were erected. Sixty thousand schoolchildren participated in a school soap drive. A vacant office was offered to store the enormous collection of soap. Each supermarket kicked off its collection barrel with a case of soap from its own stock. Businesses with as few as 10 employees held drives. City employees, firemen, and policemen conducted their drives for a contribution. A local photography studio always had someone at hand to "shoot" the various events.

This and much, much more was done by the "different" citizens of Las Vegas, Nev.

The logistics of moving this amount of soap to its destination was a project almost as big as the actual collections. A local moving and storage group furnished the boxes and trucks needed to package the soap for hauling to San Diego. A local airline also helped transport the soap.

The Navy's Project Handclasp took charge of the soap in San Diego for shipment to Vietnam where it will be given to marines for distribution among the citizenry of South Vietnam.

No less enthusiastic were the Marine Corps leaders involved in Operation Soapbar. When in town to thank Las Vegans personally, Maj. Gen. Lowell E. English, commanding general at MCRD, San Diego, said:

> It is amazing the way the community here has responded . . . truly a tremendous effort.

Col. Donald R. Kennedy, director of the 12th Marine Corps District, San Francisco, and originator of Operation Soapbar, who was here with General English, and echoed the general's praise.

A letter from Mayor Oran K. Gragson and a copy of the Las Vegas Sun newspaper with Operation Soapbar headlines has been enclosed in each box of soap destined for South Vietnam. The letter said in part:

> Sending soap to you is a very small way in which we thought we could help you (Marines) with your Civic Action Program. I'm sure it would please you to know that the citizens of our city in every walk of life and of all ages contributed toward this drive as a token of their appreciation for what you are doing for our country.
>
> We sincerely hope that our contribution will make your job easier and will aid the Vietnamese people in their fight against the malignant growth of communism which threatens to engulf them.
>
> Thanks, take care and hurry home!

Miss Martha Dawson Is Winner in Search for Homemaker of Tomorrow

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, Miss Martha Dawson, of Southside High School, Gadsden, Ala., which is in my congressional district, has been chosen as the Betty Crocker Homemaker of Tomorrow for Alabama.

The Betty Crocker search for the American homemaker of tomorrow is now in its 14th year. The search is designed to assist schools in their essential work of inspiring the Nation's young women with a deeper awareness and understanding of the place of the American home in our society, and to enhance the prestige of homemaking as a career.

This year, 600,000 senior girls in 15,000 high schools throughout the United States participated in the Betty Crocker search program. Every State winner receives a $1,500 scholarship plus an educational tour of Washington, D.C., Colonial Williamsburg, Va., and Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Speaker, these young homemakers are dedicating their efforts and energy to a most vital segment of American life. They exemplify the basic principles and goals of family life. It is with a great deal of personal pride and satisfaction that I congratulate all of these State winners in this competition, and especially Miss Dawson.

Their work is often lost in the maze of activities that are sometimes considered more important and more timely. Thus, it is, I believe, very appropriate that we set aside some time to pay tribute to these young people who are enriching home life in America and working tirelessly in one of our most important occupations—homemaking.

Television That Lingers in the Mind After the Switch Has Been Clicked Off

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, someone has been quoted as saying that the wide variety of programing offered to WQED viewers has resulted in "television that lingers in the mind after the switch has been clicked off."

Proof of the validity of this statement, and of the ever-growing awareness that Americans are beginning to recognize educational television for what it has strived to become—an invaluable national resource—is the fact that the largest educational institution in western Pennsylvania, measured by the number of students it reaches, is WQED, the Nation's first community educational television station, in Pittsburgh, Pa. It is estimated that 960,000 student viewers will have been exposed to its televised courses this year in programs which range from languages and concerts to studies of other peoples of the world and current events. This is triple the number of 5 years ago.

A special supplement of the Pittsburgh Press of April 14 carried an interesting story on the growth and effectiveness of classroom TV, which I commend to my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

CLASSROOM TV—960,000 STUDENT VIEWERS

(By Ken Eskey)

Name the largest educational institution in Western Pennsylvania.

Pittsburgh public schools?

Allegheny County schools?

Catholic schools in the Pittsburgh Diocese?

University of Pittsburgh?

The answer—as they say in the multiple choice tests—is none of the above.

The largest educational institution in Western Pennsylvania, measured by the number of students it reaches, is a blackened stone mansion in Oakland known as educational television station WQED.

Instructional TV beamed courses into more than 27,000 classrooms in 17 counties this year, penetrating as far north as Pymatuning and as far south as the hill country of Marion County, W. Va.

An estimated 960,000 student viewers will have been exposed to televised courses during the program year ending May 17.

The number of student viewers has tripled in the past five years and should pass the million mark in 1968–69.

This means a million viewers, not a million students. A student is counted twice if he takes two TV courses, three times if he takes three TV courses.

The Pittsburgh public schools, for example, had about 111,500 viewers last fall. Yet only 41,000 of the 76,000 students were watching WQED (Channel 13) or the ultra-high frequency WQEX (Channel 16).

Elementary viewers outnumbered secondary viewers 10 to one, partly because of this duplication and partly because of TV scheduling difficulties at the high school level.

Scheduling remains the chief irritant of classroom TV.

Courses are offered five days a week between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. to coincide roughly wtih school hours, but no two school systems use exactly the same timetable.

A high school French program that starts at 10:40 a.m. may suit one school district but not another, even if it's repeated at 1:45 p.m. the next day.

And a teacher may be reluctant to use TV if only one of his four French classes happens to meet during a program period.

Closed circuit television within a school system may be the ultimate solution to the scheduling problem.

Richard H. Barnes, the liaison man between WQED and the schools, says this would enable schools to tape programs and repeat them at suitable times.

Mr. Barnes, who spent eight years with the pioneer team teaching project at Lexington, Mass., shows teachers how to use classroom TV and tries to talk skeptical administrators into televised instruction.

"Administrators say the teachers aren't interested and teachers say the administrators aren't interested," he said.

Eighty-six school systems signed up for the service this year, 31 of them in Allegheny County, 12 in Beaver County, eight in Mercer County and the rest scattered through Western Pennsylvania, six counties in West Virginia and one in Ohio.

It costs a school district $1 per pupil per year to participate.

A district may contract for elementary services, secondary services or both. Pittsburgh takes both and pays about $70,000 a year, thereby providing almost one-third of the station's annual instructional budget.

All 112 City schools use classroom television, some more than others. About 54 per cent of the students and 36 per cent of the teachers take part.

More than 170 parochial schools in the WQED signal area use classroom TV.

Despite its increasing popularity, the instructional program does not support itself financially. The deficit was about $38,000 in 1966–67, according to Rhea Sikes, director of school services at WQED.

"Bootlegging"—using classroom TV without paying for it—is still a problem to the station.

But the schools that just turn on the TV set without sending in the money normally don't have access to WQED's study materials and teacher training services.

Miss Sikes believes teachers have accepted TV as a helper, not a competitor.

"It doesn't use them. They use it," she said.

Classroom television has its critics, of course. Two visitors from the Council for Basic Education commented recently that the TV programs used for large groups in the City schools "seemed to us fairly pedestrian."

Miss Sikes points out that classroom programs are developed by educators, not by television people like herself.

WQED has a 16-member School Curriculum Advisory Committee, headed by Charles Hettinger, director of television and radio education for the City schools.

Most of the committee members are school superintendents or instructional specialists from the districts served by the station.

Twenty-seven classroom courses will be offered next fall, including new ones in creative dramatics (primary), study trips (intermediate) and physics (upper elementary).

Among the most popular programs are the fourth, fifth and sixth grade science courses taught by Francis Alder of the Keystone Oaks schools.

At one time Mr. Alder was assigned to the WQED staff. Now, because of video tape, his lectures can be shown while he works elsewhere.

Other popular programs are "Tell Me a Story" and "Talking Town," both of which were developed by Pittsburgh teachers for primary children, and "Demand Performance," a series of 15-minute films with commentary by Mr. Hettinger.

Maxine Jones, a City teacher, attached to WQED, teaches "News 68," a current events program.

Miss Jones and Mr. Hettinger both work full-time on TV. They receive their regular salaries, plus 10 per cent as television teachers.

Other local teachers seen on classroom TV are Robert Honse of Chartiers Valley and Mary Alice Miklancie and Robert Berkebile of the City system.

Mr. Berkebile's linguistic courses for freshmen and sophomores are offered on WQED under a specal arrangement with the Pittsburgh Board of Education.

Many of the WQED courses were developed by educational stations in other parts of the country.

Contrary to the popular notion, Mrs. Patty Hughes' kindergarten programs are not part of classroom TV, nor are the "Misterogers" programs of Fred Rogers.

They are beamed at children in homes rather than at children in schools.

The effectiveness of classroom television is hard to measure, but Miss Sikes says the feedback was favorable from a questionnaire sent to teachers last fall by Mr. Hettinger.

The key to success, she believes, is the skill of the classroom teacher in adapting the TV lesson to her students.

A teacher in Beaver wrote to Mr. Hettinger last fall about her class of 11 handicapped pupils, some able to do second grade work, others able to tackle junior high courses, all of them enthusiastic about WQED.

"We try to strike a balance and do a good deal of adapting," she wrote. "Sometimes what they absorb is surprising."

GROWTH OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS IN USAGE OF WQED-WQEX SCHOOL SERVICES

Year	Counties	School systems	Schools	Classrooms	Viewers
1962–63	10	68	549	9,330	326,550
1963–64	13	73	541	13,626	476,910
1964–65	16	80	537	15,438	540,330
1965–66	17	80	683	17,838	624,330
1966–67	18	78	720	23,359	817,565
1967–68	17	86	735	27,416	959,560

Aberdeen Major Dies in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Ralph C. Wight, Jr., a fine soldier from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

ABERDEEN MAJOR DIES IN VIETNAM: RALPH C. WIGHT, JR., WAS WOUNDED NEAR LONG BINH

An Army major from Aberdeen, Md., was fatally wounded in Vietnam April 6 when an anti-tank round struck a jeep in which he was riding near Long Binh, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Killed was Maj. Ralph C. Wight, Jr., of 361 Roberts way. He was 35 years old.

Mrs. Marianne Wight, the officer's wife, said her husband had been executive officer of the 185th Maintenance Battalion since November 14, 1967, when he arrived in Vietnam.

"He was counting the days till he could come home," she said.

Major Wight was born in Newton, Mass., and graduated from the University of Vermont.

ORDNANCE SPECIALIST

An assignment to Aberdeen Proving Ground brought him to Maryland in 1966. He was an ordnance specialist.

Besides his wife, the major is survived by a son, Michael Thomas, 8; a daughter, Karen Anne, 5; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph C. Wight, Sr., of Pittsfield, N.H., and three sisters, Julia Anne Wight, of Newton Falls, Mass., Barbara L. Wight, of Salem, Mass., and Mrs. John P. Wellington, of Mansfield, Mass.

Builder-Burner

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, informed Americans chuckled at the announcement of Whitney Young, Jr., titular head of the National Urban League, a member of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, and the recent race riot commission who proclaims he is now grown up to be a "black power militant."

Of course, in identifying himself to the black revolutionists as one of the tribe he cushions the blow to his many white liberal friends by adding he is a builder, not a burner.

Mayhaps what he means is that he builds the organization and his stooges do the burning—nonviolent burning, that is. All of which labels Young as a builder-burner. Any question why the Commission reports can only find "white racism" for a tear-jerking scapegoat?

Must be a lot of builder-burner money available when the league can hire John Gardner and Peter Libassi away from HEW.

I include the Evening Star releases for April 9 and April 20, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 9, 1968]

YOUNG SAYS HE'S A MILITANT AS BUILDER, NOT BURNER

Whitney Young Jr., head of the National Urban League, labeled himself a "black power militant" yesterday, then immediately drew a distinction between "the builders and the burners."

He said he has reached the point where he "isn't remotely concerned with how white people feel or how sorry they are. I'm only concerned about how white people act."

He expressed belief that Americans "should no longer talk about Negro or white leadership but about American leadership," the kind of leadership representing "decent thinking people."

Generally labeled a moderate, Young displayed evidence of the pressures currently pulling at Negro moderates following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King and Negro uprisings in dozens of cities.

GARDNER ASKS ACTION

He was in Washington with John W. Gardner and other leaders of the National Urban Coalition, an urban lobby of business, labor, religious and civil rights leaders that has been organized in 33 cities, including Washington.

At a press conference, Gardner, who became president of the coalition after he resigned as secretary of health, education and welfare, read a statement saying the nation owes to the memory of King and to itself immediate action on the "crises confronting our cities."

The executive committee statement called on Congress to remain in session until it acts on a wide variety of legislation, particularly a civil rights bill and a $279 million poverty supplemental fund bill.

Meanwhile, Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield said Congress should not act hastily and that it might withhold action on all but an open-housing bill until after

an Easter recess scheduled to begin Thursday and end April 17.

YOUNG GIVES VIEWS

The coalition's statement urged adoption of a tax increase and "a specific reordering of national priorities, rather than across-the-board cuts of federal expenditures without regard to need or merit."

After the statement members of the committee were questioned by reporters.

Young—perhaps the most obviously on edge over recent events—said he has received numerous expressions of sympathy over King's death, but such tributes "are not transferable to the ghetto."

Asked where national Negro leaders go from here, he said:

"This is all in a fluid state. We are all reassessing, re-examining our own organizational thrusts as well as our efforts to cooperate with others."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 20, 1968]

RIGHTS CHIEF AT HEW JOINING URBAN COALITION

(By Barbara Kober)

F. Peter Libassi has resigned as director of Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

He will be replaced by Mrs. Ruby G. Martin, 35, who will become special assistant to the secretary in charge of civil rights activities, it was announced yesterday.

Libassi will join the executive staff of the Urban Coalition, the non-governmental agency headed by former HEW Secretary John W. Gardner.

The changes become effective May 1.

Mrs. Martin, now Director of Operations in the HEW Civil Rights Office, will be in charge of all the department's compliance activities under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits federal financial aid to activities which practice racial discrimination.

As a staff member of the organization which deals with problems of the cities, Libassi will head a nation-wide effort to form new local coalitions. His aim will be to increase from 33 to 100 the number of coalitions, which like the national organization, aim at focusing broad-based leadership and the resources of both public and private sectors on such urban problems as employment, housing, education and economic opportunity in low-income areas.

At a press conference, Libassi emphasized that his departure will bring no change in the department's civil rights enforcement policies..

"The steady movement toward dealing with larger schools in the North and moving away from small rural schools in the South" will be continued, he said.

In her new job, Mrs. Martin, a graduate of Fisk University and Howard University, will become one of the highest ranking Negroes in government.

Cumberland Marine Dies

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. William E. Propst, a fine young Marine from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his bravery and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CUMBERLAND MARINE DIES: PFC. WILLIAM E. PROPST, 21, KILLED IN VIETNAM

CUMBERLAND, April 16.—A 21-year-old Cumberland marine who had been in the service less than a year has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported today.

He was Pfc. William E. Propst, husband of Mrs. Lois M. Propst, of Brice Hollow road.

According to a telegram sent his family, he was killed Saturday near Quang Nan, South Vietnam.

Besides his wife, he is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Homer Propst; three brothers, Harlen J., Stanley and Rodney W. Propst, and six sisters, Mrs. Goldie Bennett, Mrs. Elsie G. Peterson, Mrs. Lois J. Bennett, Mrs. Anna M. Grogg, Mrs. Barbaret Wentling and Mrs. Carol L. Humbertson, all of the Cumberland area.

Guntersville, Ala., Celebrates 150th Birthday

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the 150th anniversary of the city of Guntersville, Ala.

This fine city has a very interesting history beginning with the settlement of the John Gunter family in 1818. Under unanimous consent, I submit a news article that appeared in the April 3 edition of the Guntersville Advertiser-Gleam, which relates the history of Guntersville and commemorates this anniversary.

The article follows:

HEY—WE'RE HAVING OUR 150TH BIRTHDAY

Sesquicentennial, anyone?

Don't look now, but Guntersville has reached the ripe old age of 150.

It was in 1818 that the John Gunter family moved south of the river, forming the first permanent settlement where Guntersville is located today.

The Gunters had been in these parts a good many years before that but they lived north of the river, around Claysville.

When they crossed the river in 1818 they also started operating the first ferry boat service, letting people cross the Tennessee and marking this as a permanent location for commerce going north or south.

Guntersville became a thriving settlement long before it was officially incorporated as a city in 1847. Lippincotts Gazetteer of the World, a recognized authority in such matters, states that Guntersville was settled in 1818.

At that time this area was part of Georgia. The state of Alabama wasn't created until the following year, 1819. Marshall County wasn't formed until 1836, when it was carved out of Blount and Jackson counties.

Until 1835 the territory in Alabama south of the river was part of the Cherokee Nation. The village that was to become Guntersville, then, was in Indian country the first 17 years of its existence. Large-scale settlement didn't begin south of the river until the 1830s, when the Indians were ousted by the government and moved to Arkansas and other points west.

Accounts of the early days of the Guntersville area are sketchy, and in some cases the accounts don't agree. The following is what we were able to piece together:

When Indians or other prehistoric people inhabited this area isn't known. In any event, they were not here continuously. In 1709 some Canadian explorers found Indians living along the Tennessee River and found a town, Tali, which some believe to have been on the site of Guntersville.

Evidence indicates that in the 1700's the Cherokees wandered back into this area from the upper headwaters of the Tennessee, where they had been forced by wars with the Shawnees and Chickasaws. One report is that the Cherokees drove the Chickasaws out of this area in the late 1700's and established themselves here.

John Gunter had come from Scotland to America with his parents in the latter part of the 1700's. They landed at Charleston, S.C.

John began trading with the Cherokees and Creeks in South Carolina, and ultimately began to live among the Cherokees, drifting with them from place to place. He married a full-blooded Cherokee woman and they began rearing a family.

The Gunters established a home at what is now Claysville around 1790. Three sons and three daughters were born to them. The boys were Samuel, Edward and John Jr. The girls were Jane, who married a Lt. Blackburn; Betsy, who was wed to Martin Scrimsher and Susan, who became a Vaught.

In 1814 Gen. Andrew Jackson and his army of Tennesseans came through this area during the Creek Indians Wars. He was headed south, toward what was to become known as the Battle of Horseshoe Bend on the Tallapoosa River. Jackson crossed the Tennessee at Whitesburg and marched his army over Brindlee Mountain to near Warrenton. There they camped for a time while Jackson was establishing a depot for his supplies at Fort Deposit, on the north side of the river at Honeycomb Creek.

While Jackson was here, the Cherokees in the village north of the river caught the war fever. Jackson encouraged them to raise a volunteer regiment which they did. Their major was Edward Gunter.

The regiment moved in advance of Jackson's main army and performed notably at the Horseshoe. Edward Gunter was wounded through the body, but recovered and returned home.

In 1817 Edward was granted a franchise to operate a ferry boat here, perhaps as a reward for his military services. Next year the Gunters moved south of the river, forming the first permanent settlement in the town that was to bear their name.

John Gunter built a large home a short distance from the ferry landing. This was near the point where the present bridge was built in the 1920's.

John Gunter, Jr. later built what was known as the White House in the same area.

Edward Gunter built his home in what later became Wyeth City and still later came to be called Southtown. It was on the rise about where Thomas Avenue crosses Loveless Street, the intersection with the four-way stop signs.

The Gunters established a large mercantile warehouse, and by the 1830s there were 15 to 20 families living near the White House. That, with several stores, constituted the village as of 1835.

As time went on the government came under increasing pressure from whites to make the Indian lands available for settlement. Part of what is now Marshall County was bought from the Indians in 1817. The rest was acquired by the Treaty of 1835, in which the Cherokees surrendered all their lands east of the Mississippi.

Shortly after the Indians lost their land, they moved west of the Mississippi. Some or all of the original Gunter family went along.

Today there are a good many Gunter families in Marshall County and nearby counties, although none right in Guntersville. As far as we know, however, the present Gunters are not related to the clan that founded Guntersville 150 years ago.

GUNTERS VISIT GUNTERSVILLE

Kenneth Gunter, a descendant of John Gunter, founder of Guntersville, passed through town recently.

It was Mr. Gunter's first visit to the city that bears his family's name. He lives in San Angelo, Tex., where he's with a TV cable company.

No Gunters have lived in Guntersville for many years, but there are lots of them in Texas. Kenneth's grandfather A. A. Gunter moved to St. Angelo in 1911 from around Bridgeport, Ala., and his three sons still live in St. Angelo. They are Kenneth's father E. C. Gunter, William M. Gunter, and R. C. Gunter There was once a steamboat here called the R. C. Gunter, apparently named for a namesake of the present-day Texan.

Kenneth doesn't know how many "greats" you have to add to "grandson" to describe his relationship to the original John Gunter.

The First Lady Promotes Travel to America

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Fort Worth Star Telegram of April 9 describes how Mrs. Lyndon Johnson is lending her enormous talents and energies to the Discover America program—aimed at encouraging tourism within and to the United States. The First Lady made a 5-day trip through Texas, accompanied by Secretary Udall and a group of European travel editors. During the trip, the group took part in the opening day celebrations of HemisFair 1968 in San Antonio. Another important event took place when Mrs. Johnson conferred registered national historic landmark status upon the mission and presidio of La Bahia in Goliad.

This trip is just one more example of how Mrs. Johnson has actively involved herself in programs that are important for all Americans. Travel and tourism are enormous industries in this age, both in this country and around the world. Tourism is a vital element in our international balance of payments, and Mrs. Johnson is making a substantial contribution toward solving the problem by her personal involvement and example. I insert in the RECORD the article from the Fort Worth Star Telegram:

LADY BIRD DEDICATES TWO HISTORIC LANDMARKS IN STATE

(By Marthann Berry)

CORPUS CHRISTI.—Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, in the last day of a five-day swing through her home state, conferred registered national historic landmark status upon the Mission and Presidio of La Bahia in Goliad today.

Mrs. Johnson said travel is a "major habit" in America and tourists not only move toward the major attractions such as Manhattan, the Grand Canyon or San Francisco, "but also are seeking out-of-the-way places to discover and savor."

"La Bahia is such a place," she said.

The Goliad Mission is one of the Texas Independence landmarks. It was here that Col. James Fannin and his men were killed, and it was on the Mission Hill that the Mexican hero and patriot, Gen. Ignacio Zaragoza, was born.

Mrs. Johnson is winding up a "Discover America in Texas" tour. She is accompanied by 40 European travel editors and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

This is the first of several trips that the first lady will make this spring and summer. Discover America is part of the President's program "See America First."

Following the Goliad ceremony, Mrs. Johnson and her group were to drive to Gonzales, through the Texas wildflower country, for another brief ceremony.

At nearby Palmetto State Park the group was to be honored with an old fashioned covered dish country luncheon before departing for San Antonio where they will board planes to return to Washington.

The group was at Padre Island Monday where Mrs. Johnson dedicated the island as a national seashore.

Mrs. Johnson's tour began with a visit to Fredericksburg—mainly for the benefit of the German writers—then a refreshment stop and short swing through the LBJ Ranch.

The group was in San Antonio for opening day celebrations of HemisFair '68. Mrs. Johnson made several dedications at the HemisFair opening.

The Architect and Housing

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the April 1966 issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects carries the most inclusive statement to date of the AIA concerning the architect's responsibilities in solving the Nation's acute housing problem.

Because of the importance of the architect and the AIA in providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for Americans, this article should be of interest to my colleagues:

THE ARCHITECT AND HOUSING

We are at a time in history, after 200 years of homebuilding in America, when all involved now concur that procedures and programs—federal/local, public/private—have not begin to achieve the national housing goal of providing a decent home and suitable living environment for every family.

The notion of housing as a building type is a modern one whose importance to society is clearly manifested by widespread audible concern about it, including major governmental programs. The great ages of architecture as our historians have recorded them showed little evidence of the architect's preoccupation with dwelling places for any but the affluent.

Today, the architect must recognize that he has an accelerated role to play in the housing industry: the custom-designed field where he has traditionally been involved, the homebuilding market where he must enlarge his areas of contribution, and government and privately assisted low-income housing—the exploding sector most in need of his attention.

In the year ahead, the AIA, working with our allied professionals, the building industry and government, will critically review existing and proposed housing programs and also will develop new and expanded ones with the aim of achieving our national housing goal. The following areas indicate issues on which the architectural profession will address itself in the immediate future.

GOVERNMENT'S PARTICIPATION

It is a well-established historical fact that the housing segment of the construction industry as a major source of employment is closely related to the economic health of the community. It bears the major responsibility for rebuilding and stabilizing the central city. It has for more than two decades heavily relied upon federal programs to underwrite or fund the construction of low- and moderate-income housing. Such programs require months of staffing, preparation and scheduling in order to respond to the availability of new funds.

Therefore, the AIA urges that federal programs be administered in a manner consistent with the maintenance of a sound and healthy housing industry, which should not unduly bear the responsibility for absorbing major adjustments in the nation's economic climate. The withholding of funds without regard for need in order to control inflationary trends is just as ill-advised as to overfinance more housing starts than the proven demand dictates. During the crisis in our cities, there must be a full utilization of the major tool available for renewal of neighborhoods, i.e., construction and rehabilitation.

The AIA recognizes that one function of government on the federal, state, metropolitan and municipal levels is to encourage adequate housing for all strata of the population. The Institute also recognizes the need for government at all levels to participate in the development of programs for low-income families.

Low-Income Housing.—The AIA believes that the public housing concept developed during the '30s for the displaced and the poverty stricken has proven unsuited to today's city problems.

A completely new solution must be found. The best long-term answer is to reduce the number of unemployable by improved education and by overcoming discrimination. However, as an interim solution, the AIA believes that there is currently no substitute to government assistance for the poorest, whose needs are for broad forms of social services which cannot be met through the private sector or other forms of subsidy. Furthermore, community balance requires public programs, preferably under local governmental responsibility with assistance from state and federal levels.

Major reform is imperative in government procedures for housing relocation and related compensation as imposed by large-scale public works. Present inequitable procedures are a primary cause of today's bitterness and unrest.

What has been built to date has shown that the disadvantaged poor should not be isolated in housing institutions. We find many of the present concepts of tenancy to be self-defeating. We look to a definition of low-income housing that will encompass the needs of a family through good and bad fortune; that will not punish the ambitious by eviction; that will allow certain forms of cooperative management for those tenants who choose to stay and invest their funds and efforts in their home.

We see as an essential ingredient of successful government programs, a mandate for the creation of a "good" or qualitative housing environment rather than that which is described as being merely "safe" or "sanitary" or "not of elaborate of extravagant design or materials."

Homeownership—For families of limited income whose physical circumstances and location are favorable, homeownership can be an extremely desirable social goal. But this alone cannot do the hoped-for job without other improvements and reforms including: 1) an increase in the supply of houses for sale in the lower-cost brackets; 2) the upgrading and maintenance of municipal fire, police and sanitary services, schools and community facilities in the urban areas; 3) improved availability of fire, liability and property insurance; 4) a broadly applied fair housing law that will maximize the alternatives by creating a free and fluid market.

Rent Supplements—We see rent supplements as a legitimate assist to private in-

dustry and the housing business in certain market areas. Such programs can make feasible the private development of good housing that otherwise would be economically out of reach of low-income families without requiring the government to invest in additional public housing. Therefore, the AIA recommends an immediate and significant expansion in the philosophy and funding of rent supplement programs.

Rehabilitation—The AIA recognizes that residential rehabilitation provides a multifaceted tool. It enlarges the inventory of good housing by putting back neglected and abandoned units on the market. It helps to preserve both the character of existing neighborhoods and the architecture of earlier periods. To be effective, we feel the upper limits on these programs should be raised to meet the demands of the market. For a more widely effective effort in our cities, we see the need for rehabilitation programs outside of limited "target areas."

State, Metropolitan and Municipal Government—The AIA notes that some of the foregoing programs can also become the function of local governments. However, ehere are certain goals which are specifically nonfederal in nature. They include reform of taxation and land use policies so as to provide incentives that 1) encourage rehabilitation and maintenance of housing and neighborhoods, and 2) would create balanced communities which integrate housing with commercial, educational and recreational facilities in viable urban locations.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

The AIA recognizes that one way to provide more and better housing is to produce it for less money. American industry has demonstrated its capacity to respond quickly in other research areas, and if given the necessary impetus through private/public coordination and funding, can also respond to advanced housing technology—and in a very short period of time.

Housing technology refers to a broad definition of research including demonstrations and experiments in new approaches to the living environment. This should encompass experiments in new towns, new towns-in-towns and advanced planning techniques for existing cities involving all of its components: the central city, its suburbia and its rural surroundings. New approaches and systems must be developed concurrently with government-owned and -operated housings.

The needs of human beings must be better understood. Research with the collaboration of the social scientists should be instituted to provide a better understanding of the anonymous dwellers' needs. Existing and subsequent housing must be visited and reevaluated so that their occupants' experience will guide future planning.

Efforts must be made in conjunction with the labor force and the building trades in advancing research and technology, and ways must be developed to allow existing codes to recognize experimentation in building design and construction in order to be able to evaluate new ideas effectively.

Housing construction technology must be advanced through research for new ideas, the further development of existing technology and transfer of the experience of other industries such as electronics, aerospace, automotive, shipbuilding, etc.; and through acceleration of industrialized housing exemplified by the prefabrication and mobile home industries.

ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Professional design services must be made available to all in our society. The AIA supports community assistance programs which utilize the capabilities that our profession can offer.

We recognize our moral responsibility to develop and sponsor programs that would provide professional assistance in producing new and rehabilitated housing and neighborhoods where otherwise such help would not be available. However, the AIA seeks creation and implementation of programs and legislation that would provide financial assistance to housing development organizations and sponsors, enabling accomplishment of the initial planning of needed housing by non-profit groups which are not financially equipped to pay for the necessary professional services prior to final commitment. To further heighten the new sense of "social obligation" of the private sector, a fair profit must be incorporated in any program, new or old. Our economy is based on the profit motive, and any sense of altruism will be enhanced if a reasonable reward is available.

DESIGN FOR HUMAN NEEDS

Architects, in earning a leadership role in translating the needs of people for shelter into physical forms, must become involved in the governmental functions of programming and policymaking which result in the physical housing product. Today's decision makers often are unaware of the consequences of their actions, and without meaningful participation by architects, sufficient emphasis is not placed on the important relationship of physical environment to human well-being.

Architects have a contribution to make and must accept both a professional and a public responsibility in the review of housing proposals and programs. Arbitrary codes and restrictive requirements must be replaced by professionals making evaluations on the basis of human needs.

"Well-designed municipal structures such as hospitals, libraries and even schools are often available to the underprivileged, but when they go home they best look at their television sets in the dark." JACK C. COHEN, AIA.

I sense that housing has been somewhat of a stepchild to the profession, but hopefully we architects are beginning to recognize our responsibilities toward assuming our proper role.

Housing is the most tangible physical aspect in the lives of those individuals caught in the urban crisis. Well-designed municipal structures such as hospitals, libraries and even schools are often available to the underprivileged, but when they go home they best look at their television sets in the dark.

We of the architectural profession have all too frequently made ourselves think and act as technicians, with too much regard for building codes, governmental regulations, zoning policies and, yes, fees, and have not concerned ourselves with the conceptual and philosophical design objectives.

We are fortunate that both our professional leadership and a great number of individual AIA members have become aware of the architects' isolation from housing matters and are attempting to do something about it. More and more practitioners are participating in community action groups. And so we are presented with a direct opportunity to establish dialogue with the poorly housed, in new and dynamic ways. There are attempts in some parts of the nation to promote an exchange between the building industry and the profession.

The AIA in the past has approached the subject without a comprehensive view of the social impacts involved in the process of providing housing for all.

Now, in this year of cataclysmatic change and crisis, it is imperative that architects fulfill their role as the shapers of an excellent environment for all citizens.

Our contribution to the urban dilemma must be felt now—next year will be too late.

"A whole new breed of architects could develop if low-cost housing becomes, as it must, a large-scale enterprise."—JEROME P. CAVANAGH.

There are never enough good houses to go around. That is one of our nation's recurring domestic dilemmas.

In these days of mounting prosperity, the housing situation has become almost intolerable. And we seem to be running out of answers.

Government really did not become involved extensively in housing until the late 1930s. Its goals may have seemed impressive, but results have been rather limited.

The fact is that we have been underbuilding for years. For example, in eight years the metropolitan Detroit area gained nearly 700,000 people but less than 160,000 additional housing units.

These figures do not reflect the number of units that have become old, substandard and uninhabitable. The reality of the statistics hits hardest among the lower-income groups whose earnings only recently have been sensed and surveyed.

These are the people who get the old housing as it is "filtered down" (abandoned, discarded, land contracted, leased, subleased and sold) to them from those whose economic conditions improve. Yet even this filtered-down housing is becoming difficult to obtain in many urban area markets.

The problem of obtaining housing, whether old or new, is getting worse. As new construction lags, the availability of older housing lessens even more. The effect on the already ill-housed urban poor is staggering.

Low-rent or public housing has, only in a limited way, come to grips with this aspect of the problem. In 30 years, fewer than 640,000 units of public housing have been built nationally. Current estimates show that the low-income population easily outnumbers this supply category by more than 50 to 1.

Except for wartime demands in the 1940s, the housing supply did not appear too uncertain in Detroit until just a few years ago.

There are three major factors involved in the recent tightening of the city's housing supply which seem to have relevance nationally as well. They are:

1. A steady decline in new housing from 43,000 in 1954 to less than 16,000 in 1961, followed by only a slight surge back to 29,000 during 1967.

2. Necessary clearance for freeway construction and, to a lesser extent, slum clearance through urban renewal.

3. The inevitable aging and deterioration of older housing, making many more units less habitable every year.

The task of bringing housing supply in line with demand and need is going to be a most formidable urban challenge for some time. It can be a futile one if present trends in the housing construction industry prevail.

One way to increase the housing supply is by developing and implementing cost-cutting, time- and labor-saving methods of construction on a large scale. This, to most people in the business, means cheap housing. But it need not be.

Lately, many of our local officials have even concluded that there is no such thing as low-cost housing. But if the need is to be met there must be more low-cost housing constructed, and not just at the current experimental and piecemeal rate. Hundreds of thousands of units must be built and made available now or in the next few years.

This will require a reordering of national priorities on the part of government, combined with a more complete and actual commitment from business, particularly the real estate investment and building firms.

In all of these matters, the architect has an essential role. Esthetically and professionally, there is much to be achieved. It takes much more than award-winning designs to make low-cost housing desirable and livable.

Prefabricated housing and packaged unit

construction are popular methods now used on a limited scale in many cities.

Locally, our Metropolitan Detroit Citizens Development Authority (MDCDA) is sponsoring a demonstration project in which one- to four-bedroom housing units will be constructed at a cost of $10 a square foot. This is nearly three times less expensive than several low-rent apartment buildings for the elderly, now delayed because of high bids.

These MDCDA-sponsored homes will be built in groupings of eight units or less. Each will include a living room, dining room and furnished kitchen. The rent, without any federal supplementation, will range from $90 to $115 a month.

It has been a long, long time since any housing units have been built at $10 a square foot in Detroit. Not even the high-rise efficiency apartments, still being planned and constructed here, can come near this low-cost figure.

This newest attempt at low-cost construction in Detroit will be watched with great interest and attention. If it succeeds, the MDCDA will go ahead with similar projects on urban renewal land, particularly in the city's model neighborhood area where a variety of rehabilitation and rebuilding programs are being planned by the residents.

As projects such as this become more commonplace, demand for innovative architectural assistance will increase.

A whole new breed of architects could develop if low-cost housing becomes, as it must, a large-scale enterprise. These architects will have to be dedicated professionals who can imagine, compute, design, prod and persuade in helping to produce decent, livable housing for every family.

The role of the architect is clear. To give him less than full attention and support would detract from the urgency of the task. There simply must be more good housing to go around.

"Most architects today shy away from the increasingly complex problems of providing better housing and a better living environment for everyone."—JAMES SAN JULE.

The position of the architect related to housing has always been a curious and disturbing one in the United States: At no time in our history has had more than a peripheral influence for the better on the design or quality of the housing and the communities in which most Americans have lived.

Despite the showcase homes, apartment structures and new community plans which appear in architectural publications, this condition is almost as true today as it was 100 years ago. Of the nearly 34 million housing units built in hundreds of communities since the end of World War II, only a relatively few have been designed or influenced by architects.

Across the nation, architects talk freely, and sometimes bitterly, about the reasons for their lack of involvement with the design of housing: "There's not enough money in it." "It takes too much time." "Frankly, we don't know how to work with the builders."

Except for philosophical discussions over cocktails or at professional gatherings, and the occasional design of a luxury house or a multifamily structure, most architects today shy away from the increasingly complex problems of providing better housing and a better living environment for everyone. And it has always been so.

This is a sad and wasteful situation, and one for which builders of housing, financing institutions, government at all levels and schools, as well as architects, must share the blame.

It is sad because of an ever-increasing frustration and cynicism on the part of architects who believe there is little or nothing they can do about the conditions of housing. It is wasteful because, with only a few minor exceptions, the skills, knowledge, professionalism and intellectuality of architects are today so little reflected in the quality of housing design and in the creation of communities.

The tremendous new need for housing in the years ahead, and its influence on our living environment, demands a historic change in the relationship of the architect to this building type. All who are now involved with housing, and all who are concerned about housing, must share in bringing about that change.

One practical starting point should certainly be the creation of a better understanding and a closer working relationship between architects and builders, not only in the design and production of the housing and the communities which are possible today but also in the development of new forms and in the broader social, economic and political considerations which are already urgent.

Much of today's narrow thinking on the part of both architects and builders must be put aside if this is to be accomplished. Both have much to gain economically and psychologically by bridging the gulf which now separates most of them.

Important business needs in the housing industry today can provide some of the structural materials for that bridge. To cite four:

Most builders know they need a better product to sell in an increasingly sophisticated and demanding market. Builder-architect teams can create that better market.

Most builders know they need new technology to drive down construction costs and to help solve the growing shortage of construction manpower. Builder-architect cooperation can help create that new technology.

Most builders are aware of the need for housing for low- and middle-income families and of its business potential. Builders and architects, working together, can help develop methods to meet this need.

Most builders know the need to modernize antiquated building codes and zoning and land use policies. Cooperation between builders and architects on various government levels would help make more rational a situation which now hinders progress in housing and environmental design and in building technology.

More and better housing will be produced, and architects and builders alike will profit from such cooperative efforts to face these business needs. And architects for the first time will enter the mainstream of our nation's housing.

Overriding all is the unique contribution that architects can make to the American people in their present and urgent search for a better living environment and for a higher quality of life. This search takes many forms, but certainly a most important one is a deep-felt urge to satisfy emotional and psychological needs in housing. The architect by his training, and by his intellectual decision to be such a professional, has the most crucial part of all to play in making certain that this part of the search is successful.

"There is no single housing design formula which will meet all social needs."—RALPH WARBURTON, AIA.

The national housing design objective—the provision of an adequate number of appropriate dwellings in good community environments—has not been met.

Though current efforts comprise in dollar volume over 30 percent of all physical development activity, they do not yet include realistic participation by architects, sociologists, industrialists and others whose skills must increasingly be brought to bear on housing goals. Design services are vitally needed if the national level of the environment for man is to be elevated.

We are developing annually over 400 square miles of land with about 1⅓ million housing units. While adding to our existing stock of about 65 million units, this degree of production barely provides for our expanding population and largely ignores replacement needs. Forty percent of the nation's families are frequently forced into dilapidated dwellings because little is offered at a price they can afford.

At the same time in other countries, recent estimates show that housing is being built for as little as one-third of our costs, though foreign space standards are often much lower than ours, to be sure.

In some areas, foreign productivity is as high as costs are low. The Soviet Union, for example, is currently building housing for all aspects of its population at the rate of 3 million units per year—over twice the rate of our production—and the construction quality of this housing is rising rapidly.

Review and improvement of our national housing effort is overdue. Those observers concerned with *qualitative* matters insist upon the need for more research feedback leading to a significant refinement of family and societal benefits. Exponents of *quantitative* indices would like to see more housing scheduled to meet defined needs, costs refined systematically and the delivery time shortened. Both design concerns are important.

There is no single housing design formula which will meet all social needs. Low family incomes may lead to the likelihood of overcrowding: Social contact can become too facile, and strong architectural means to develop a measure of individual privacy are required.

Also, while the small percentage of upper-income families can achieve the freedoms of choice and individuality in many ways, the large group of lower-income households finds that these vital expressions are more directly linked to their dwellings. Thus they see the design of their homes as very important.

New forms of flexible administration arrangements are emerging which may involve many types of tenure including public housing, leasing, cooperatives, condominiums and conventional ownership. Innovative construction methods can also play a role when sweat equity by future residents is involved. These directions are opening up new areas for imaginative planning, design and construction.

One significant way of upgrading quality aspects, saving construction time and reducing costs can involve industrial production techniques. On the design agenda for over 30 years, the development of mass-produced and mass-erected modules (multiroom units), components (baths, kitchens) and elements (posts, beams, panels)—and combinations of these—is beginning to accelerate.

Over 40 percent of all multi-family housing in Great Britain, France and Russia is built using industrialized systems techniques. Under HUD sponsorship, several refined alternatives are being explored through construction, some in connection with the Federal Lands for Critical Urban Needs effort.

In addition to developing new materials and methods, the action of design professionals in identifying and resisting artificial constraints to the use of new technology can complement several federal activities. Success in this area will contribute to enlarging design capacity and reducing costs so that the needs of millions for well-designed standard housing can be fulfilled.

A strong urban design plan for the entire neighborhood can wisely embrace many public and private construction activities. One of these in an existing community sparked by the Model Cities program will increasingly be rehabilitation. There are over 25 million housing units over 35 years old, and many now are capable of significant refurbishment.

Efforts to meet broad housing development goals are being undertaken more and more through the cooperative sponsorship efforts of government and private enterprise. When optimally structured, a client team can over-

come many obstacles to progress and unleash new opportunities for the design team to explore. Coordinated commitment to design and build better and faster is vital.

This commitment can help achieve the goals of providing a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. To meet this goal, President Johnson has proposed building 300,000 new housing units next year for low- and middle-income families—three times more than last year. This campaign would intensify until it produced 6 million low- and middle-income units over a 10-year period—11 times our performance in the previous decade.

Architects are critical to the success of this effort. To the degree that professionals engage in it aggressively, bring with them all the necessary related skills, and actively cooperate with public and private groups will the quality of the environment be raised. This is our responsibility, and we must perform.

"The architect must act with a new boldness and a depth of creativity not evident in the recent past."—WILLIAM L. RAFSKY

The housing and community development programs of the United States have evolved into a comprehensive effort aimed at reacting to the total cycle of urban changes—growth, maturity, decline, decay.

The focus of activity has shifted from the individual housing site in the 1930s to the urban renewals project area in the 1950s to the total community in the 1960s and likely to the metropolitan area and the region by the 1970s.

Nor can the national effort to rebuild urban areas be measured solely in physical terms. We are increasingly concerned about building the kind of urban structure that will recognize the social needs of every facet of our population and extend opportunities for everyone to participate in the fulness of American life. The emergence of the low-income and minority family as a full partner in the American society requires a special sensitivity to his needs and aspirations.

The scope and complexity of rebuilding urban America presents special challenges to the architect. He occupies a responsible, if not the pivotal, role in determining whether as a nation and as a society we will measure up to producing quality and relevance in the rebuilding of our urban areas.

If he is to fill this role, the architect must act with a new boldness and a depth of creativity not evident in the recent past. He must get to the heart of understanding the best of our urban society and then translate it into a viable environment—not an easy task.

Architects, like all of us who are involved in today's urban world, are searching for relevance—both as individuals and as professionals. But it is particularly important for the architect who, in his best tradition, is not just a draftsman who executes plans but an interpreter of his times who works with ideas and creates new forms.

This struggle to understand and to be relevant is beginning now, I understand, in the schools of architecture where students are no longer satisfied with the prospect of building architectural monuments. I am told that today's student has an acute social conscience related to the problems of urban life and that he is often active in political affairs.

This is certainly a healthy sign since it reflects the student's interest in understanding the important issues of society in which he must live and work. Yet his involvement only starts here. His true role is to infuse his knowledge and concern about urban issues into the substantive work of his profession.

The substance of architecture in today's urban world is related to the entire fabric of the city and to the total living environment. The architect must be concerned with air and water pollution and the abrasiveness of noise. He must understand the desires of urban man to retain individual identity and privacy in an encroaching world and to live with some sense of the changing seasons. The techniques and materials available to assist him in this attempt to relate his art to the contemporary world are fortunately expanding.

Yet, in adjusting his sights to the needs of the times, the architect possibly has no better resource than that of the tradition which has produced great architecture in the past; it is characterized by three basic elements: boldness, relevance and creativity. The times call for greatness—and great architects.

"Here is another opportunity for architects to join with others in designing standards that are politically feasible and for which subsidies are practicable."—JOHN SPARKMAN.

To the outside world, the United States is an affluent society with all the material possessions one would ever want or hope to have. Unfortunately, this rosy view is only partially true.

It is not true for the millions of poor families living in city or rural slums. Nor is it true for a large number of middle-class families who may have safe and sanitary shelter but who live in an environment seriously deficient in the amenities that are necessary to help them enjoy a full and fruitful life.

The national housing policy refers not only to a goal of decent housing but to a "suitable living environment" for every American family. The architect often carries the responsibility for giving meaning to these words.

As time goes on, the words will probably remain unchanged but their interpretation will change as our society progresses and as we learn how to build an environment more suitable to man's aspirations for a satisfactory life. The nation's architects and urban planners should be in the forefront in the development of the latest designs to carry out the national housing goal concept.

We have been providing financial assistance for over 30 years to local communities to help get rid of slums and to provide decent shelter for its poor. In the process, we have learned a great deal. The government's first effort through public housing was strictly a brick and mortar job undertaken with the notion that all the poor needed was a roof over their heads.

The public housing effort was replaced by slum clearance and urban redevelopment effort authorized by the Housing Act of 1949. This was broadened in 1954 to the urban renewal concept which visualized a total assault on all housing deficiencies through slum clearance, rehabilitation or conservation. Great strides were made to clear out and rebuild some of the poorest areas of the cities, but the program ran into serious difficulty because of its concentration on real estate objectives and not on dislocated residents.

The next major shift in the US city rebuilding job was the introduction of the Model Cities concept whereby federal funds would help rebuild entire areas of the cities in a comprehensive manner including the upgrading of its residents and its social institutions.

The program is basically sound and a natural and necessary answer to the varied and interlocking problems present in certain areas of the nation's cities. Of course, until we have demonstrated success in this effort, we will have to proceed on faith that it will work and that the whole job can be done if the proper effort is made at local and national levels.

The one big missing link to make Model Cities successful is effective rehabilitation. A reasonably good financial assistance program has been developed to help the residents meet the monthly charges in this connection, but very little progress has been made in developing a satisfactory and effective technique for the physical work involved in carrying out rehabilitation on a large scale.

Until a method for rehabilitation, involving mass acquisition and volume production can be developed, I believe that the Model Cities program will fall far short of its objectives. This should not be allowed to happen, and I am confident that once private industry, including architects, recognizes the importance of this problem, it will meet the challenge and join government in resolving it.

Parallel to the program to clear up slums and rebuild cities, the federal government has been actively engaged in helping American families get decent housing by helping them finance homes and apartments. The first and by far the most productive has been the Federal Home Loan Bank System involving principally the savings and loan associations. At the present time, such associations have $122 billion of outstanding mortgage loans, or about 44 percent of total residential debt.

If the system can be kept confined primarily to mortgage lending, it has the potential for financing well over 50 percent of all new housing built. Unfortunately, in recent years the associations have been serving primarily upper middle-income groups, with little effort being made to direct their lending activities to the area of greatest need: the low- and moderate-income groups in the cities.

Recently, the industry has indicated a willingness to involve itself in inner-city housing problems. The details have not yet been worked out, but I look forward to a significant breakthrough once the giant lending industry becomes effective in this area of greatest need.

The Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans Administration and the Farmers Home Administration, through their mortgage insurance programs, in combination with the Federal National Mortgage Association, have provided the greatest assistance to enable families of moderate income obtain decent housing.

In recent years, however, these programs have been unresponsive to the housing needs of the low- and moderate-income families. Various financial aids have been developed starting in 1961 to provide a subsidy to bring down the cost to the level these families can afford. The 221(d)(3) below-market program and the rent supplement program were designed for this purpose and are currently being used for rental housing.

Last year a new interest-subsidy program for the purchase of housing was devised by the Senate Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee which would give the benefit of a 3-percent loan to certain lower-income families seeking homeownership. The proposal is a part of S. 2700, now pending before the US Senate.

These programs have a great potential but, unfortunately, much of their benefit may be lost because housing costs have risen so sharply in recent years. In the pending homeownership plan, a mortgage ceiling of $15,000 (or $17,500 in high-cost areas) would be established under the program.

Already we have been told that homebuilders cannot build under these ceilings. We have probably not heard the last of this, but our committee takes the attitude that, for government subsidy programs, these are reasonable ceilings and, instead of raising them, insists that industry produce the housing to fit. Here is another opportunity for architects to join with others in designing standards that are politically feasible and for which subsidies are practicable.

Congress has developed a wide range of tools whereby federal assistance can be obtained for the clearance of slums, the re-

building of cities and the financing of new and existing houses.

It is now up to private industry, the architects, the urban planners, and the homebuilders to give these programs life and to provide the expertise to devise new community plans, new housing design and new construction techniques which, in combination with government financial aid, can produce housing in the kind of environment that our great masses of American people can enjoy and afford.

"We have a public responsibility to see that potential clients who cannot afford large budgets, or who do not wish to use full architectural services, have the benefit of consultation."—ROBERT L. DURHAM, FAIA.

Our nation must not continue its current direction in housing. While the factors causing the summer riots are elusive, poor housing is high on the list.

The housing industry is restive and has been especially plagued by fluctuating economic factors. Both federal and local governments are exploring new approaches to public housing. Policies being discussed by members of Congress remain unclear. In this situation of unrest and confusion, the architectural profession has both opportunity and responsibility.

The suburban evolution which has left us with urban revolution indicates that we do not have solutions for the problems that beset our citizens, within or without our cities.

That portion of our population which has violently demonstrated contempt for its surroundings has been given no choice. Suburbanites who thought they had a choice are exhibiting dissatisfaction with the dullness of their environment.

At no time in the history of public housing has its results been subject to such questioning. Private housing, supported by government programs designed to provide maximum standards and maximum quality, has produced unsatisfactory quality at maximum price.

We have the responsibility of fitting ourselves to the twofold housing task: making our professional services more widely available to the American public and promoting our skills and knowledge as an accepted standard in housing of every type and quality.

To this end, the AIA is making a basic reappraisal of its policies. We are preparing to offer political leadership on every subject in this field—a new role because for too long we architects have been content to react to the proposals of others.

We must offer more than our carefully conceived and positive advice to legislators and all others concerned with housing problems; we must also initiate legislation.

It seems obvious that we must also provide technical leadership. Architects must exert more influence in the writing of better and more standardized building codes.

We must involve ourselves with technical manufacturing processes so that design concepts become a part of industrialization processes. In order to establish policies that will make US industrial know-how available in housing, we must sit down with labor as well.

We must become the advocates of future home dwellers in providing every device and policy that might produce better housing at reasonable cost. This includes multidisciplinary community design (economic planning, transportation, etc.) and systems approaches.

Suburbia was built in a fashion that often prevented the orderly growth of cities, resulting in wasted and despoiled landscapes and lack of sense of community. We and our professional colleagues, along with a growing segment of the American public, have learned much from the experience of the past two decades.

Serving notice that the profession is vitally interested in housing requires leadership from individual architects, from AIA chapters and from the Institute nationally. We must assure the public that we are ready to become involved; and lest we think we have demonstrated this involvement, try making a few calls among the architects listed in the Yellow Pages under the pretense of seeking assistance on the design of a small house.

It is high time that individuals can more readily obtain architectural consulting services on housing matters. We have a public responsibility to see that potential clients who cannot afford large budgets, or who do not wish to use full architectural services, have the benefit of consultation. However, we still maintain it is preferable that the architect coordinates the complete design process.

Even the casual student of past civilizations has noted that one of the first signs of decay was the desire not to get involved. We stand aghast at reports that witnesses turn their backs on attack and robbery. Is the housing crisis any less an example of noncommitment? Our creative talents and our professional responsibilities demand that we face involvement with housing people, rich and poor.

Only by assuming active leadership politically, technically and professionally can we offer more than lip service in building a better environment. We have the capabilities; do we now have the will?

Washington Reconstruction: An "Alice in Wonderland" Epic

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital under reconstruction could not have produced more myth and tales if prepared by Lewis Carroll.

I include clippings from the local newspapers following my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 13, 1968]

LOOTED STORE'S OWNER DEFIES LAW TOO, AND GETS RESULTS

BALTIMORE.—The operator of a looted men's shop purposely got himself arrested Friday, but he accomplished his mission.

Raymond Ely, enraged after his shop was broken into for the third time since rioting broke out in Baltimore last Saturday, took direct action.

Donning a gas mask to protect himself from tear gas released in the shop during the night, Ely tossed debris onto the sidewalk.

"You've got to break a few laws to get attention," said the 38-year-old Ely. "Stokely Carmichael can run a roadblock, but I can't throw trash into the street. It's enough to make a sane man go nuts."

Ely was charged with disorderly conduct and released on his own recognizance, but he considered it worth while. The debris, which the city wouldn't take from the store, was removed from the sidewalk.

"The fact that I behaved like a maniac today got me more results than behaving like a gentleman for three days," Ely said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 17, 1968]

NEGRO-RUN GHETTO MAPPED BY PRIDE

The top officials of Pride, Inc., said yesterday they are drawing up a master plan for the redevelopment of the riot-hit parts of Washington that would give Negroes control of the business, social and political life there.

They called for a halt to all rebuilding efforts and an end to the city government's "business-as-usual" philosophy until they complete their master plan within six to eight weeks.

Specifically, Mary Treadwell, director of program development for Pride, called for:

The Small Business Administration to stop processing all disaster loans for riot-hit businesses. Pride officials are trying to set up a meeting with the SBA.

The SBA and local lending institutions to refuse loans to businesses in those areas unless they are 51 per cent owned by Negroes. The Pride officials said the loans are "economically unfeasible" because the businesses will only be burned again.

Negro contractors be hired to clear the burned-out sections and convert them into parks until planning is completed.

The Pride officials—Carroll Harvey, Marion Barry and Miss Treadwell—define the affected areas as strips along 7th and 14th Streets NW. and H Street NE. They did not give precise definitions of the areas.

The planning, they said, would be done by the Negro community—not just Pride the federally financed self-help organization that is shifting from cleanup projects to establishing businesses of its own.

Harvey proposed that the city government and lending institutions establish a $5 million revolving fund that could be lent to Negroes on a longterm low-interest basis so they can gain economic security.

He said the Government should train ghetto residents in business management and accounting, investigate the small number of liquor licenses in the city held by Negroes, restrict the number of liquor stores allowed in a neighborhood, control "quality, price and credit exploitation" in the innercity, close stores that sell inferior merchandise and prohibit the Redevelopment Land Agency from establishing economic segregation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

UPO DEFERS FINAL ACTION ON REJECTING FEDERAL FUNDS

(By Betty James)

The board of the United Planning Organization last night deferred action until next week on a proposal that UPO reject all fiscal 1969 funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity, the federal anti-poverty agency.

The board voted 14 to 6 to consider the motion at a special meeting April 25. The deadline for submission of budget proposals to OEO was today, but UPO's deferral of action does not necessarily mean it could not still participate in the federal funds.

Thomas E. Payne, chief representative of the poor on the board of UPO, made the motion for rejection. He argued that the money that OEO says is available again has been reduced and is inadequate to fight poverty here. Rejecting the money will wake up OEO and Congress, he suggested.

ASKS REVISED PROGRAM

Payne said if UPO does submit a proposal, it should completely revamp its program, turning from community organization to community development.

Washington's civil disturbance demonstrated that only crisis brings response, Payne said. It also demonstrated that UPO's job in community organization is completed, in that UPO has made needy citizens aware of their problems, he said.

If UPO asks for money, it should be for programs like a multi-million-dollar revolving fund to buy and build housing for the poor, Payne said. Frederick B. Lee, president of UPO, said OEO has told his organization in the past that such funding is against OEO policy.

SOME $12 MILLION AVAILABLE

Payne is concerned primarily with the $8.6 million OEO has said is available for the Dis-

trict for programs such as community organization and legal services.

Also involved, however, is action on proposals for $923,000 for the suburbs, $359,000 for the Housing Development Corp. and $2.2 million for the Opportunities Industrialization Center. The total is $12.1 million.

Mrs. William H. Wood, chairman of the community action committee in Prince Georges County, who cannot attend the meeting on April 25, voted last night against the motion to reject the funds.

WARNED ON GAMBLE

Speaking to Payne's motion, Theodore Hagans, a board member, said, "I have no desire to create any more crises in Washington at the expense of the poor people. All of us sitting here will not be the sufferers if something goes wrong with this gamble."

Wiley A. Branton, executive director of UPO, said if the board doesn't act on the budget proposals the alternative will be for the District government to try to take over the poverty program, as it can do under amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Another board member, James P. Gibbons, Jr., who supported Payne, declared that should this happen, "I think the mayor is at least as responsive to the community as this board is. UPO may go back to being another planning organization, and that mightn't be so bad."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

GROUP SEEKS NEGRO CONTROL OF RIOT REBUILDING PROGRAM

(By Paul Delaney and Shirley Elder)

A group of Negro businessmen yesterday formed an organization to demand black control of rebuilding and subsequent ownership and management of properties in areas destroyed by last week's disorders.

Members of the Black Economic Achievement and Construction of Neighborhoods (BEACON) said they will present a 10-point program outlining their proposals to Mayor Walter E. Washington on Monday.

In their proposals, the group urges the mayor to set up a meeting with appropriate federal agencies to implement the program, which includes demands that Negroes plan and rebuild the affected areas and that citizen participation and youth involvement be assured.

Cochairman of BEACON are Mrs. Cecelia Scott and Ed Murphy, both owners of restaurants. The announcement was made at a press conference held at Murphy's supper club at 2227 Georgia Avenue NW. Spokesman for the group was Chuck Stone, former aide to Adam Clayton Powell.

WANTS RESIDENTS INVOLVED

Stone said BEACON is not insisting that the mayor and the federal government deal exclusively with it. He said a similarly constituted, representative black organization could carry out the same goals.

In a related move, the Rev. Channing E. Phillips, leader of the pro-Kennedy Democrats here, also said residents of each neighborhood should be involved in the planning and rebuilding of riot-shattered areas.

"Washington now has the opportunity to rebuild . . .," Phillips said in a press conference. "To do so, we cannot simply put up again the same kind of city that was burned down; we face both the great opportunity to try something new and the necessity of doing it so the whole tragedy is not simply repeated."

Neighborhood stores should be owned and operated by those who live nearby, Phillips continued. He called for government loans to enable Negroes to set up grocery and other co-ops.

All this takes money, Phillips said, and money must be spent, both private and public money. He suggested that Congress give top priority to urban and human needs and, as money is released from the war in Vietnam, it should be diverted to the war on poverty at home.

PROPOSALS

BEACON'S 10 points are:

1. That a program for redevelopment and rebuilding be placed under total control of the black community by an agency such as BEACON or one similar in composition and purpose.

2. That the agency be an all-black one empowered to hire, let contracts and supervise all planning in cooperation with government agencies and necessary outside professional consultants. The government agencies would have no veto powers over the single agency, but the agency could veto suggestions of consultants.

3. That planning for rebuilding begin with full utilization of black architects, urban planners, contractors, subcontractors, economists, insurance companies and agents, real estate companies and other black executives and administrators.

4. That Title II of the Public Housing Law dealing with citizen participation be amended to be interpreted to mean one-third black minimum.

5. That all federal and city agencies concerned with the problems of the current crisis consult with BEACON or the designated agency to devise tightly-coordinated and integrated plans for rebuilding the devastated areas. The plans would encompass such laws as the Public Works and Economic Development Act, Model Cities Act, Manpower Act and the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

AGENCY OK NECESSARY

6. That under no circumstances will any planning or programs be considered, proposed or undertaken without the full approval and consent of BEACON or a similar agency responsible only to the black community.

7. That a variety of programs and proposals be submitted that will include construction of attractive and imaginative low-cost housing projects with businesses, shopping centers, educational clusters, recreational centers or any combination; also, the purchase of land by the city or Federal Government be made available to black businessmen first.

8. That all businesses to be rebuilt or constructed in the devastated areas be either under the ownership or management of Negroes. "Black entrepreneurship must be made a cardinal fact of any plans or program for these areas."

9. That young black people who live in the areas be made a part of planning and execution.

10. That Negro residents of the areas be given priority in all jobs in connection with demolition and construction.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 13, 1968]

SHOUTING FLARES AT CARDOZO MEETING ON RIOT RESPONSIBILITY

(By Lee Flor)

CHANGE, the anti-poverty organization in the Upper Cardozo Area, sponsored a meeting between businessmen and Cardozo residents yesterday that turned into a shouting match over responsibility for last week's disorders and what should be done.

First, organization members had to give up seats to the Cardozo residents. Later, after complaints about the presence of newspapermen and television reporters, CHANGE threw the press out.

Mrs. Ruth R. Webster, president of the executive board of CHANGE, had called the meeting at the group's offices, 3308 14th St. NW, in the heart of a burned-out area. The meeting was supposed to give residents a chance to tell white businessmen why their stores were burned during the civil disorders last week.

There were other reports that CHANGE officials expected neighborhood residents to tell businessmen that "outsiders" burned the stores.

But Mrs. Webster said the meeting was formally called so residents could talk about "how do we rebuild 14th Street?"

"Do you want a liquor store on every corner and a tavern on every block?" Mrs. Webster asked the 30 persons crowded into the meeting room.

"What were the majority of Negroes saying when they burned your stores," she said, turning to the white businessmen.

Robert King, a volunteer worker for Calvary Methodist Church, was the first resident to speak.

"We need high rise apartments on the corners where the liquor stores were—we need low-income dwellings."

Then some of the persons in the back of the room pushed forward and started to give their opinions.

George E. Storey, representing a group called "Build Black" said "there needs to be more black businessmen." "Those lilly-white businessmen should lend us the money to establish Negro businesses," Storey said.

If Negro businesses are not established, civil disorders will occur over and over again, Storey said.

Then Reed Scott, president of the Columbia Heights Businessmen's Association, spoke up.

"We have several Negro businessmen whose businesses were burned out," he said, and went on to mention several cases.

"They were a colored front (for white owners)," someone shouted.

Another crowd member shouted for a moratorium on all city planning and on all attempts to rebuild the burned out areas.

Mrs. Webster asked the crowd to "let us all plan together."

"You don't plan with cameras and newsmen present," crowd members shouted back.

The crowd went into an uproar, with individuals shouting at each other. One Negro businessman told a crowd member: "You don't own anything on this street but your big mouth."

"We'll plan this city with gasoline," another crowd member shouted.

Mrs. Webster asked the press to leave.

Scott later told newsmen that he did not believe the fires and civil disorders were racial in origin. He said he did not know if the businessmen would want to rebuild their stores in the area.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 11, 1968]

WORK ON CITY PROBLEMS, BARRY URGES COALITION

(By Paul Delaney)

A routine report meeting yesterday of the Washington Urban Coalition turned into a soul-searching session after several Negroes, led by civil rights leader Marion Barry, accused the group of losing sight of its goals and of discriminating against the very people it is supposed to help.

Barry interrupted the meeting after several minutes of self-praise by coalition members. He demanded the meeting get back on the track and be serious about solving immediate and long-range problems of areas of the city torn by disturbances.

The meeting did get back on course and the group adopted a resolution by Miss Flaxie Pinkett to look into the problems of persons being detained and awaiting trial. The coalition voted to set up a committee to investigate the matter of "unreasonable bonds" to see what the group could do about the situation.

DISLIKES TONE

Clad in Pride, Inc. green and wearing sunglasses, Barry told the gathering he didn't like the tone of the meeting. His arguments were spiced with some mild profanity that caused murmurs among the blue-ribbon members of the coalition.

Barry was upset as Safety Director Patrick

V. Murphy, with a nod of agreement from police chief John B. Layton, praised the patrolmen on the street during the riot, and another coalition member commended fire departments of neighboring jurisdictions.

"We have a very serious problem in our city, with millions of dollars worth of property damage," Barry stated. "Why do we go on patting each other on the back like a mutual admiration society when this thing isn't over yet?

MAYOR SPEAKS

"It's not just the 6,300 people who were arrested, but a whole lot of black people in this town are angry and just waiting till the troops leave."

Coalition executive director Walter McArdle answered that when a man does an outstanding job he deserves credit.

Mayor Walter E. Washington, caught in the middle of the controversy, noted that the curfew and other measures taken are indicative of the seriousness of the situation. He praised the fact that the diverse group was engaging in good dialogue and "coming together" to handle the problems of human needs.

And without putting down Barry or chiding the business, civic, religious and professional leaders who make up the coalition, the mayor stated:

"This is what we're here for. We've got to address ourselves to those human needs. We've got to look at them in a different framework than in years past. The very fact that Mr. Barry can stand here and respond to the needs is what this whole thing's all about."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 12, 1968]

SOME U.S. EMPLOYEES FACE PAY CUTOFF IN RIOT

At least some federal workers face a cut-off of pay if they are convicted of such offenses as looting, burning and inciting to riot in last week's strife here and elsewhere.

The Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare have notified their employes they are required by law to impose the penalty in case of conviction of serious rioting offenses.

Curfew violation would not necessarily mean a salary cutoff, attorneys believed.

The penalty provision was specifically written into the appropriations bill for Labor, HEW and the National Labor Relations Board last year in a rider offered by Rep. Joel T. Broyhill, R-Va.

According to the rider, no salary may be paid to any employe convicted of inciting, promoting or carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of federal, state or local laws designed to protect persons or property.

The law does not call for outright dismissal—but loss of pay might be considered tantamount to this.

It was not immediately clear how other federal agencies would proceed in cases of riot-connected convictions of their employes. A Civil Service Commission spokesman pointed out that in screening persons for initial employment, the agency policy is to consider convictions on an individual case-by-case basis.

In a memo to Labor Department employes, Assistant Secretary Leo R. Werts noted that conviction of crimes not specified in the rider do not carry the same automatic penalty.

He noted also that a guilty plea is the same as a conviction.

Both HEW and Labor advised workers who are concerned about the provision to consult their own attorneys and legal offices of their agencies.

Labor Department Solicitor Charles Donahue explained that since the rider is in the appropriation act, "we felt it was our responsibility to call it to the attention of all the officials of the department who might have employes who got involved in any of the recent disturbances in any of the cities of the country.

"We were equally concerned about the rights of the employes," he added, pointing out that they should be aware that guilty pleas might expose them to loss of pay.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 14, 1968]

BOARD EASES STAND: LIQUOR STORES TO GET AID ON BILL PAYING

District liquor store owners who suffered losses during last week's rioting will be given a break in meeting the deadline to pay for their inventories.

The Alcoholic Beverage Control Board announced yesterday that it would give special consideration to those hard-hit victims of the riots.

Liquor store owners are required by law to pay for each month's supply of alcohol by the 15th of the next month. In a series of meetings this week with the board, representatives of the liquor industry requested that owners who suffered losses be given special consideration.

Board member J. Bernard Wyckoff said the board reached an informal understanding with representatives of the industry.

TO BE RECEPTIVE

"We are perfectly conscious of their problems and we will do everything we can for those affected," Wyckoff said.

He reported that the "understanding" means that the board will be receptive to examinations by those dealers who were victims of looting and burning. Wyckoff noted that liquor stores were particularly hit hard during the disorders and that many dealers won't be able to replace their inventory and some will go out of business.

Wyckoff added that the board expects to receive requests from the store owners between now and May 15. He explained that the District has a very strict law concerning the purchase of liquor.

A 30-DAY GRACE PERIOD

"The liquor they buy from wholesalers must be paid for by the 15th of the next month," Wyckoff stated. "However, there is a 30-day period of grace.

"If the purchase is not paid for by then, the owners can't purchase any more alcohol except on a cash basis. The law is to prevent credit problems."

Wyckoff said the owners are required to inform the board when and why they can't meet their payments. The board then is required to consider a penalty, from a warning to suspension of operations. The latter "does their credit situation no good," Wyckoff said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 14, 1968]

WHO PAYS FOR GOODS LOOTED AT PAWNSHOPS

(By William Grigg)

Six of the city's 13 pawnshops were badly damaged in last week's disorder and the pawned property of thousands of persons was destroyed or stolen, the president of the Pawnbrokers Association of Washington said today.

The president, Jerry Livingston, said the situation is "ironic, because some poor people leave TVs and other valuable items with pawnbrokers for safekeeping, as well as to secure a loan." He said a man living in a boarding or rooming house may pawn items, if he is going to be out of town a few days, so they won't be stolen.

About the only things left in some of the pawnshops were small, valuable items such as jewelry, they were in safes, Livingston added.

TOTAL OF $250,000

Burned or stolen items may involve the pawned property of thousands of persons and may total $250,000, he estimated.

Whether the pawnbroker is responsible for the losses is not clear. Some receipts for pawned items say the pawnbroker is not responsible if an item is lost through burglary, or fire, but it is not known if this is legally binding.

On the other hand, people who pawned items do at least have the money loaned them.

Livingston said the pawnbrokers are angry that police and federal troops "stood by" and permitted looting during a part of the disorder. He said some shop owners have talked about trying to sue the city for failing to protect them.

MANY SHOPS RUINED

Sparks Pawnbrokers at 1914 7th St. NW is nothing but rubble now, Livingston said. Others that were badly damaged or had much of their pawned items taken by looters, he said, were:

Royal, 3012 14th St. NW; Sam's, 1930 14th St. NW; Capitol, 1738 14th St. NW.; Morris, 1253 H St. NE. and Weinstein's, 313 H St. NW.

These six shops, which are regulated in regard to the amount of interest they can charge may loan $200,000 to $300,000 in a year to persons who leave items behind as security, Livington said.

None of the pawnshops hit were owned by Negroes, but Negro employees were put out of work when the shops were hit, Livingston said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

HEARING I SET ON PAWNSHOP RATE RISE

The Washington City Council last night ordered a public hearing before interest rates for the city's pawnbrokers are raised.

After an hour of debate, the council voted 5 to 4 to accept the recommendations of an ad hoc committee composed of Vice Chairman Walter E. Fauntroy and Joseph Yeldell.

The pawnshop item has been before the council several times. The council previously approved the rate increase at the urging of Julian Dugas, director of the Department of Licenses and Inspections. However, the council later named Fauntroy and Yeldell to study the issue.

The proposed rates would be 5 percent per month on the first $25, 3 percent on the next $175 and 2 percent on the next $800.

These would replace rates of 3 percent per month on $100, 2½ percent on $200, 2 percent on $500 and 1 percent on $1,000. The rate of 8 percent a year on loans above $1,000 would be unchanged.

In other action, the council approved a $436,000 amendment to the 1969 budget to pay for space rental for the Departments of Highways and Traffic and Sanitary Engineering. The money would come from several funds in which financing of projects can be delayed.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

NORTHWEST HOUSING PLAN FUNDED: ARCHDIOCESE SLATES LOW-COST PROJECT

(By Russell Chandler)

A pilot project to acquire and rehabilitate a number of low-rent houses in Northwest Washington with $10,000 "seed money" from the Washington Catholic Archdiocese and $137,000 loaned through the Federal Housing Administration was announced today by the archdiocese office of urban affairs.

The Redevelopment Land Agency today approved the transfer of nine houses to the Urban Rehabilitation Corp., a nonprofit organization composed of church, labor, education and other community leaders.

The corporation will engage Negro contractors and Project Build apprentice trainees from District vocational high schools to rehabilitate the houses—perhaps up to several hundred eventually—for the poor.

The Rev. Geno Baroni, director of the

archdiocese office of urban affairs, said the first phase of the project will be to renovate nine 4-bedroom row houses on K Street and New York Avenue in the Northwest 1 urban renewal area and turn them over to low-income families on long term, low-interest mortgages. Renovation is scheduled to begin May 1, he said.

Some 80 ghetto youths between the ages of 17½ and 24 will be assigned for six months to do this and other remodeling under the supervision of eight journeyman craftsmen. Project Build director Roland J. Williams said the youths will gain experience leading in building trades careers.

FIRST IN DISTRICT

Baroni said the rehabilitation project is the first in the District to be implemented under the 221-H housing program and that the new corporation is negotiating for "several hundred more houses to restore and make available to the poor."

The $137,000 mortgage money has been supplied by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, with the FHA guaranteeing the loan.

Last week the Washington Lay Association, an unofficial group of Roman Catholic laymen, announced a major drive to raise $1 million to subsidize home ownership for several hundred District low-income families. Senator Robert F. Kennedy, D-N.Y., was named chairman of that effort, which also is to make use of the 221-H housing program.

That drive has no official connection with the archdiocese, nor has Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, had any role in its organization.

TO CANVASS PARISHIONERS

The archdiocese-aided group, Urban Rehabilitation, was formed last July and its officers applied for the federal housing program assistance in December, according to Baroni. He said FHA and RLA pushed the application through "in record time."

Baroni said today the archdiocese "has pledged its support for an expanded program," but added that no immediate solicitation of area Catholics is planned. The Washington Lay Association canvass of 60,000 parishioners will be held the first week of May.

The Urban Rehabilitation project has sparked a joint effort by the Washington Area Contractors Association, the Central Labor Council, the area's vocational high schools and components of the Urban League.

Negro contractors engaged in small construction projects—and assisted by the Small Business Administration—will perform the work and Project Build will use its trainees for subcontracting.

Williams said the training will be done through a contract with the Department of Labor. He said this is the first time such an arrangement has been offered here.

TO GET $56 PAY

"We will prepare and inform the boys and steer them into skilled trades," he said. Trainees will get $56 a week until qualifying as journeymen.

The houses, when renovated, will sell in the $15,000 range, Baroni said. This will mean families will pay about $125 monthly, including all utilities, taxes, interest and principal. He said a typical mortgage payment will be $92 a month.

The 221-H program makes housing available to a family of four whose annual income is no more than $4,900, or a family of seven making not more than $5,600.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 17, 1968]

REMAINING TROOPS LEAVE CITY: ROAD BACK'S BUMPY NOW

(By Jack Vitek)

The City Council, which is scheduled to begin public hearings next Tuesday to get citizens views about how the city's "long, hard road to recovery" is to begin, got a taste of what it will hear last night from Marion Barry.

Mayor Washington had called for "pulling together" earlier in the day as he announced that the remaining 5,600 Federal troops and National Guardsmen had been pulled out of the District, but it was doubtful that the recovery plans that he and his administration are formulating bear any resemblance to those advanced by Mr. Barry. Mr. Barry forced his way before the City Council meeting and finally was allowed five minutes by Council Chairman John W. Hechinger, who called the late "intrusion highly irregular."

HIS STORY

The situation Mr. Barry sketched was of a white society that had fled the inner city but still controlled the politics and business of the ghetto, enforcing what he called a condition of "gray flannel slavery." His figures showed that only four of the 200 licensed liquor dealers are Negro.

Mr. Barry discarded the findings of white sociologists—erroneous, he said, because Negroes often lie to them—and opposed the "business as usual" policy because it would carry out a trend which would "inevitably lead the citizens of the ghetto to destory . . . society."

Instead, Mr. Barry asked the Council to stop processing special low-interest disaster loans to "exploitive" businesses and to give no loans to white businesses in the ghetto unless proprietors agreed to a plan which would lead to 51 per cent black ownership.

Earlier, Deputy Mayor Thomas Fletcher had said that the pattern of stores burned—credit companies, pawnbrokers, liquor, chain and clothing stores—showed "resentment for poor service and bad business practices."

SAME ROUTE

This pattern, identical to the one in other cities with riots, he said, was based on the "public image" of the stores and whether they were white-owned. Homes had been burned only when fires spread to them from stores, he said, and only eight public buildings had been destroyed.

The city would study the problem and try to devise "a better system of consumer protection," he said. He also said Mayor Walter Washington had asked the Administration for the "disaster area" classification that would permit special 30-year three per cent loans to rebuild businesses.

Mr. Fletcher said that he knew of no insurance companies cancelling coverage or holding up any payments. Asked whether any businesses were completely ruined, he replied, "It may be that the ruin was mental, not financial. That we can never rebuild."

The Urban Coalition's emergency relief actions showed "the fastest response in any area of the country," he said, but added that the real commendations will have "to wait until we see how well we have rebuilt."

MORE PRAISE

Several Council members praised the restraint used by police in dealing with rioters, and Mr. Fletcher called this policy "the only intelligent approach you could probably use." He said statistics showed that Washington was "no worse and in some ways better off than cities using other means."

Tho the Council members did not mention Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley by name, they were obviously adding their thoughts to the sharp nation-wide debate provoked by his ordering police there to shoot to kill arsonists and to maim or cripple looters.

New York Mayor John Lindsay led the opposition to Mayor Daley's remarks, saying, "We're going to respect human life . . . in short we're not going to shoot children in New York City."

New Jersey Gov. Richard Hughes told a conference of his state's mayors that looters and arsonists should be dealt with swiftly and sternly—but by the courts, and not by being shot.

However, Joseph J. Lefevour, president of the Fraternal Order of Police, praised Mayor Daley's "positive position," adding: "You have our deepest respect and admiration for the unequivocal stand you have taken with respect to the anarchy that is threatening to destroy our society."

EXPLANATION

Mayor Daley himself today said his "shoot to kill" order was "misunderstood and blown out of proportion," and that it referred only to "obvious arsonists."

"If they are burning the building down they should be shot," he said.

Gilbert Gimble, a District police department spokesman, said that a 1954 police regulation governed what happened here:

"Basically, it says the police service revolver should never be used because of a suspicion of a serious crime but only when the gravity of the situation would justify death or serious injury. And that means we're not shooting kids who are stealing some shoes out of a store window."

District Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy declined to direct comment on Mayor Daley's position, but said, "I think our policy of restraint is a good policy."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 14, 1968]

"WE DON'T HAVE A BUSINESS" THE STORY OF ONE RAVAGED BLOCK

(By Barry Kalb and Winston Groom)

"Thursday, my husband told me we were buying a new house. It was a big step for us," Mrs. Albert Schindler recalled a couple of days ago. "Friday morning, he called me up and said, 'Forget it. We don't have a business.' "

The Schindlers' dry cleaning plant on 14th Street NW was a blackened smoking mess, their machinery all but destroyed, their customers' clothes taken or burned.

The inevitable debates over the causes of last weekend's riot, over the actions of the police, over the timing of the decision to call in troops, over the extent and comparative severity of the damage—these debates will swirl irrelevantly over the heads of the Schindlers and their fellow merchants whose stores, perhaps whose life's work, have been looted and burned to the ground.

But all of the talk will not resurrect a going business from the piles of scorched timbers and ashes.

A Redevelopment Land Agency survey early last week showed that at least 645 buildings have been damaged or destroyed. These 645 buildings housed 909 commercial establishments.

Now that the last fires have been extinguished, the businessmen hit hard by the destruction have begun to survey their losses and decide what lies ahead of them.

Some merchants have been wiped out. Many will be able to rebuild, but the road back to financial solvency will be a long one. There is the problem of collecting insurance, and then finding someone who will reinsure them at prices that are not prohibitive. There is the need in some cases for loans to supplement insurance policies that will pay for only a portion of the damage.

There is the problem of how to live while the rebuilding is going on.

There is the problem, if they wish to stay in the same area, of contending with moves announced by Negro organizations to replace white merchants with Negroes in the inner city.

And there is the problem, if they do stay, of the residue of bitterness that will have to be soothed before any workable relationship between the merchants and the residents of the neighborhoods can hope to exist.

The damage was felt mainly in three areas of the city: 7th Street NW, 14th Street NW and H Street NE. This is the story of one block, the 3300 block of 14th Street NW, and

how the merchants of this block have reacted to the near disaster.

The 3300 block runs from Park Road on the south, where the Tivoli Theater is located, to Monroe Street on the north. Though by no means the worst hit block in the city, it is perhaps representative of the type of destruction wrought by the riot.

The shops on this block are typical of those found in the inner-city commercial district: a large clothing and specialty store, barbershops, beauty shops, clothing stores, a liquor store, a jeweler, a theater, a bank and a bar.

There is a marked difference between the two sides of the block. The west side of the street houses white merchants almost exclusively, several of whom own more than one store. The stores on the east side, the Tivoli side, are for the most part Negro-owned or Negro-operated.

Every store on the west side, with the exception of the Riggs National Bank branch, suffered major damage. On the east side, "soul brother" signs mark a row of untouched front windows which runs almost the entire block.

Although the Negro ownership of these stores played a significant role in preventing their destruction, there is another factor which probably accounts in part for this: There is little in most of these stores that anybody would want to steal.

THE WEST SIDE

14th and Park Road—Riggs National Bank, Park Road Branch. The vice president in charge is Arthur McInnis. The bank has been there since 1922 and employs 14 persons, three of whom are Negro.

The bank branch itself suffered minimal damage, mostly from water used to put out fires in other stores. However, the Riggs Bank building which, in addition to housing the bank, occupies half the block and rents space to other merchants, suffered "substantial" damages, according to bank officials.

The officials would not disclose any estimate of the loss, but said that is was covered by insurance.

3306—Renay's Maternity Shop (uniforms and maternity wear). Owned by Albert M. Esses since 1953. It had two employes—both Negro, both residents of the neighborhood.

Renay's was both looted and burned. Esses carried $20,000 to $25,000 in insurance but he feels the loss will exceed that. He feels police protection "wasn't worth a thing," and that the military "should have been called on Thursday night."

He says he noticed the neighborhood was getting tougher every day but "never dreamed this sort of thing would happen."

Esses says he will probably rebuild but this time will install a central burglar-alarm system and metal gates for protection. He will carry his present employes on the payroll as long as he can and give them a couple of months' salary if he has to let them go.

3310—Midtown Stationery and Office Supply Co. Owned by Alfred Stein and open since 1952. There were 10 employes. The racial breakdown could not be determined.

The store was looted and gutted by fire, and Stein considers it a total loss. "I was wiped out; completely burned, completely looted," he says. He cannot estimate the financial loss yet, but figures his insurance will cover only 50 percent of the damage. "I am going to take a hell of a licking," he said.

Stein is one of the most bitter of the merchants on the block. He criticizes the city government for ordering the police not to arrest looters and feels the federal government was extremely inept in its handling of the situation. "I called the White House and pleaded with them to call out the military," he says. "We're weighing whether or not to sue the government for gross negligence."

Stein's plans are uncertain, but he is one of the few who seems to be considering leaving the neighborhood. He believes others will follow. "I don't think the merchants will go in," he says. "That street is dead."

3314—Usona Shop (cards and gifts). Owned jointly by three white men including Robert P. Boyle who has been there for three years. The shop has been there for about 30 years and has six employes—four Negro and two white.

The store was looted and damaged by fire and Boyle estimates the loss at between $12,000 and $15,000. He feels insurance will cover about two-thirds of the damage.

He has talked with the other two owners and they are still not certain if they will stay on. "We've got to put this thing together and see what we can salvage," he says.

3316—Bob Inn (night club). Owned by James C. Powell, it has been there for 17 or 18 years and has 16 employes—all Negro. Powell's white.

The place was looted but not set afire. Most of the loss was in stolen liquor stock. George Farmer, the manager, estimates loss at about $4,100 including some broken windows. They will reopen shortly but won't keep much stock on hand in the future.

3318—Harris Beauty and Barber Supply Co.—Owned by Irving Hoddes, opened in 1955 and has three employes. Hoddes is white and the employes are Negro.

The store suffered no fire damage but water leaked down from the floors above and caused considerable loss. "It was like a shower bath when we got in," he says. Windows were smashed and looting accounted for further losses.

In all, Hoddes estimates he suffered about $12,000 in damages, $10,000 of which is covered by insurance. He will probably reopen but he's waiting to see what his neighbors decide to do. "I'd hate to be the only store on the block along with a lot of burned-out buildings," he says.

3320—Nationwide Taxes (Income tax consultants). The office just opened in January and will close in April. It is undamaged except for a broken window in the rear and is still in operation.

3322—Melart Jewelers—Owned by Mel Foer and opened in 1964. There were three full-time employes (two white and one Negro) and one Negro part-time. The ownership is white.

Employes of the store managed to save some of the merchandise by putting it in the safe, but aside from that, Foer says, "all the fixtures, all the furniture, all the equipment was completely burned. The machinery was heated to the point where it melted."

He estimates the damage at between $30,000 and $50,000 and says insurance will probably pay for "close to what the losses are."

Foer was out of the country on Thursday, and didn't learn of the destruction of his store until two days later. He sounds more dazed than bitter. He praises his help.

Probably every merchant had loyal and faithful employes who, at the risk of their life, stayed behind to try to save things. And they came back later, during a lull, to take merchandise out. "I can't say enough for these people," he says.

Will he come back? "It's too soon to tell," he says.

3324—Sally Shops (women's clothing) Owned by Murray Braunstein for 10 years. He has four employes, all Negro.

The store was burned and looted. "They didn't leave a stitch," he says. He estimates losses at $75,000, most of which he hopes to recover from insurance.

"I've never had much trouble before. The people had always been wonderful. It's almost impossible to believe you could be in a place so long with these people and know so little about them," says Braunstein, who is white.

Braunstein plans to rebuild if he can get insurance again. He feels the government should underwrite insurance in risk areas.

"If the insurance doesn't come through," he says, "you'll have a desert here."

3328—Speedy Liquors—Owned by George Rogers, his wife and Robert Harris, who are all Negroes. They purchased the store in September. There are three employes, also Negroes.

Speedy Liquors fared better than most liquor stores in riot areas, but damage and looting were still extensive. There was no burning except for part of one wall in the back that adjoins Morton's.

Quite a bit of liquor remains on the shelves, but Rogers, the only Negro merchant on the west side of the block, says about half the stock was taken or destroyed.

In addition, water leaking in from above caused considerable damage, particularly in the basement. He estimates his loss at between $12,000 and $15,000 and doesn't know how much of that was insured.

Rogers also seems bitter at the destruction. Obviously, he was not the target of racial hostility and he feels "you have a certain type of people waiting for the opportunity to do something like this. The people doing the looting were mostly people we had waited on."

Rogers will reopen. "We're going to have to reopen—we've got large debts and we have to make them up," he says.

3330—Morton's Clothing Store—One of a chain of medium-price clothing department stores owned by Mortimer Lebowitz and his brother, Leonard Leslie. The two men also own the building that runs from 3318 to the northern corner.

Ninety percent of about 90 employes are Negro, including assistant manager Beverley Gaskins and six others of the 10-man executive staff of the store which opened last August.

Lebowitz, who is white, has worked with the Negro community for many years. He was a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People when that was considered something of a radical organization. He was president of the Washington Urban League in the late 1950's and is presently on the league's board of directors. Lebowitz is proud of the fact that he marched with the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. into Selma, Ala., in 1965, and during the 1963 civil rights march here.

The store is almost a total loss. Lebowitz estimates the damage at about $1.5 million (and about $1 million at his H Street store, which was burned to the ground), but adds, "We're completely covered for our losses."

Lebowitz feels that the community has shared in the loss. He has made a point of hiring "as many indigenous people as possible." His employes were recruited by the Urban League at his request. They were trained on the job.

The community also has lost a type of store needed in the inner city, Lebowitz feels. "People kept coming in and telling us how wonderful it was that a store like this had opened in the area," he says.

He hopes to rebuild at both locations, and speaks of opening some sort of temporary stores during the interim: "I feel these areas have to be served."

THE EAST SIDE

3301–3329—Beginning with the Tivoli Theater, there are Maxwell's Barber Shop, managed by Thomas Maxwell; Fantasy Hair Fashions, a beauty parlor, managed by Nura Q. Amin; Pete's House of Styles, a beauty parlor, owned by Gladys E. Peterson; Peay's Variety Store, owned by Elmore Peay; Ace Sewing Center, owned by Mary M. Newman; Tivoli Barber Shop, managed by Cornell Brace Jr.; Arrow TV; a television repair and second-hand store, owned by Jack Gibson; Jean Muriel Originals, a wig and related items shop; an annex of Arrow TV; Specialty Enterprises, a wig and related items shop, owned by Jack Turner; Brevard Beauty Salon, owned by Thomasina Brevard; and a self-service laundromat.

Only the laundromat, which is owned by a white man was damaged in this group. Its windows were broken.

Some of the owners of these stores, perhaps feeling the "soul brother" signs they painted needed backing up, stayed in their stores to discourage looters. Turner, who carries a gun on his hip, said he had trouble with only one man. "A cat from outside the neighborhood tried to come in here," he says. "We flattened him."

John Davis, the head janitor at the Tivoli, said he and an usher camped out in the theater lobby to avert damage. "We know a lot of people in the neighborhood and we talked to them if they came near. We saved this place," he says.

Other owners left, but there was no damage. An employe of Arrow TV remarked: "The only reason they didn't hit this side of the block is that there ain't nothing here to take." Most of his stock was large, used console models.

3331—Beverly Cleaners—Owned by Albert Schindler and Sidney Gritz, brothers-in-law, both white. Opened by them almost 10 years ago, it has four employes, all Negroes.

This is the only store on the east side of the block that suffered major damage. Schindler says the building is probably salvageable, but most of the machinery and all of the clothing were lost. He estimates the loss to the machinery at about $15,000, which will be covered by insurance. But the owners will have to make good on customers' claims out of their own pockets.

The two partners present a contrast in reaction. Schindler is extremely bitter. He feels that greater force including the shooting of looters, should have been used to stop the destruction. Gritz is more stoic in his acceptance of the damage, and recognizes that along with aid to the merchants, "something has to be done to help the Negro community."

Schindler says he would like to get out, but "I think we'll be forced back in. We have five years to go on our lease, and our landlord said he won't let us out of it."

Gritz says, "We're willing to come back if our customers will have us."

REACTIONS VARY

Reactions to the destruction, obviously, ranged from shock to acceptance to overwhelming bitterness. The bitternness was directed not only at the looters and vandals but at city and federal officials for their handling of the situation.

George Rogers recalled the scene in his store Friday afternoon, his face tense with barely controlled anger. "Young people were running in and out behind my counter, carrying out my whisky. Nobody stopped them. Nobody told them to stop.

"I asked a policeman why he didn't stop people. He told me he had to wait for orders."

Public Safety Director Patrick V. Murphy and special presidential liaison man Cyrus Vance have praised the police for their restraint in dealing with the rioters. But the merchants scoff. "That is ridiculous—restraint! How can you use restraint when criminals are running rampant?" Alfred Stein demands.

But most of the merchants conclude with a sigh of resignation, "Once it got out of hand, I don't think they had enough police to cope with the situation." However, to a man, they feel that the destruction could have been minimized by calling out the troops earlier.

TRAFFIC A FACTOR

Regular Army and National Guard troops were put on the alert late Thursday night, but were not actually called in until late Friday afternoon, and, slowed down by a massive traffic jam, were not substantially deployed in the primary riot areas until the early hours of Saturday morning.

"In my opinion, the White House is guilty of gross negligence in not providing protection for citizens," says Stein. "I'm very bitter."

Even when the troops arrived, orders for them to stop the looting were slow in coming through. Mortimer Lebowitz recalls, "Our manager asked a soldier, 'Are you going to let them walk out with all these things?' And the soldier said, 'Yes, I guess that's what we're supposed to do.' "

City officials have said that troops were not called early Friday because the situation appeared to have calmed after the initial violence Thursday night and Friday morning. At any rate, they argue, in spite of the presence of some 14,000 policemen and troops, there were still not enough men to stop the looting at the peak without the use of guns. And this was something they emphatically did not want.

"What are you going to do, start shooting little kids for stealing a transistor?" an official asked.

Animosity toward the Negro race was never expressed openly by the merchants, but was thinly disguised in some instances. One merchant suggested that if the presidential election were held now, "George Wallace would get a lot of votes here."

SHOCK MORE TYPICAL

But shock appeared to be the more typical reaction, and some merchants expressed a more understanding view. "I have no animosity toward the Negro race," said Lebowitz. "I have, if anything, a warmer feeling for my Negro friends, because they had to sit in the midst of it. I feel this is the responsibility of American society."

Rogers, a Negro, is hardly mollified by pleas for members of his race. "This 'soul brother' business," he sneers. "One of my employes told a looter 'This place is owned by a soul brother,' and he said, 'I don't care "who" brother you are.' " After that, Rogers sat in his store with a pistol.

Why were some merchants hit and others not? The overwhelming reply from those who suffered was, "Because we're white." This is undoubtedly true, but it appears to be a simplification of the reasons for the destruction.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders states:

". . . In some cases, rioters focused on stores operated by white merchants, they apparently believed had been charging exorbitant prices or selling inferior goods. Not all the violence against these stores can be attributed to 'revenge' for such practices. Yet it is clear that many residents of disadvantaged Negro neighborhoods believe they suffer constant abuses by local merchants . . ."

HOWLETT QUOTED

There are those in the area who have expressed this same belief. "White America has preyed on the Negro here," says Dr. Duncan Howlett, pastor of All Souls Unitarian Church, two blocks from the riot area. "The merchants tempt the people with eye-catching window displays and taunts of easy credit."

Bernardo Lloyd, a director of CHANGE, Inc., which has its office in the 3300 block, spent hours during the height of the riot trying to move people off the street. He agrees with Howlett's contention.

"Just down the street, I saw a pair of shoes in a display window for $100. Nobody around here makes that kind of money."

Lloyd, who has lived in the areas for several years, says Negroes resent the business community because they've never been allowed to become a part of it. "Look around," he says. "Except at Morton's and a few others, community Negroes are hired only as porters or clerks or janitors—they're not even salesmen."

The merchants aren't the only ones hurt by the destruction. Some of the employes will get their jobs back, but many are pounding the pavement looking for a new job. One negro standing on the street said angrily, "They put 10,000 black people out of a job. I don't have no job. They burned my place down."

"I got kids," he said.

A woman staring at the ruined shell of Morton's remarked: "This is a shame. I been in this neighborhood 25 years, and we never had a store like this here."

MONEY NECESSARY

Few of the businessmen on the block had full coverage on their losses, and extra money will have to come from somewhere. There is the possibility that some sort of emergency measures will be passed to aid victims of the riot. Another, readily available source of money is the Small Business Administration.

Eugene Waldron, of SBA, says that virtually every businessman hit by the riot will be eligible for the agency's Economic Opportunity Program, which provides long-term loans to "economically disadvantaged persons." Included in this category, Waldron says, are any merchants whose business plight is not their own fault.

If the determination of whether or not to stay in business is relatively simple, however, the decision on where to stay in business has been complicated by outside factors.

Bob Smith of the Redevelopment Land Agency explains that nobody, including the District government, knows at this time just what the future status of the primary riot areas will be. Some were slated for urban renewal in five years or so, but the riot has accelerated the timetable.

As Waldron puts it, "There's no sense in a man's going back into 14th Street if it's going to be razed within a year."

COUNSELING CENTER

A counseling center for businessmen has been set up at the Lincoln Temple Memorial Church, 1701 11th St. NW. Representatives of insurance companies, SBA, RLA, the Public Utilities Commission, the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity and the Small Business Guidance Center will be on hand to answer merchants' questions as best they can.

But Smith stresses that the purpose of the center will be more to gather information than to disseminate it, since no decisions can be taken by city and federal authorities until the extent of the damage and personal hardship is known.

The work must be carried out as quickly as possible, says Smith. "Somebody's got to go over this whole city and put something down on paper. Some determinations have got to be made."

There is considerable sentiment within the Negro community to have the white merchants leave the inner-city and have Negro merchants take their place.

The Rev. Channing Phillips, president of the Housing Development Corporation, said Friday night. "We cannot simply put up again the same kind of city that was burned down. We face both the great opportunity to try something new and the necessity of doing it so the whole tragedy is not simply repeated."

The businessmen, still smarting under their own losses, are apparently more concerned now about their own problems. At a meeting of businessmen who had suffered losses, held at the Montgomery County Jewish Center on Thursday night, Lebowitz was booed off the stage as he made a plea for understanding.

At any rate, some merchants, including Lebowitz, are determined to stay. Lebowitz remarked:

"I hope to keep my staff together and keep this going."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 14, 1968]

CAMERAS CLICK AWAY: SUNNY EASTER FINDS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RELAXED AMID THE RUBBLE

(By Duncan Spencer)

Two little Negro boys in their Easter best poked through the glass and rubble at Man-

hattan Auto on 7th Street NW. They picked up a headlight; an elderly woman waved her cane. "Nobody can't tell you nothing," she fumed, shaking her head.

Elsewhere on Washington's sunny Easter morning, 200 troops lined up outside the Armory next to D.C. Stadium waiting for breakfast at 7:30 a.m.

And the city's languid Easter afternoon was the time for the games people play at Dupont Circle; pretending to read the paper, playing chess on a bench, displaying bare and dirty hippy feet, arguing potent arguments, strumming the same three chords on a guitar over and over to an audience of none, hearing news on a transistor radio.

The heat in the air was swept away by zephyrs that scraped last year's brittle leaves along the streets and seemed to carry away the memory of the wretched events of the previous week.

But at the same time early churchgoers raised the strains of "Welcome Happy Morning Age to Age Shall Say," policemen were carrying the body of a 40-year-old Negro man, William P. Jeffers, from a burned-out basement in the 1500 block of 7th Street. He was the eleventh riot victim.

By noon, 7th Street NW and 14th Street NW were clogged with cars occupied mostly by white people, gaping at the scars of the riot they had heard so much about crawling along snapping photos, staring from behind dark glasses.

The sidewalks, even in the most ravaged blocks, were crowded with people, their black faces set off like inlay against vivid Sunday clothes and the lovely lillies children carried home.

Photographers were everywhere, their eyes up to the front of the buildings, picking the worst spots, standing back and shooting endless pictures of rubble, wreckage and broken glass, sometimes to the amusement of the residents.

"What's he going to do, put that in his scrapbook?" a man with a pair of toddlers said and laughed.

No one on the sidewalk seemed the least interested in telling a tourist about the riot, even if he was a senator, like Gale McGee, D-Wyo., who drove the 7th Street stretch at about 2:40 p.m. in his yellow convertible, top down.

But the conversations on the streets could have enlightened the sightseers. Some thought it was over for the summer. Others tried to explain why 7th Street was in ruins.

Nurhal E. Ward works at Carter's Amoco at 7th and O Streets, right next to the O Street Market, which somehow escaped being destroyed by the flames.

"Don't you think people will wait now and see what city hall does?" he asked. Carter's was struck even though Carter, the owner, is a Negro.

At 5 p.m. last Friday, Ward put the cash register in the back of his car, locked up the station, turned off the main gas switch, scribbled "Soul" on the window and took off.

Yesterday he was puzzled, he said, even though he feels a strong kinship with the people on 7th Street. "You got to understand the credit merchants—I don't feel no compassion for them." He noted that pawnshops and "easy" credit stores were usually run by white absentee merchants.

"When that man sees you come in that door, he sees you're a black man, he knows you gotta come there—there's always the feeling that something sneaky's going on."

More ominously, he spoke of a professional woman he knew (he called her "the Ph. D."), who would get gas at Carter's. One day she whispered to him while he was making change for her: "Damn it, burn it down, all of it."

"And she was making $20,000 a year with her husband, both of them professional people," he added with a shrug.

Few yesterday were as philosophical or disturbed as Ward.

At 14th and T Streets NW, pictures of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in two large sizes were hawked, as well as lapel buttons with King's picture and the words "I Have a Dream." Violet ribbon was attached to the buttons.

Hains Point was the city's Coney Island all afternoon. Hundreds of soldiers had bivouacked on the west end of the golf course there, and soldiers stretched beneath the cherry trees.

The soldiers have lost the look of patient endurance they had worn through the crisis. Yesterday they strolled at the water's edge without their guns. They watched the sailboats, or the girls; but a few still patrolled in jeeps, sweating under their helmets.

White Washington relaxed, too, after days of tension and introspection. Visitors clambered as usual on the marble monuments, furtively picked the flowers, or wandered on the Capitol grounds.

In Georgetown young girls tripped the streets in sandals and bright skirts after church. The balloon man of Wisconsin Avenue was at his station near N Street. "If the children's happy, then everybody's happy—," he crooned.

Later, at dusk, from the treelined homes behind the busy restaurant section of Georgetown, the tinkle of glassware floated through the air.

From dim backyards and balconies came the song of laughter; one by one the lights came on from living room windows.

Undemocratic: The Way We Nominate and Elect Our President

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday evening, April 20, it was my privilege to be the guest of Local No. 340, Truckdrivers Union in South Portland, Maine, and to present my views on the undemocratic method by which we nominate and elect our Chief Executive. The need for reform is, in my opinion, obvious and urgent. There are, no doubt, numerous Members of this body who share my concern. In hopes that my colleagues will give serious consideration to the issues of reform, I am inserting the substance of my statement for their attention:

LIBERATING AMERICAN VOTERS

(By Congressman WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY)

Electoral college reform will have little meaning if unaccompanied by reform in our procedures for nominating presidential candidates. The path to the Presidency begins when each state picks its delegates to the National nominating convention. In the fifty states, there are fifty different systems for accomplishing that task. Generally, however, there are two ways, either selecting the delegates through a State convention or committee process—or via the primary, a direct vote of the whole party membership.

While only 16 states have primary contests, from March through the summer of every national election year, all the attention is focused upon them. In only six of these states are the delegates legally bound by the results of their respective primaries. In four states, the delegates may run uncommitted and in the remaining five states and the District of Columbia, primaries have no legal bonds over the delegates to the National convention. Only about two of every five delegates to each party national convention has been chosen through the primary procedure. I recently read a good summation of our primary procedure—The first thing to be said is that primaries are important because of all the fuss made over them.

Unfortunately, the State convention process lends itself more readily to undue influence than the primary system. The convention procedure lends itself to other movements which inhibit the democratic process even more. Favorite son movements have become a popular means by which to restrict delegates by holding them to that candidate through the first ballot of a convention which is oftentimes the final and conclusive ballot. The unit rule device inhibits free choice by requiring all of a state's delegates to abide by a majority of its membership vote.

With the advent of television, the National nominating convention itself has become a spectator sport. The majority of Americans sit on the sidelines and watch—while others eliminate all but two men from the Presidential race. Watching this event has become almost as exciting as football contests on New Year's Day. Like football, most Americans observe rather than participate. Unlike football, the outcome of the contest directly affects every overserver and nonobserver. That makes all the difference and that is why Americans must be given a greater, more direct and more meaningful participation in the nomination and subsequent election of the President.

Party nominees should be chosen by votes of all concerned citizens through a national primary election—rather than by State delegations at National conventions.

The electoral college and the need for its reform should be discussed now—because it is difficult to attract interest in reform when we are not face to face with a Presidential election. Under the present system, the American people vote indirectly by signifying a choice for an "elector" who is pledged—(but as evidenced in 1960, apparently not bound)—to support the party nominee. We are necessarily made more aware of the defects of the system now because we are approaching the national election. We think in terms of winning individual votes to elect the President but we should not ignore the fact that individual votes do not elect a President. Let us be aware of the possibility that the electors we choose to do our voting may "not" register our choice. The last President elected by a minority of the popular vote cast was to our benefit and good fortune. (John F. Kennedy received 49.48% of the popular vote to 49.23% for Mr. Nixon.) The next one could lead to our downfall.

As we approach this election and expend our energies to elect our Party's candidate, we should be impressed by the desperate need for liberating American voters. For so many years, we have tolerated an arrangement born out of the belief that the majority of our citizenry was too ignorant to make such an important decision as to determine the Presidency of the United States. There was a time when the American people were expected to tolerate that insult, but I don't know why they should tolerate it now. The inescapable fact that a man can become President without the support of a majority of American voters should warn us of the chance that we may someday suffer from our lack of concern for reform.

It has been pointed out by numerous historians that we have fortunately and sometimes only narrowly escaped the dire consequences which can result from the electoral college system but this is not a good argument for continuing the system. Perceiving the inherent defects, we must proceed to devise an instrument for the election of the chief executive which is consistent with our democratic beliefs. The President should be elected by direct popular vote.

One of the champions of the effort for

reform is our Senior Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Speaking before the Senate Judiciary Committee March 2, 1966, she stated, "The Electoral college is doomed to be replaced by the direct election system. It is only a matter of time. Its years are numbered." Senator Smith has actively pursued reforms since 1950.

Without enacting urgently needed election reforms, we live with the constant threat that someday, the Presidential Election will again be thrown into the House of Representatives. Imagine, if you can the catastrophe of a President so chosen, elected by States, each having one equal vote to represent its diverse interests and diverse population—whether large or small. Congressman Jonathan B. Bingham (D-N.Y.) has rightfully perceived the urgency of the matter and has introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would remove from the House the mandate to select a President when no candidate in the national election receives a majority of the electoral votes. The amendment provides for a runoff election between the two candidates with the greatest number of electoral votes if neither receives a majority. It also does away with the undemocratic system of unpledged electors.

While my colleague's amendment is applicable to the present electoral system, it would, I believe, adapt to a popular and direct vote system should we succeed in reforming the procedure.

I am hopeful that the Congress will respond to the need for these election reforms by adopting legislation providing for direct primary nominations of the major candidates, by abolishing the electoral college system in favor of direct popular elections and by taking the necessary steps toward amending our Constitution in accordance with Congressman Bingham's objective to preclude the possibility that the Members of the House of Representatives should have the power to choose the President of the United States.

In fino, we should make every effort to eliminate devices and procedures which tend to disenfranchise the American voter.

Greece

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of the junta's takeover, this week's Time of April 26, 1968, reports that Greece's economy has suffered a setback. While the "Old Fox" Papandreou remains under house arrest and his son and others are protesting the junta's rule, tourism has fallen off by 14 percent and foreign investment some 30 percent below the 1966 level. The article follows:

GREECE—A SORT OF CELEBRATION

"This year, the day of the Lord's Resurrection coincides with the anniversary of our people's crucifixion." (Former Premier George Papandreou.)

As the Greeks observed their Orthodox Easter, which the Julian calendar places a week later than in the West this year, they also marked the end of their first year under military rule. To celebrate the occasion, the junta planned military parades, ordered flags flown from every building and issued new gold and silver coins bearing its symbol: the shadow of a soldier against the background of a phoenix rising from the ashes. The regime of Colonel-turned-Premier George Papadopoulos hinted that it would make some surprise announcements, perhaps including an amnesty for many of its 2,500 political prisoners, 100 of whom were released just before Easter. And, in an effort to ensure that the celebrations would not be marred by dissident voice, it placed under house arrest two of its bitterest critics, George Papandreou, 80, the leader of the big and now banned Center Union Party, and Panayotis Kanellopoulos, 66, the last constitutionally appointed Premier.

In Papandreou's case, the precaution did no good. Anticipating a crackdown, "the Old Fox"—as he is widely known in Greece—slipped out before his arrest a recording of a ringing anti-junta speech to Britain, where the BBC's Greek-language broadcast beamed his defiant words into sets all over Greece. In the eight-minute speech, Papandreou, who was Premier in 1963–65, called on the free world to boycott the junta so that "it will be worthy of the name." At home, he called on the Greek army to reassess its own support of the junta in light of the fact that the ruling colonels had produced no proof of a planned Communist takeover, their rationalization for seizing power. Under Greece's stern martial law, Papandreou's blast was tantamount to treason, but the junta took no further action against him for the time being, ridiculing his statement as a play for a return to power.

Economic Slump: Though the junta has brought stability to Greece and taken a certain number of sensible steps, it has little to celebrate on its first anniversary except its own dogged determination to hold onto power. The country is still ruled by decree, and the press remains under tight censorship. Because of the period of political uncertainty that preceded the coup, the Greek economy, which had been growing nearly as fast as Japan's, was headed into a recession even before the colonels seized power. Despite all sorts of pump-priming measures, such as the cancellation of $260 million in farmers' debts to the state bank, Greece's economy remained in low gear.

Tourism fell 14% in 1967, and is off badly this year. The construction trade, Greece's second biggest industry after agriculture, has experienced a slump. Foreign investment has declined some 30% below the 1966 level. Though the junta has set Sept. 1 as the date for a plebiscite for a new constitution, few Greeks feel that the ex-colonels will step aside in favor of a representative government—though they may form their own party and permit elections if they think they are fairly certain of winning. Right now, talk of elections is extremely vague. Says Premier Papadopoulos: "You are asking the surgeon to plan out the patient's summer vacation two years hence, while he is still strapped to the surgical table."

Protest Movements: Strapped to the table as they are, Greeks at home either tolerate the junta's rule or feel that they are helpless to do anything about it. King Constantine remains in exile in a Rome hotel, with little prospect of returning to Greece soon; about his only public activity recently was to be guest of honor at an international karate contest in Rome's Olympic Village (he holds a black belt). Other Greeks abroad are not, however, so fatalistic; in city after city this week, they protested the military dictatorship. Actress Melina Mercouri, who has made opposition to the junta a second career, flew into London for a demonstration in Trafalgar Square, and similar rallies were scheduled for, among other places, Chicago, Montreal, Melbourne, Stockholm, West Berlin and Rome.

The biggest of all were planned for West Germany, where there are 160,000 Greek workers. One of the speakers there was to be Andreas Papandreou, 49, the Harvard-educated son of old George, who was released from a junta prison last December and has gone into exile to organize a resistance movement. Though the protest movements among the Greek communities abroad are indeed unlikely to overthrow the junta, they nevertheless succeed in discouraging tourists to Greece and businessmen from investing there. In the long run, the ex-colonels may find those measures more difficult to deal with than with an outright armed uprising.

A Sad Easter in Greece

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Easter in Greece. It was also the first anniversary of the day American-made tanks were used by a small group of officers to end parliamentary government in Greece. The venerable George Papandreou, rightly predicting that the dictators would muzzle him on the occasion of the anniversary, smuggled out of Greece a stirring and eloquent statement—one that our Government should not ignore. Mr. Papandreou has since been joined in his appeal by the former right-wing Premier—Mr. Cannelopoulos—who is also under house arrest. Mr. Cannelopoulos addressed his appeal to the West to cease all support to the junta, through British Members of Parliament who met with him last week.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Papandreou's opening sentence must have caused many secret tears in Greece as his well-known but aged voice said:

This year, the day of the Lord's Resurrection coincides with the anniversary of our people's crucifixion.

The people of Greece rely on the BBC for news just as they did during World War II. The BBC has now done them another great service by making it possible to hear the voice of one of their most beloved leaders, who at the age of 80 is still so feared by the military junta that they cut his telephone wires and put him under house arrest, as Easter approached.

Mr. Speaker, I place the New York Times front page news story as well as the text of Mr. Papandreou's smuggled speech to his people in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 1968]

TEXT OF THE APPEAL BY FORMER PREMIER PAPANDREOU OF GREECE

(ATHENS, April 17.—Following is the text of a statement by George Papandreou, former Greek Premier, who is under house arrest, as received by foreign correspondents:)

This year, the day of the Lord's Resurrection coincides with the anniversary of our people's crucifixion. The military coup of the 21 April has abolished all freedoms. It has abolished the freedom of the press. Newspapers are not merely censored; they are actually being written by the personnel of the junta. Their contents are uniform; only the headings are different.

It has abolished the freedom of speech. No one may utter a word of criticism. He who does is at once committed for trial before a military tribunal. And the military tribunals impose sentences of long-term imprisonment. In fact, even without uttering a word, thousands of citizens are arrested and deported to desolate islands, under strict police surveillance.

They have abolished the freedom of assembly. Even the meeting of a few people is a crime, subject to trial by military tribunal. The junta alleges that it has restored order. But this is not "law and order." It is not the order of free men. It is the "order" of fear, the order of military tribunals. And this is a common characteristic of all totalitarian regimes.

In order to justify the coup d'état, the junta has manufactured a myth—the myth that a Communist revolution was to be launched during the elections of May 28, 1967 and that they had resorted to the coup in order to forestall it. "The country's salvation is the supreme law," they said. And they themselves hastened to become the "saviors."

The country's salvation is indeed the supreme law—but only if it is in danger. No such danger existed. As everybody has admitted since, the Center Union, the country's greatest democratic party, would have emerged almighty from the election of May 28. And the Center Union, as we have declared repeatedly, was both ideologically independent and politically self-sufficient.

The truth is that the myth of the Communist danger was manufactured and the coup undertaken only to prevent our electoral victory.

And the full proof that there was no danger of a Communist revolution has been offered by the junta itself. For a whole year, the junta has been carrying out investigations and has failed to discover even a single weapon, either among the democratic camp or even among the Communists. Not a single weapon.

How, then, could a revolution be launched by an unarmed people against a fully armed state? Only idiots could still believe this myth.

The junta now declares that it has taken up the country's rebirth. It denounces the "corrupt" past. And yet, never before, not even during the worst period of parliamentarianism, has there been such demagogy and such favoritism. All those who had been voted into office have been dismissed without exception: mayors and members of municipal councils, the members of the governing bodies of cooperative societies, and lawyers' and doctors' associations and in general, the occupants of any elective office whatever. They have been replaced by relatives and favorites, whose main task is to send off telegrams of gratitude and to organize welcoming parties. And thousands of honorable officers and civil servants have been arbitrarily dismissed.

USE OF LIES CHARGED

The junta first made use of a big lie in order to seize power, the lie of an impending Communist revolution. And now, it employs another lie in order to stay in power. It used the fraud of the forthcoming plebiscite and of elections in the indefinite future. A plebiscite on the new constitution is to take place on Sept. 1. No one knows yet what this new constitution will be. A dictatorship drawing up the constitution for a democracy! It is an absurdity.

In the meantime, this dictatorship keeps publishing in the press articles of a draft constitution prepared by a committee asking for a people's opinion. In exchange for the complete abrogation of the constitution, the junta now offers the people the study of a constitution. This is adding mockery to tyranny. But this is not all.

The people are invited to take part in the plebiscite, while being fully aware that, whatever its outcome, the junta will still be in power tomorrow. And, having pinpointed its "valiant" opponents—for everybody is an opponent—the junta will reform them by imprisonment and deportation. Such will be the "free expression" of the people's will.

I now address myself to the country's armed forces. I understand their special sensivity in matters of national concern, which explains why, on April 21, 1967, they were misled by the great lie that a Communist revolution was impending. But now the lie has been uncovered. There had neither been, nor is there now, danger of a Communist revolution. Yet the junta is still in power. Why?

And now I address myself to the free world. We had hoped, after the Second World War, that Fascism had been definitely crushed and that it would not be able to make its appearance again, at least not in Europe. And yet it did. It is to our shame that its first reappearance should have taken place in our country, Greece, the cradle of democracy.

However the fate of the junta will not remain a local affair. Its fate will set a precedent, which will either encourage or disappoint, would-be dictators in other countries.

That is why I appeal to the free world, to its peoples and governments. We ask their solidarity and support. We do not ask for interference in our international affairs. But they are entitled to determine their own policy. And international isolation, both political and economic, of the junta will lead to its immediate overthrow. And that is what we appeal for in the name of the enslaved Greek people who we represent.

By taking such an initiative, the free world will both honor and protect itself. It will become worthy of its name.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 1968]

PAPANDREOU ASKS WORLD BOYCOTT TO TOPPLE REGIME—EX-PREMIER OF GREECE DEFIES HOUSE ARREST AND MARTIAL LAW TO ISSUE STATEMENT

ATHENS, April 17.—Former Premier George Papandreou defied house arrest and martial law today to appeal to the world for help in toppling the army-backed Greek regime.

The octogenarian leader of the Center Union party was put under house arrest on Monday to stop him from denouncing the regime, which on Sunday will mark its first year in power.

In a statement that reached foreign correspondents tonight, Mr. Papandreou called for an international political and economic boycott that would lead to the junta's overthrow.

He stated that what he asked of the free world, its peoples and their governments was solidarity and support. "We do not ask for interference in our internal affairs" he said, but they are entitled to determine their own policy. And international isolation, both political and economic, of the junta will lead to its immediate overthrow.

The house arrest of former Premiers Papandreou and Panayotis Canellopoulos, the rightist leader of the National Radical Union, Monday night, was part of a bid by the regime to prevent farmer leaders from issuing hostile statements while the regime celebrates its anniversary.

ANOTHER EX-OFFICIAL DETAINED

Demetrios Papaspyrou, president of Greece's last Parliament, was also placed under house arrest today after having refused to retract statements critical of the regime made to foreign newspapers.

Anghelos Angelousis and Efstathios Anthopoulos, Center Union Deputies, were arrested and the authorities prepared to deport them to the Aegean Islands.

Mr. Papandreou's statement referred to the coincidence of the regime's anniversary Sunday with the Orthodox Easter Sunday. It said: "This year the day of the Lord's Resurrection coincides with the anniversary of our people's crucifixion. The military coup of April 21 has abolished all freedoms."

The statement attacked the Greek rulers for having seized power under false pretenses—on the assertion that they were averting a Communist coup.

It said that for an entire year the junta had searched and investigated but had failed to find even a single weapon.

General elections were to have been held in Greece on May 28, 1967, five weeks after the military seized power.

Mr. Papandreou's statement derided the regime's contention that it was cleansing public life.

"Never before, not even during the worst periods of Parliamentarianism, has there been such demagogy, such favoritism," the statement said. "All elected officers were dismissed without exception, to be replaced by relatives and favorites whose main task is to send off telegrams of gratitude and to organize welcoming parties."

Mr. Papandreou charged the regime with having added mockery to tyranny by staying in power on the pretext it had to hold a plebiscite on the new constitution and elections in the indefinite future.

It said that Mr. Papandreou had understood the susceptibilities of the armed forces in matters of national importance and this explained why on April 21, 1967, the troops were "misled by the great lie" that a Communist revolution was impending.

COULD BE TRIED

The statement added that the "lie" had been uncovered, but it asked why the junta was still in power.

Under the present martial law, Mr. Papandreou's defiance could bring him before an extraordinary court-martial. Five-year jail terms have been dealt out by military tribunals for lesser offenses.

This was the first major political statement by Mr. Papandreou, who was Premier of Greece from March, 1964, to July, 1965, as leader of the nation's biggest political party, since his arrest on April 21, 1967, the night the military seized power.

After detention in a hospital, Mr. Papandreou was sent home but was placed under strict confinement. His detention was lifted on Dec. 23, after Premier George Papadopoulos had granted an amnesty for political offenses. Then came the house arrest on Monday.

A spokesman for the regime said that Mr. Papandreou and Mr. Canellopoulos were "engaging in excessive political activity that might disturb public order and security and might involve them in unpleasant adventures."

BBC BROADCASTS STATEMENT

LONDON, April 17.—The British Broadcasting Corporation tonight carried the voice of Mr. Papandreou and his defiant words to the Greek people. His statement was broadcast in the Overseas Service of the B.B.C.

A tape recording was smuggled out to London. The B.B.C. would not disclose any details, but it was reported here that Mr. Papandreou got the tape out before he was put under house arrest on Monday.

Danger on the Horizon for the Small Broadcaster

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending in the other body a proposed amendment to the copyright revision bill which would require an additional payment by broadcast media every time a record is broadcast. Such a proposal, if implemented, would no doubt double the costs of doing business—particularly of small radio stations. It is obvious to me that recording artists are already benefiting from the exposure of

their songs to the public by radio stations. In fact, if it were not for that exposure, many of those same recording stars would still be trying to "make it in the big time."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider that latest assault against the small radio stations.

Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, a striking new museum on the campus of Springfield, Mass., College just a few miles away from the site where Dr. James Naismith invented basketball, was formally dedicated last Tuesday afternoon.

Several hours later the hall of fame held its first enshrinement dinner, an event honoring four basketball greats newly elected to the hall: Howard G. Cann, Clair F. Bee, Amory T. Gill, and Alvin F. Julian.

I had the honor of addressing the hundreds of celebrated athletes, coaches, officials, and writers gathered in the hall of fame for the afternoon dedication ceremonies. It was a signal honor, Mr. Speaker, because the Naismith Hall of Fame is the finest sports museum in the United States. In scope, in beauty, and in sheer physical size it surpasses the Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, N.Y., and the Professional Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio. Unlike these two museums, the Naismith Hall of Fame is dedicated to the totality of the sport it represents. Its exhibits recognize all aspects of basketball—the game's humble beginnings in the Springfield YMCA School For Boys, its slow spread into amateur athletics, its astonishing growth over the past decade into a multimillion-dollar professional sport.

John Bunn, a member of the hall of fame and chairman of its honors committee, pointed out at Tuesday's dedication ceremonies that the museum "surpasses the expectations of any of those who had something to do with it."

Tracing the events leading up to the construction of the hall of fame, Mr. Bunn neatly summed up the basketball world's attitude to the museum by calling it "a dream come true."

Basketball's famous teams and players, of course, are prominent among the individuals and groups honored in the hall of fame. But the game's coaches, officials, innovators, writers, and historians are also given the attention they deserve. Of the four men enshrined in the hall of fame last week, for example, three have earned this honor for coaching and one for innovations and writings that helped shape the game. Here are brief biographies of these four basketball immortals:

CLAIR F. BEE (1900–) ELECTED 1967—CONTRIBUTOR

Graduated from Grafton, West Virginia, H.S. 1917, B.A. from Waynesburg College 1925, and M.A. from Rutgers 1932, Coach 29 years. Lost 7 games in 5 years at Rider, won 95% of games at Long Island University 1931–1952, including 43 straight. Undefeated teams 1936 and 1939. NIT Champions in 1939 and 1941. Baltimore "Bullets" 1952–54. Member All-American Selection Board. Traveled and lectured extensively abroad. Rules Innovator including "3 Second" and "24 Second" Rules. Prolific writer including 5 "Clair Bee" books in 1935 and many books and articles that remain valuable references. Received many coaching awards around the world.

HOWARD G. CANN (1895–) ELECTED 1967—COACH

Graduated from New York (Commerce) H.S. 1913 and New York University 1920. Great three sport athlete in high school and college. Member 1920 Olympic team. Led N.Y.U. to National AAU Title 1920 as its "Greatest All-Round Athlete." Coached at N.Y.U. 35 years. Teams won 409, lost 232. Coach of Year 1947. East Coach 1948. Received N.Y. Writers Distinguished Service Award. NABC Merit Award 1967. Coached many great players in outstanding coaching career.

AMORY T. GILL (1901–1966), ELECTED 1967–COACH

Graduated from Salem, Oregon, H.S. 1920 and Oregon State University 1924. Captain and twice All-State 1919 and 1920. All Conference and All-American 1924. Coached 2 years at Oakland, California, H.S.; 36 years at Oregon State where he won 599 games. Won Pacific Coast Title 5 years, Far West Classic 8 years. Fourth in NCAA Tourney 1949 and 1963. Olympic Trials Coach 1964. NABC West Coach 1964. "Slats" was NABC President, 1957–58.

ALVIN F. JULIAN (1901–1967), ELECTED 1967–COACH

Graduated from Reading, Pennsylvania, H.S. 1919 and Bucknell University 1923. Won 12 letters in high school and 10 in college. After playing pro football and baseball, began 41 years coaching 3 sports at various times. In Basketball won 381 games at Albright, Muhlenberg, Holy Cross, Dartmouth, and the Boston Celtics. Teams were in 5 NCAA Tourneys and 2 NIT Tourneys, won NCAA Title for Holy Cross in 1947. Won 3 Ivy Titles at Dartmouth 1956, 1958, 1959. Boston Writers Coach of Year, 1947; Philadelphia Writers Award, 1966. Coach NABC West Team 1965. NABC Merit Award 1967. "Doggie" was NABC President, 1966–67. NABC Metropolitan Award 1967.

The program for the enshrinement dinner honoring these men was as follows:

PROGRAM

GORDON CAMERON—GENERAL CHAIRMAN

(President, Farm Credit Banks of Springfield)

1. Invocation, Rabbi Herman E. Snyder.
2. Dinner.
3. Introductions, Mr. Cameron.
4. Master of ceremonies, Curt Gowdy, NBC–TV.
5. Alvin F. Julian Award to a New England basketball coach, Edward Markey, Pres. New England Basketball Coaches Assoc.
6. Enshrinement ceremonies:

A. Joe Lapchick presenting Clair F. Bee; Nat Holman presenting Howard G. Cann; Forrest Twogood presenting Amory T. Gill; Henry Iba presenting Alvin F. Julian.

B. Presentation for enshrinement: John Bunn, chairman, Hall of Fame Honors Committee.

C. Clifford B. Fagan, president, Hall of Fame Board of Trustees.

D. Clair Bee on behalf of enshrinees.

E. Recognition of Hall of Famers.

7. Hall of Fame prayer, Rev. H. Hughes Wagner.
8. Principal address, Adolph Rupp, basketball coach, University of Kentucky.
9. Benediction, Rt. Rev. Timothy J. Leary.

Music by Ted Lockwood Orchestra.

The program for the hall of fame's dedication ceremonies:

NAISMITH MEMORIAL BASKETBALL HALL OF FAME: DEDICATION PROGRAM 3 P.M., APRIL 16, 1968, PRESIDENT CLIFFORD FAGAN, PRESIDING

I. Invocation: Rt. Rev. Timothy J. Leary.

II. Introductions: Hall of Fame Trustees Hall of Famers.

III. History of Hall of Fame: John Bunn.

IV. Springfield, the home of the Hall of Fame; Rep. Edward P. Boland.

V. Dedication prayer: Rev. H. Hughes Wagner, Pastor, Trinity Methodist Church.

VI. Announcements.

VII. Benediction: Rabbi Herman E. Snyder.

I know my colleagues join me in wishing every success to the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, to its president, Clifford Fagan, and to its director, Lee Williams. The hall is a fitting monument to basketball—the world's most popular sport and the only major sport conceived wholly within the United States.

The Springfield Union last Wednesday published an article on the hall of fame's dedication ceremonies and enshrinement dinner. With permission I insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

HOOP HALL OF FAME ELECTEES ENSHRINED

(By Jerry Radding)

CHICOPEE.—Basketball, which once had to fight for recognition as a major sport, won its most glorious victory here Tuesday night just a few miles from where the game was invented.

The momentous occasion was the first enshrinement dinner of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame. Special honors were conferred upon four new electees, Clair F. Bee, Howard G. Cann, Amory T. (Slats) Gill and Alvin F. (Doggie) Julian.

FORMAL DEDICATION

The Hall of Fame building, situated on the Springfield College campus, was formally dedicated in an afternoon ceremony. The showcase of basketball was opened in February.

When these events were in the planning stage months ago, Hall of Fame executive director Lee Williams remarked: "This will be basketball's finest hour."

The 500 in attendance, which included many of the men of high rank in the hoop field, must have agreed.

Bee, coach of the famed Long Island University Blackbirds and a prolific writer of books on the game, was presented for enshrinement by Hall of Famer Joe Lapchick.

Cann, coach at New York University for 35 years and a member of the 1920 Olympic team received his honors from Nat Holman, another old Hall of Fame member.

ON ORIGINAL CELTICS

Holman and Lapchick both were members of the original New York Celtics.

Forrest Twogood, assistant athletic director at Southern Cal, made the enshrinement presentation to Gill, late coach and All American at Oregon State. Mrs. Amory Gill made the acceptance.

Making the enshrinement address to Julian was Henry Iba, immediate past-president of the National Association of Basketball Coaches. Mrs. Alvin Julian accepted honors for her late husband, who had a distinguished coaching career at Albright, Holy Cross, Dartmouth and with the Boston Celtics.

Another highlight of the dinner was the awarding of the Alvin F. Julian Bowl by the

New England College Basketball Coaches Association. Recipient was Rick Wilson of Amherst College, who just completed his 20th season as head basketball coach.

Ed Markey, president of the New England group, made the presentation.

RUPP MAIN SPEAKER

Adolph Rupp of Kentucky, winner of four NCAA championships and 23 Southeast Conference crowns, was main speaker. Rupp is an energetic member of the Hall of Fame board of trustees.

Curt Gowdy, popular sportscaster who admitted that he landed his first job in basketball, was master of ceremonies. Gowdy deviated briefly to baseball before getting to the business at hand.

Eighteen of the 35 living Hall of Fame electees attended the dinner. Those appearing besides the new electees were Holman, Lapchick, Ken Loeffler, Chuck Hyatt, Bob Kurland, Branch McCracken, George Mikan, Col. John Roosma, Bernhard Borgmann, John (Honey) Russell, John Bunn, Bill Mokray, A. A. Schabinger, David Tobey, Andy Phillip, and Barney Sedran.

General chairman of the dinner was Gordon Cameron, president of the Farm Credit Banks of Springfield.

Opening greetings were delivered by Mayor Frank H. Freedman of Springfield, President Wilbert E. Locklin of Springfield College and Melvin Holstein, president of the Joint Civic Agencies.

STEEPED WITH SENTIMENT

Clifford B. Fagan of Chicago, president of the Hall of Fame, presided at the dedication program, which was steeped with sentiment and nostalgia.

Speakers were U.S. Rep. Edward P. Boland and Bunn, a Hall of Famer and chairman of the honors committee.

"Built into these walls is the spirit of our country, since this is a truly American game," said Cong. Boland. "This Hall of Fame will do much for the city, Springfield College and the game of basketball."

Bunn, who once coached basketball and served as athletic director at Springfield College, traced the history of the Hall of Fame from its humble beginnings in the 30s to the present.

CREDITS EARLY WORK

He credited the early work of Dr. Forrest C., (Phog) Allen, the late Dr. Edward J. Hickox of Springfield College and the National Association of Basketball Coaches for helping to make the shrine a reality.

"This building epitomizes the life of Dr. James Naismith," said Bunn. "It's the saga of a man and his game.

"It's a dream come true. What we have here now surpasses all expectations of any of those who had something to do with it."

Following the building dedication the plaques of the four new electees were unveiled in the honors court. There now are 66 individuals and four teams in the Hall of Fame.

Members of the clergy participating in the dedication and enshrinement ceremonies were Rt. Rev. Timothy J. Leary, Rabbi Herman E. Snyder and Rev. H. Hughes Wagner.

Council Work Recognized

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable BOB SIKES, and I have worked for some time with the several counties in northwest Florida in developing the Northwest Florida Development Council. We think this organization is going to add tremendously to the initiative of those counties in improving their economic well-being. I am happy to enclose a very fine editorial from the Graceville News of April 18, 1968, regarding the council's work:

COUNCIL WORK RECOGNIZED

Significance of events during the past weekend can only be guessed at right now, but doors are opened to what could be one of the most exciting and far-reaching programs in the history of the Florida Panhandle.

The Northwest Florida Development Council (NWFDC) officially received its certificate of designation as an instrument to handle programs under the Economic Development Act (EDA).

This, in itself, may not sound too exciting because we all have known of the existence of the Council since it was formed, and in some general way of the work it was to do. It was charged, very simply, with "developing" Northwest Florida—at least, the ten counties in the council, and they comprise the major part of the geography of the Panhandle.

But this is not just another Chamber of Commerce, or Committee of 100, or other such organization. As important as these agencies are in their own localities, the new Council will work with a concept new to this area, and relatively new in the country.

In the words of Dr. Bill Nagle, director of the Office of Development Districts of Economic Development Administration in Washington, D.C., the Council can "speak with a louder voice than ever has been heard from this area." This louder voice is to be used in defining and solving perplexing problems of unemployment, underemployment, sagging economies, recreational development, social and educational upgrading, cultural improvement, transportation—there literally is no end to the scope of its work. And it respects no county boundaries, no artificial lines which heretofore have separated neighbors and have served to keep local problems pretty well immune from solution.

One of the more exciting facets of the Council's work, now that its first phase of study and planning is over and it has received official designation, is the insistence that all people, of whatever station, of whatever political persuasion, of whatever race, become actively involved in the work of the group.

Nagle emphasized that this was not just another example of "committee work," that the justifiable pride members of the Council have in reaching this first plateau must be shared and honestly felt by those with most to gain, the economically depressed and educationally inadequate and culturally deprived. This, he said, is a major step forward for them, not for the Council.

We have long advocated the disregard of county lines and city boundaries in the overall progress of our area. We have been encouraged by such limited activities as the vocational-technical school in Chipley, which serves more than one county; by Chipola Junior College in Marianna, which serves more than one county; by Vanity Fair's plans for a plant near Graceville, which will provide employment for more than one county; by efforts for a tri-city airport, which will serve more than one county.

These are efforts destined to succeed, and no small part of their success is due to the inter-linking of interest and responsibility which transcends political boundaries.

Now officially designated, the Council can—indeed, is called on to—proceed with identifying specific areas of need, specific solutions and programs, and specific costs. Now working under the monitoring eye of the EDA regional office in Huntsville, Ala., the Council has a direct line to sources of funds which, properly used, can transform the beauteous but poor Panhandle into a beauteous, thriving, vital area, where jobs are available for those who want them.

To President DeVane Williams of Bonifay and other officers, directors and members of the Council we offer our sincere congratulations for this recognition they have achieved; we offer our thanks for their many hours of labor in our behalf; and we offer our complete cooperation in helping achieve that prosperous and industrious, healthful and happy "promised land" that awaits.

Once political subdivisions such as cities and counties recognize that as long as one person is unemployed, whatever his race, he is a drag on the economy of the area, and a liability on the tax burden carried by the productive. If those unemployed and underemployed can be made into productive, taxpaying citizens; if those uneducated and undereducated can be trained for a useful place in society, contributing their talents; if those with talent and education can be enticed to devote more of themselves to the cooperative effort, there literally is no end to the heights this area can climb.

Birthday Celebration of Queen Isabella

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, Monday, April 22, 1968, we celebrate the birthday of Queen Isabella of Spain. If this determined woman had not seen fit to support the voyage of Christopher Columbus this land of ours would have a far different history.

It is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several of the many proclamations proclaiming April 22 as Queen Isabella Day. The person to whom much credit should go for his work in setting aside this day to honor Queen Isabella is John Paul Paine of Washington, D.C.

John Paine's letter of April 4, 1968, and several proclamations are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 4, 1968.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND FULTON: As the creator of Queen Isabella Day in the United States, I am delighted to let you know that proclamations are beginning to pour in from all over the country. I have been overwhelmed by the generosity of so many Mayors, City Managers, Governors and Congressmen. And now millions will acclaim the Queen.

States like Alabama, Vermont, Maine, Florida, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Maryland and cities like Albany, Bronx & Buffalo, N.Y., Akron, Canton, Columbus & Youngstown, Ohio; Berkeley, Long Beach & Oakland, Calif., Houston, New Orleans, Memphis, Detroit, Newark, St. Louis, Davenport, Iowa; Englewood, N.J., are just a few who have already issued documents honoring the Spanish queen. Some of the above have done so for the last three years as you know.

Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, we Americans should all want to honor Isabella's memory, because, had it not been for the shrewd intuition and calculated gamble of this daring queen, we might not be here today. History tells us that every other power of that day, turned the Navigator down when he approached them for financial aid.

You are to be congratulated, Mr. Fulton, for having introduced a bill better known as H.J. Res. 135, authorizing the President to proclaim April 22d of each year, as Queen Isabella Day in the United States. The above proclamations can only enhance its passage in the 90th Congress. I hope it is not left to die. Every Congressman and Senator is now aware of your Queen Isabella legislation.

Looking forward to hearing from you. . . .

Sincerely,

JOHN PAUL PAINE.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR, STATE OF ALABAMA

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451–1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968:

Now, therefore, I, Lurleen B. Wallace, Governor of the State of Alabama, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in the State of Alabama and urge all citizens to mark this day with ceremonies appropriate to her honor.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and have caused the Great Seal of the State of Alabama to be affixed, done at the State Capitol in the City of Montgomery on this the 6th day of March, 1968.

LURLEEN B. WALLACE,
Governor.

ATTEST.

MABEL S. AMOS,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION, CITY OF DETROIT

Whereas, the enthusiasm and support of a single ruler led to the discovery of America and the resounding effect this discovery had upon the history of the world, and

Whereas this great ruler, Queen Isabella of Aragon and Castile, was the sole backer of Christopher Columbus, whose proposed expedition to the New World was contrary to the 15th century concept of the world, and

Whereas the shrewd intuition of Queen Isabella, as well as the financial support and risk taken by Her Majesty on behalf of Spain was responsible for uncovering the unknown riches of the Western Hemisphere, and

Whereas the history of America has direct linkage to the birth of Queen Isabella on April 22, 1451

Now, therefore, I, Jerome P. Cavanagh, Mayor of the City of Detroit, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968 as Queen Isabella Day in Detroit and urge all citizens to honor this Spanish Queen who was instrumental in making the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World a reality.

Given under my hand and seal this 16th day of April, 1968.

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE MAYOR, CITY OF SACRAMENTO

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through the support from Queen Isabella (1451–1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies, and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism, and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968

Now, therefore, I, Richard H. Marriott, Mayor of the City of Sacramento, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968 as Queen Isabella Day in Sacramento and urge all citizens to honor this Spanish Queen who was instrumental in making the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World a reality.

Issued: This 15th day of April, 1968.

RICHARD H. MARRIOTT,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION, CITY OF PROVIDENCE, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451–1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, and

Whereas, That voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies, and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism, and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968,

Now, therefore, I, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., Mayor of Providence, do hereby proclaim Monday, April, 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in Providence and urge all citizens to honor this Spanish Queen who was instrumental in making the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World a reality.

In witness whereof, I, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., Mayor of Providence, have hereunto set my hand and caused my seal to be affixed this 4th day of April, A.D. 1968.

JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, Jr.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451–1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies, and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virture and unselfish patriotism, and

Whereas, the Five Hundred and Seventeenth Anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968,

Now, therefore, I, W. W. McAllister, Mayor of the City of San Antonio, do hereby proclaim Monday, Aprill 22, 1968, to be "Queen Isabella Day" in San Antonio, Texas, and urge all citizens to honor this Spanish Queen who was instrumental in making the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World a reality.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of San Antonio to be affixed this 4th day April, 1968.

W. W. MCALLISTER,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF FLORIDA

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451–1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies, and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism, and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968,

Now, therefore, I, Claude R. Kirk, Jr., by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in the State and urge all citizens to mark this day with ceremonies appropriate to her honor.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the Capital, this 7 day of March A.D., 1968.

CLAUDE R. KIRK, Jr.,
Governor.

Attest.

JIM ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF MAINE

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451–1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, that voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, the five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968;

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in the State of Maine, and urge all citizens to mark this day with appropriate ceremonies and observances.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this Thirteenth day of March, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-eight, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the One Hundred and Ninety-second.

KENNETH M. CURTIS.

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451–1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon; and

Whereas, That voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foundations for contemporary American societies; and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism; and

Whereas, The five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968;

Now, therefore, I, Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim April 22, 1968, as Queen Isabella Day in the State of Maryland.

Given Under My Hand and the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, in the City of Annapolis, this 20th Day of March, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty Eight.

By the Governor:

SPIRO T. AGNEW.

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF MINNESOTA

Whereas, Christopher Columbus' voyage to the New World in 1492 was made possible through support from Queen Isabella (1451–1504), Queen of Castile, wife of Ferdinand of Aragon, and

Whereas, That voyage opened North and South America to settlement and development by European nations, laying the foun-

dations for contemporary American societies, and

Whereas, Spain prospered under Queen Isabella's clear intellect, resolute energy, moral virtue and unselfish patriotism, and

Whereas, The five hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the birth of Queen Isabella will be observed on April 22, 1968,

Now, therefore, I, Harold LeVander, Governor of the State of Minnesota, do hereby proclaim Monday, April 22, 1968, as "Queen Isabella Day" in Minnesota, and urge all citizens to mark this day with ceremonies appropriate to her honor.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed at the State Capitol this twenty-first day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-eight, and of the State, the one hundred tenth.

HAROLD LEVANDER,
Governor.
JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, March 5, 1968.

Hon. WILLIAM H. CLAYPOOLE,
House of Representatives,
Main Capitol Building,
Harrisburg, Pa.

DEAR BILL: As requested in your recent letter, I was happy to designate a Queen Isabelle day in Pennsylvania, and the official pronouncement is enclosed for you to forward to Mr. Paine.

Thank you for bringing this to my attention.

With kindest personal regards,
Cordially,

RAYMOND P. SHAFER.

More U.S. Assistance for Latin America

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, during a recent series of meetings by the Foreign Policy Association, Dr. John Plank, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, presented some excellent insights on what we should be doing in Latin America in the next decade. He feels that Latin America offers the greatest promise for moving from a traditional to a modern society. Latin America is of the west, with values and aspirations similar to ours.

Yet, our similarities can lead us into a trap, and cause us to become complacent. The United States and Latin America, in Dr. Plank's opinion, are now pulling further apart, culturally and economically, and this trend must be reversed.

The United States tends to be crisis-oriented, responding to emergencies "with a good deal more zest and commitment" than we normally do. In Latin America political systems are very resistant to change. Hence the Communist threat can be put into a proper perspective and we should have "more time to build carefully and wholesomely in one cooperative endeavor with progressive Latin Americans."

Cuba, in Mr. Plank's opinion, is an unusual case, and should not worry us to any great extent, but in the coming years we will see more violence in Latin America. However, this will be due largely to national and social concerns rather than Communist inspiration.

In Latin America, we should be thinking of $20 billion a year in aid from public and private sources, rather than $2 billion. Economic aid is not enough.

No amount of straightforward economic and financial assistance will achieve wholesome development in the absence of changes, marked changes, in the social and political dispensations.

Aid must be more imaginative, with more involvement of voluntary associations, business resources, and political organizations.

Also, we must commit ourselves to the attainment of meaningful participant democracies in Latin America. Peace, progress, and participation are the three elements of political development, and we should give preferred treatment to governments which have achieved or are conscientiously working to achieve meaningful participation.

The remarks make by Dr. Plank, as summarized above, deserve careful examination. The full text follows:

I want to consider with you several problem areas in inter-American relations which, I think, if more carefully attended to, might make possible much more fruitful cooperation between the two parts of the hemisphere than has been characteristic of the past. I do not want to suggest that inter-American relations are ever going to be easy—the power disparity is too great, the difference in life-styles between North America and Latin America is too extreme, some features of the historical record are too deeply etched in stereotyped ways, to make easy interaction in pursuit of common purposes very likely. But neither do I want to make a negative, a pessimistic projection. Of all parts of the developing world, Latin America, it seems to me, offers the most promise of making the transition from what has been labelled "traditional" to what we call "modern" status . . . for, however appalling may appear to us to be conditions in Latin America today, Latin America is still substantially farther along toward wholesome development than, I should think, are Africa, Asia, or the Middle East. Moreover, Latin America is of the west, western. For all that there are great differences between Iberian culture and Northern European-North American culture, still the values of Latin America are like our values, the aspirations of Latin America are like our aspirations. We can, in short, come closer to mutual understanding with Latin America than we can with peoples elsewhere in the developing world. These are relative judgments, of course, and I repeat that I am far from wanting to suggest that communication and understanding are or can be easy . . . our commonalities at the surface often conceal profound differences, cultural differences.

Now, it may be said that full appreciation of the dimensions and difficulties of the problems that perturb inter-American relations can discourage us, lead to an attitude of resignation and withdrawal on our parts from Latin America. I confess I occasionally come close to succumbing to that mood—when one looks soberly at the obstacles to effective cooperation, obstacles not only intrinsic to the Latin American situation but also those that are part of our own United States situation (our decision-making machinery, our own priority scaling of problems domestic and international,) I become, at least temporarily, mightly discouraged. That mood, however, is a function of my own impatience, a function of despairing of ever finding a way of tackling all the problems at once. And it is a mood that passes. There are things to do, things that can be done—and progress, as conceived by anyone who is not an apolcalyptic romantic, must be recognized to occur only at the margin, only incrementally.

Let me, then, run through a handful of topics that I think important in terms of our handling demands and challenges from Latin America during the coming decade more effectively and constructively than we handled them in past decades.

First, let us take a look at the notion that has in a sense underlain our Latin American policy for generations—what Prof. Arthur P. Whitaker has called "The Western Hemisphere Idea." That idea is now part of our national mythology, it being predicated on the belief that elements of geography, history, and ideology have welded the states of this part of the world into a special kind of community, different from and potentially superior to areas and peoples elsewhere. It is the Western Hemisphere Idea that is celebrated on Pan-American Day when we formally rededicate ourselves to the values of representative democracy, it is that idea which underlies the Rio Treaty of 1947 which geographically delimits this area and puts it out of bounds to extra-hemispheric powers. There is obviously much to the Western Hemisphere Idea—whatever may be its intrinsic validity, that people in the Americas both North and South do believe in it makes it a force to conjure with. And it gives us something to build on. The difficulty is that it tends to lead us to a distorted picture of both our relationships with Latin American peoples and our relationships with peoples elsewhere, particularly peoples of the Northern Hemisphere and Europe. In point of fact, the Western Hemisphere Idea is critically important, but important as an ideal to be achieved, not as a presumed fact upon which to predicate decisions and policy. I think that at present the United States and the states of Latin America are pulling further apart rather than growing closer together, whether one looks to the economic dimension or more broadly to the cultural one. That trend I think needs to be reversed, but it will be reversed only when we recognize the superficiality of much of what we regard as the bonds of inter-American unity. There is no absence of rhetoric about the inter-American community, no absence of formal institutions to embody and advance the interests of that community. What we need to do now is give substance to the rhetoric and to the formal institutions.

This brings me to a second point. We in this country tend to be crisis-oriented, we tend to respond to emergencies with a good deal more zest and commitment than we do to the long-term business of patient building, particularly in that which pertains to our international policies. It is, for instance, quite improbable that the United States would have embarked on the Alliance for Progress had Vice President Nixon not been spat upon and stoned in 1958, had Fidel Castro not assumed power in 1959, had we not been able to put the Alliance for Progress into an anti-communist perspective. For years now we have been told that it is "one minute to midnight" in Latin America. What I want to suggest to you is that the crisis mentality is the inappropriate mentality with which to approach Latin American problems during the coming decade. We have simply got to think, both as a government and as a people, in much longer time-perspectives in respect of building the inter-American community, achieving meaningful success for the Alliance for Progress, than we have done. It is not "one minute to midnight" in Latin America, if by that we mean that the region is about to explode into revolutionary violence or that the communists, however defined, are ready to spring into positions of power and to impose a totalitarian clamp

upon society after society. That there is suffering and that the suffering is increasing is true, that there are massive problems and that the problems are becoming more serious is true, that there are communists and that their number is increasing is true. But the power of tradition in Latin America is immensely strong, the institutional ruts—in many cases centuries old—are very deep and resistant, and the strength of the established forces (in oversimplified but widely accepted language, the oligarchy) is very great. We are not going to see collapse of Latin American political systems—they are oddly stable and resistant to change, whether that change be oriented toward totalitarianism or toward constructive democratization.

It would be deplorable if recognition of this fact should lead us to reduce our efforts to help Latin America through today's very difficult transitional phase. On the other hand, recognition of it should help us put the communist threat into proper perspective and it should be viewed by us as giving us more time to build carefully and wholesomely in our cooperative endeavor with progressive Latin Americans. We do not need to be stampeded into precipitous action, either dubious, crash projects under the Alliance for Progress or counter-productive activity in the name of anti-communism.

We in this country may be disappointed at the slow progress of the Alliance for Progress; but we can take—if we wish—a certain wry satisfaction from the fact that the totalitarians of the left and right are every bit as frustrated as we. Let me make this, the third point, a little more explicit. Cuba frightened us badly, and we have operated on the assumption that additional Cubas were not only possible but likely. (Fidel, of course, has operated on the same assumption.) But in crucially important respects Cuba was *sui generis* in this hemisphere. Cuba was a tight little island in that (a) it was an island; (b) it was highly developed by relevant Latin American standards with good transportation and communication, a fairly homogeneous population; (c) Batista was a peculiarly loathsome dictator while Fidel was a particularly and romantically attractive leader who probably deceived himself and certainly deceived the Cuban people as to his eventual orientation and goals; and (d) Fidel was able to export his opposition, most of whom of course left Cuba voluntarily. These are not conditions that are to be duplicated elsewhere. Also, I think it possible that we during the years ahead will misinterpret both Cuba's role in the western hemisphere and the nature of revolutionary movements in Latin America. While we North Americans naturally enough focus on Cuba's—or more accurately, Fidel's—efforts to export his revolution, if we reflect we recognize that a very small part of Cuba's resources and energies are spent in that direction. Most of Fidel's time and almost all of most Cubans' time is devoted to domestic Cuban concerns, whether growing sugar cane or consolidating the revolution or enjoying baseball. Fidel, in other words, is not playing a role in Latin America even remotely comparable to that played by Ho Chi Minh, whatever Fidel's rhetorical pretensions may be. As for the revolutionary movements, whe shall undoubtedly see more rather than less violence in Latin America during the decade ahead as numbers, growing numbers, of Latin American young people (including some of the region's most gifted and dedicated) despair of accomplishing necessary change peacefully and opt for the route of violent overthrow of institutions. We would err seriously if we were to regard their activity as being motivated by any widespread desire to subject their countries to the hegemony of Havana or Peking or Moscow. They may call themselves communists—not all of them will—but theirs is primarily a national and a social, not an ideological, concern. Our usual reaction to such men, of course, is to fear and distrust them. And of course to the extent that we indiscriminately brand these men communists, we often play into the hands of Latin America's most reactionary elements.

Regrettably we are in some contexts obliged to work with such reactionary elements, for they are in control of their governments, and the Alliance for Progress—which is our institutional arrangement for promoting peaceful change, the "revolution in freedom" of which President Frei speaks—is to a very substantial degree a government-to-government operation. It is for this reason that some Latin Americans believe the Alliance was doomed from the outset—could anyone realistically expect, ask they, that the oligarchy would cooperate in its own planned destruction? But the problems of the Alliance as presently set up go beyond that, for the Alliance, designed in 1961 to provide from both public and private sources a total of $2,000,000,000 a year of developmental assistance from the United States, is quite inadequate to make more than a scratch on the surface of Latin America. What we need to do—something that is very difficult for us to do as long as Vietnam and our domestic problems put such a heavy claim on our resources—is to think about ways through which vastly increased amounts can be made available to the Latin Americans for their developmental programs. From all external sources—external, that is, to Latin America—we should be thinking in terms of 20 billions rather than 2; and we are very far from that. If we were prepared during the next decade really to think about changing our trading posture vis-a-vis Latin America, giving them easier access to our markets, making Latin America truly a preferred area, we might get some distance toward the 20 billion annual goal.

I suspect, though, that the Alliance got off on the wrong foot and is disappointing to most of us because of an initial miscomprehension, namely, that development is primarily an economic matter, something that occurs when adequate financial and technical resources are made available. Actually, development, depending as it does upon appropriate values, attitudes, cultural sets, depending as it does upon the motivations of persons, of individuals, is much more a cultural and political phenomenon than it is economic one. Or to put it a bit differently, no amount of straightforward economic and financial assistance will achieve wholesome development in the absence of changes, marked changes, in the social and political dispensations.

During the next decade, therefore, I would urge us to rethink developmental priorities and to assign primacy to the political and cultural dimensions as against the narrowly economic ones. When we do begin to think in these ways, alternative courses of action appear to us; and also we discover that we do have resources here at home that, properly deployed, sensitively used, would vastly increase the amount of help we can give Latin America that, we hope, would speed Latin America's development. There is not time here to explore the possibilities, but I think of what could be done through more imaginative use of our voluntary associations, more imaginative use of our business resources, more imaginative and courageous use of our political organizations. There are problems and risks here, of course: problems of inadequate knowledge of the Latin American situation, problems of insensitivity on the part of many North Americans, risk derivative from the charge of "intervention"—for we are here getting close to some very sensitive areas. But let it be said that under the Alliance for Progress as presently set up, progress is not occurring, and the rich are getting richer while the poor are getting poorer. Unless we move strongly and creatively into new areas, we are simply going to suffer one frustration after another.

Creativity here does oblige us to make some difficult distinctions and judgments. We are obliged to commit ourselves firmly and openly to the attainment of meaningfully participant democracy—something to which the Latin Americans themselves have been formally committed for a century and a half—and really to work, to bring our pressures to bear, to make that achievement possible. But at the same time we are obliged to recognize that political development is a highly complex process, one that requires the reconciliation of three only awkwardly compatible ingredients, public order, increased productivity, and popular involvement, or to put the matter alliteratively, peace, progress, and participation. Doctrinaire opposition to military regimes is therefore as ill-advised as the doctrinaire assumption that Latin Americans are simply not capable of democratic development. My own view, however, is that participation is itself intrinsically valuable and achievement of meaningful participation ought to entitle those governments that attain—or are working conscientiously for its attainment—to a preferred status in our eyes and in the allocation of our resources. I think, though, that there is no society in this hemisphere—not Paraguay, not Haiti—in which the United States, in either its public or its private sector—could not find meaningful opportunities to promote political development; and I think that political development is the frontier area along which we should be moving most innovatively during the coming decade.

In summary, let me say two things: (1) Unless we and the Latin Americans really get to work on constructive development, with primary emphasis on political development, nothing much is going to happen in Latin America during the decade ahead. The region will not slide off toward totalitarianism—the communists and others lack that capability; but neither will the region move forward in directions and at a rate satisfactory to us and responsibly progressive Latin Americans. Rather, the area will continue to oscillate between spurts of ill-coordinated forward movement and sharp retrogressions, periods of reasonable tranquility interrupted by sporadic manifestations of violence. In short, we shall see the continuation of a slow descent toward social and political tragedy. (2) On the other hand, if we in the United States, using both increased public and vastly increased private resources and working in league with our forward-looking Latin American friends, really put our innovative capacity and our creative energy to work on the developmental challenge in Latin America, we may well surprise ourselves at the progress we can make. Latin America is difficult, no question about it. But no other area of the developing world offers more in the way of opportunity for constructive endeavor, offers more possibility to demonstrate that meaningful democracy is not an historical sport, to be enjoyed only briefly by a tiny, privileged minority of the earth's billions of persons. If we believe in democracy—as you and I do—let us get to work, then, systematically and soberly to make it relevant and operational for our brothers in Latin America.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, every day that goes by underscores the loss

suffered by all of us when Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated. I issued a statement expressing some of my sentiments and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON THE ASSASSINATION OF MARTIN LUTHER KING

The assassination of the apostle of nonviolence is the greatest tragedy of its kind since the death of President Kennedy. It was no doubt the work of a diseased mind, but there is something fearfully wrong with a society that produces such diseased minds. All of us—whites and blacks alike—should rededicate ourselves to the goals toward which Dr. King was striving and for which he gave his life. What has happened—apparently at the hand of a white man—is a shame upon all whites. Let it be the signal for swift action to eradicate the evils Dr. King was struggling against. But let it not be a signal for a violent vengeance. Such vengeance, however understandable, would serve only to redouble the calamity and to make mockery of the sacrifice.

Milwaukee's WTMJ Opposes Municipal Industrial Financing

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, seldom have the people of Wisconsin been so united on an issue as they are on their opposition to the practice of municipal industrial financing.

For that reason, there was broad approval for the recent Treasury Department action ruling that the tax exemption on industrial development bonds would be abolished.

Subsequent Senate action overturning the Treasury action was received with considerable concern. That concern turned to approbation as the Senate reversed itself and adopted Senator RIBICOFF's amendment which would end municipal financing by congressional consent.

Wisconsin residents are hopeful that the House-Senate conference on H.R. 15414, the pending tax bill, will decide one of two courses of action. Either the Ribicoff amendment should be accepted in its entirety or the entire matter should be dropped and the earlier Treasury Department ruling be allowed to stand.

We in Wisconsin have had enough of the "plant piracy" that has resulted from municipal industrial financing. We are tired of having our pockets picked in extra taxes to pay the way for tax-exempt bonds for building factories in other States. We are disgusted with the concept of "State socialism" which underlies the practice of industrial development bonding.

The sentiments of our Wisconsin people on this issue were stated very well recently in an editorial broadcast on radio and television by one of the Nation's most responsible and community-minded stations, WTMJ-TV of Milwaukee. I include the text of that editorial at this point and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

We voiced concern last week when the senate took a stand against a treasury department ruling to end tax exemptions on industrial development bonds. Subsequently, the senate reversed itself and legislated an end to the unfair tax loophole, effective next January 1st. Wisconsin is one of eight states that did not permit municipalities to issue tax free bonds to lure industries with the promise of cheap leases for their plants. Hopefully, such pirating of firms to locations having lower operating costs at the expense of federal taxpayers now will diminish. And investment money attracted to such bonds will instead flow to municipal issues in the public areas—such as schools, waterworks, sewers, public hospitals and roads.

States should continue to compete with each other for industries, but they should compete fairly. Wisconsin has been at a serious disadvantage, despite its attempt to hold industries by means of municipal assistance through industrial development corporations. These coporations are able to legally assembly land for industrial expansion purposes and also to aid in attracting financial assistance. These industrial corporations are widespread and, at last count, there were 280 in Wisconsin. They have been a big factor in keeping at least some smaller plants from moving out of the state. In a few instances parts of big companies were successfully held in Wisconsin. Most important are the jobs that are saved for our own residents and the new jobs that are created by help from the industrial development corporations.

Memorial at Lincoln's Tomb

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a memorial service for Rev. Martin Luther King was held April 7 at Lincoln's tomb in Springfield, Ill., attended by about 3,000 people. Rev. Negil McPherson, pastor of Zion Baptist Church, was in charge of the biracial, interfaith service. Invocation was by Msgr. John Bretz, pastor of Christ the King parish. Rev. Richard Paul Graebel, pastor of First Presbyterian Church, read excerpts from Reverend King's speeches. Rabbi Meyer Abramowitz of Temple B'rith Sholom, offered the memorial prayer. Vocal solos were by Mrs. Margie Jones, and Rev. Joseph Albrecht, pastor of the First Methodist Church, gave the benediction.

The stirring, inspirational, memorial sermon, by Rev. Rudolph S. Shoultz, pastor of Union Baptist Church, included these statements:

Everywhere in our world, since last Thursday men of goodwill have been in great sorrow and we don't have to remind you why we are here.

As I sat at my desk to prepare this message, I remember a statement he made to me in 1960, when we were in Buffalo, N.Y. He said, "Shoultz, non-violence is the only thing that we can do to express our grievances, so that the people of the United States can hear."

To many of us his death was a shock, but now that the shock is quieting down, one thing all of us can say, because he was here, he left the world richer.

We are grieved because of the death of this our "Modern Emancipator." He has given to those of us of color, new hopes when we were hopeless, new inspiration when we were lost, and down with despair, new ideals of this country and new purpose of these United States, when we have lost hope in a country that says, "All men are created equal" and would not live up to that phrase.

Standing here at this spot, I think Springfield does have an ideal place for such an occasion, for here lies the body of a man, who was slain by a sniper's bullet, but, this did not stop the cause for which he gave his life, and let us serve warning that the cause for which Dr. Martin Luther King gave his life will not stop, for we have tasted the sweet wine of freedom, and we know that our voice should be heard. We are teaching our children the real meaning of, "One Nation under God." We have also come to realize the meaning of "The Land of Liberty," and this cause or ideals will not die. Of course the one who pulled the trigger on Thursday and those who may rejoice of his death, will never know how much these ideals have burned in our hearts and become a part of our lives.

Some have even said that Dr. King was sold out to the Communists because of his non-violence attitude toward the war in Viet Nam.

But, if you had ever had any dealings with that great leader, Our Modern Emancipator, you would have known that he was not for sale at any price, for he was already *Sold Out* to A Master From Whom He Was Determined To Never Let Go. Therefore, we know he was priceless.

To us he was like Abraham, he went where he was called and was faithful in all things, even unto death.

To us he was like Moses, he led us from doubts and fears to confidence, even in the face of many difficulties.

To us he was like Joshua, he gave us love for this country and was willing to fight and suffer for its success.

To us he was like Jonathan, he met many of us, discouraged, brother, and cheered us by giving us the strength.

To us he was like Isaiah, he constantly pointed to us, the brighter days and a better tomorrow.

Even in this last known public rally he said he may not enjoy it, but he knows it is coming.

Dr. King inspired us in 1963, with his dream that one day "My black children and my neighbors white children will walk hand in hand singing. Free at Last, Free at Last, Thank God, I am Free at Last."

He has inspired us with the meaning of the words of Christ, "Not only to go the mile that is asked of Thee,

but, go the other,

Not only to give your cloak, but your coat,

Not only take the slap on one cheek, but turn the other,"

Because of the inspiration we received from him, we come to know and understand that freedom cannot be gained by riots, looting, burning or any other means, but through the process of non-violence.

Because of him we know and come to understand that the cause for which he lived, the principles and philosophy for which he gave his life will be our marching cry, until the unseen shackles of slavery will finally be removed, until we can say whether it is on the battlefields of Viet Nam, I am an American, not just a black American but, an American.

Another King Exhorts to Violence

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star today carried a UPI dispatch concerning the proposed poor people's campaign which will culminate

in a march in Washington, D.C., late in the month of May. The brother of the late Rev. Martin Luther King, the Reverend A. D. King was quoted as saying:

We are going to Washington and disrupt Washington so it cannot function unless it does something about the black folk.

Reverend King was also quoted as saying that if violence comes, it "will come only on the seed of white racism and this is not our fault."

This policy of disrupting Washington is, of course, the plan laid down by Martin Luther King before his violent death recently. Every concerned citizen was shocked at the vicious slaying of the civil rights leader, and everyone is anxious that his slayer, or slayers, is quickly apprehended and punished. But, in the interest of the maintenance of law and order, it must be remembered that any policy of civil disobedience is as former Supreme Court Justice Charles Whitaker puts it "active, overt, willful mass violations of our criminal laws."

In July 1967, the late Reverend King stated:

I can't recommend burning down Cleveland. We end up getting killed more than anyone else and our businesses get burned.

It would seem that Reverend King was not as much concerned with the moral aspect of burning a city as with the penalties accruing from the act.

At another time Reverend King reverted to the moral approach when he declared:

It may be necessary to engage in such acts. . . . Often an individual has to break a particular law in order to obey a higher law.

It is apparent that the proposal of policies of civil disobedience, as espoused by Martin Luther King are based on very unstable foundations.

Just as his brother proposes in his coming march, Martin Luther King sought to create dangerous situations while at the same time placing the blame for possible violence or disorder on others. In his book, "Why We Can't Wait," he stated:

The purpose of our direct-action program is to create a situation so crisis-packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation. . . . Actually, we who engage in nonviolence direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with.

It is certainly high time that we recognize that, regardless of how many disclaimers of violence are made, the disruption of the orderly processes of city life are violations of criminal law. Justice Whitaker went right to the heart of the matter when he stated:

Active and overt acts willfully committed in violation of our criminal laws are criminal violations and not "civil disobedience."

Under unanimous consent I include the article, "Plan for March of Poor Listed," appearing in the Washington Star of April 22, 1968, in the RECORD, at this point:

PLAN FOR MARCH OF POOR LISTED—ABERNATHY HEDGES ON CAMP-IN SITES

ATLANTA.—A full timetable for marchers coming to Washington for the Poor Peoples's Campaign was announced yesterday by the successor to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

The Rev. Ralph Abernathy, who now heads the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, hedged again on announcing locations where campaigners would "camp-in" in tent and frame dwellings during the demonstration, which starts with an advance party of negotiators in Washington April 29.

A Washington coordinator, Anthony Henry, however said Saturday the campaigners would attempt to use the Mall for their "City of Hope," whether permission is granted or not. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall indicated last week permission would probably not be granted.

THREE-PRONGED MARCH

Abernathy will launch each phase of the three-pronged March to the Nation's Capital—from the South, the Midwest and the Northeast.

Planned by King to pressure the Johnson administration and Congress to take action to help the nation's poor, particularly in Negro ghettos and on tenant farms, the active campaign will begin May 2 at Memphis, Tenn., from the spot at the motel balcony where King was slain by a white sniper April 4. Abernathy will place a memorial plaque on the Lorraine Motel balcony.

King's brother, the Rev. A. D. King, told his congregation at Louisville, Ky., yesterday that "We are going to Washington and disrupt Washington so it cannot function unless it does something about the black folk." If violence comes, he said, it "will come only on the seed of white racism and this is not our fault."

Here is the timetable announced for the campaign:

April 29—Abernathy heads 100-man delegation of Negroes in talks with government officials to present their demands.

May 2—Abernathy lays memorial plaque in concrete of Lorraine Hotel balcony, leads march toward Marks, Miss.

May 4—March arrives in Marks to help local residents prepare mule-drawn wagon train which will wind its way through the South to Washington.

May 6—Second caravan leaves Jackson, Miss. in church buses for stops in Alabama to recruit more demonstrators.

May 7—Wagon train caravan, the main Southern contingent, begins trek to Washington via Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia.

May 8—Chicago Caravan leaves for Washington.

May 9—Boston caravan leaves for Washington.

May 12—First caravan reaches Washington.

May 13—Construction of shanty town begins in "prominent place" in Washington.

May 16—Chicago caravan arrives in Washington.

May 17—Boston caravan arrives in Washington.

May 18—Southern caravan reaches Washington.

May 21—Major demonstrations begin.

May 30—Mass march through downtown Washington with all caravans and "thousands" of local Negro residents.

Tet Offensive Disruption Held Exaggerated

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written concerning the recent Communist Tet offensive. We have heard assertions that the offensive dealt a crippling blow to the rural pacification program and inflicted serious psychological damage on the South Vietnamese people. It is my opinion that these assertions are inaccurate and do not reflect the true picture of the effect of the Communist offensive.

An excellent estimate of the results of the Tet offensive appeared in an editorial in the April 16 Evening Star, based on the report of a prominent Vietnamese physician, Dr. Phan Quang Dan. This estimate presents the view that the reports of disruption of the pacification program are greatly exaggerated, and rejects the notion of a great Communist victory. I agree with this appraisal and feel that it is further evidence of the military superiority which has been established in South Vietnam and the lack of public support for the Communist movement.

Under unanimous consent I insert this editorial in the RECORD so that you may have an opportunity to read it:

TET OFFENSIVE DISRUPTION HELD EXAGGERATED

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

At the risk of seeming to flog a dead horse, a new estimate of the results of the Communist Tet offensive in Vietnam is worth considering.

The estimate is new, at least, to the American public. Written last month by a prominent Vietnamese physician, Dr. Phan Quang Dan, it was turned over to American Embassy officials in Saigon and recently made available here.

The report is significant because the horse is actually far from dead. The argument over what really happened in the course of the Communist offensive launched during the lunar new year holidays at the end of January still goes on. Public opinion about current developments in Vietnam and Washington is strongly conditioned by it.

Official claims that the Tet offensive amounted to a major defeat for the Communists have been met with widespread hoots of derision in this country and abroad. Heavy as the losses of the Communists were, it has been argued that they were more than offset by the psychological damage inflicted on South Vietnam and in the United States.

The idea has persisted that the American position in Vietnam and that of the government in Saigon were gravely weakened by the attacks on the cities. Hanoi, quite predictably, seized on this theme as the explanation for Lyndon Johnson's bid for peace talks and his withdrawal from the presidential race. And so, it seems, have many others.

In particular, it is said, the Tet offensive showed the futility of all the efforts that have been made in the area of rural pacification in Vietnam. With the withdrawal of pacification teams from many villages to the larger cities, it has been widely assumed, even by American officials, that the Communists quickly moved in and took over.

In fact, according to this detailed report, nothing of the sort happened. The Communist effort was directed entirely against the 36 provincial capitals, all of which were attacked and many seized at least for a few days. Though the smaller towns and villages were left pretty much to defend themselves, the assumption that many of them were taken over by the Communists now appears to be disproved. Says Dr. Dan:

"No district capital was attacked. The countryside was quiet. And during the first week of the Communist assault, highways were usually free throughout South Vietnam.

"The Communist general offensive amounted to a flurry of simultaneous raids on provincial cities. The districts and vil-

lages were left unruffled, sketching out the limits of Communist strength and capabilities."

A revised American assessment is only slightly less optimistic about the over-all picture. The latest figures show that out of 9,024 hamlets rated as contested or relatively secure, only 355 fell temporarily under Viet Cong control. Those affected by Communist efforts in the countryside amounted to something less than 8 percent of the total rural population.

If this is an accurate picture of what happened—and there is reason to believe that it is—the reports of wholesale disruption of the pacification program have been greatly exaggerated. And so also, in Dr. Dan's opinion, have been the estimates of psychological damage.

In contrast to public reaction to earlier major upheavals such as the Japanese coup against the French in Vietnam in 1945, the signing of the Geneva agreement in 1954 or the overthrow of Ngo Dinh Diem in 1963, the people this time remained remarkably calm. Despite fervent appeals, very few rallied to the support of the Communists. No one questioned the authority of the elected government in Saigon and the South Vietnamese army in most places responded vigorously to the attack.

Dr. Dan, who is by no means incurably optimistic or uncritical of the Saigon regime, firmly rejects the notion of a great Communist victory. In his view: "South Vietnam, with all its weaknesses, is emerging from the lunar new year storm as a definitely viable state with a basically loyal army and police and a population firmly committed to freedom."

This is admittedly the judgment of one man who is deeply engaged in the struggle against communism in Vietnam and deeply concerned by the defeatism in this country. But it may serve to stimulate second thoughts among those who believe there is nothing left to do except throw in the sponge.

Earl Radke, a Great American

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the record of service to the needy of Mr. Earl L. Radke, one of our Nation's most outstanding veterans and a man whom we of the San Fernando Valley are proud to have as our neighbor.

Earl Radke was born in Chicago, Ill., August 18, 1894. In 1917 he was married and he entered the Army infantry. He later left the infantry with an honorable discharge.

In 1926, the Radke's moved west to California into the town of Reseda—now part of the 22d District of California, which I represent. He was one month slow from becoming a charter member of Reseda Post 308 of the American Legion, but he has been a member of good standing of that post since 1928.

As Earl was active in the American Legion so was his wife in the American Legion Auxiliary, where she was instrumental in taking the Spanish American and World War I veterans from Wadsworth Veterans' Administration hospital on picnic lunches out to the beach areas of Santa Monica—an all-day trip. Mrs. Radke passed away in October of 1958.

Earl, now alone, has continued to give this extra service to hospital patients. He has been service officer of his post for the past 6 years. Twice he has been an area chaplain, servicing over 20,000 Legionnaires; and chaplain of the 20th District which serves over 8,000 members. So many times has he served in this capacity that recently he was named chaplain emeritus, a title in which he takes justifiable pride.

In 1967 Earl called at various hospitals over 130 times. He made 45 home visits and attended 25 funerals. He also attended 11 hospital programs and received more than 150 phone calls from people seeking his counsel on such matters as widows' benefits, funeral arrangements, GI benefits for surviving children, aid for disabled veterans, how and where to get a job and hundreds of related points.

Earl has driven more than 4,500 miles to accomplish these tasks. It costs him between $500 and $600 a year for his hospital visits alone—but Earl Radke has never asked for a dime.

No amount of money, however, could be sufficient to pay men such as Earl Radke who devote so much of their time, who give so much of themselves to the service of mankind.

Launching of SS "Alaskan Mail"

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1968, while the House was in recess the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., in my district, launched another vessel which will make a notable contribution to the role of our merchant marine, the SS *Alaskan Mail* of the American Mail Line. The sponsor of this new ship was the gracious wife of the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT.

Senator BARTLETT, the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, delivered a most stirring address immediately preceding the christening. I include it in the RECORD so that all might share the import of its message:

LAUNCHING OF SS "ALASKAN MAIL"

There is something about a launching that stirs the spirit.

Perhaps it is the excitement of being in on the start of something new; perhaps a feeling of pride in seeing a new American ship slide down the ways; perhaps just simply a feeling of awe at what man can build if he but concentrates on construction rather than on destruction.

In recent days, the news has been more of the latter than the former. Events conspire to test our capacity to make our way in a modern world with compassion, fairness and wisdom. Pressures build to push us along paths which lead to disaster.

At home, some persons would use the acts of a few as an excuse to punish the many.

In foreign affairs, some persons, seeing the world only from our sides of the oceans, promote policies benefitting narrow, short-range interests at the expense of the general good.

In these trying times, a ship launching takes on heightened meaning. A launching *is* the start of something new, and a sign of faith in the future of a nation crying out for such signs.

The launching of a modern vessel *does* create pride, for in a nation less sure than it was of its ability to compete freely in the modern world, the launching is a sign of a will to challenge the seas and the men of other lands who sail them.

A new ship is an awe-inspiring example of the technical skill of a nation, and as such, a sign to other nations that we are far from being ready to lower the U.S. flag on the trade routes of the world's oceans.

Clearly, in launching the *Alaskan Mail*, the American Mail Line is setting an example not only for other steamship companies, but for all those persons who believe that it is both good economics and good for international relations to increase rather than decrease our business dealings with foreign nations.

The American Mail Line is no inexperienced, new arrival in the shipping business. To the contrary, it can trace its origin to 1850, making it one of the oldest steamship lines in America. When such an experienced firm undertakes a vessel replacement program involving construction of five of the largest dry cargo liners in the world, including the *Alaskan Mail*, there is good reason to believe that if international trade is permitted to flourish we can and will have a modern merchant fleet, a fleet that will be able to carry American goods to foreign ports and foreign goods to American ports, ensuring that no foreign power will be able to interfere with our ability to trade.

Obviously, Worth B. Fowler, president of the American Mail Line, and the other officers of the company who decided to undertake a major building program at a time when an air of uncertainty hangs over the future of this country's merchant marine industry, believe that foreign trade will flourish in the years ahead.

I would like to be as confident as they must be, but there are disturbing signs that foreign trade will not grow as it should because inhibiting restraints may be applied.

You may recall that a few moments ago I spoke of pressures building to push us along dangerous paths, both at home and abroad. While this may not be the proper place to discuss the problems of our cities and Vietnam, I do think it is both proper and important to discuss briefly the growing pressure on Congress to enact various barriers to free trade, for many persons here have an important stake in foreign trade.

Already the Senate has approved restrictions on the importation of textile articles. Countless of other bills setting similar restrictions on a wide range of imports have been introduced in the Senate. If passage of the textile import bill has not already broken the log jam of such bills, the passage of one or two more will surely start a torrent of such bills, running from mink to zinc.

I do not mean to minimize the problems of industries facing competition from foreign imports. However, I do believe, and believe quite strongly, that the erection of trade barriers is not the way to alleviate these problems.

Let us take a brief look at what might happen if Congress did enact such legislation.

It is virtually certain that foreign governments would retaliate by erecting additional trade barriers of their own. If that were to happen, our balance-of-trade surplus would be greatly reduced if not eliminated entirely. And it is important to realize that the effects of cutbacks in trade would not be restricted to those industries which had received tariff protection. Rather, the effect would snowball across the entire foreign trade picture. As William M. Roth, U.S. special representative for trade negotiations, told a group of Detroit businessmen last fall.

"If the United States shuts out imports of European textiles, or glass, or steel, don't assume that it will be the American textile or glass or steel exporters who necessarily pay. It may be you—or one of your best customers."

The truth of that statement is indicated by the consideration the Common Market has given to curbing imports on such U.S. products as tobacco and feed grains, or by the threat that Japan will retaliate with massive new trade barriers if this country imposes textile quotas.

I have a special interest in trade with Japan. Because of its location, and because of its many natural resources, Alaska can supply many of the raw materials Japan needs to maintain its impressive industrial growth. In 1966, Alaska enjoyed a balance of foreign trade surplus of almost $60 million, a surplus important to the economy of the nation as well as the state.

I would think that the American Mail Line and other shipping firms operating to the Far East and the shipbuilding firms which construct the vessels for these lines share my interest in seeing that trade with Asia flourishes rather than diminishes.

Because of my interest in free trade, I have opposed travel as well as trade restrictions. An effort is being made to convince Japan, for example, to relax certain restrictions which hamper the ability of Americans to do business in Japan. It made no sense to me to seek such concessions from Japan while at the same time we attempt to discourage the travel of U.S. citizens in Japan, particularly in light of my belief that if we win these concessions, we will accomplish a lot more for our balance of trade problem than we could through travel restrictions.

But perhaps the most insidious aspect of trade barriers is the effect they would have even if other nations *did not* retaliate.

At this moment in history, we are the world's leading international merchant, a fact that keeps our balance of payments situation from getting completely out of hand. If we erect trade barriers, then nations which sell products here will have fewer American dollars to buy American exports. Therefore, our export market would suffer even without foreign retaliation in the form of trade barriers.

Then, of course, a cutback in certain foreign imports would mean the loss of jobs in this nation. In addition, such a cutback would no doubt result in an increase in the price of many items, thereby adding pressure to our economy's inflationary spiral. And finally, it could well relax the efforts of some firms to modernize their operation in order to compete with foreign imports. I happen to believe that this nation possesses the technical skill to find ways to compete with foreign firms, and inasmuch as trade barriers are nothing more than a form of subsidized protection for certain industries, I much prefer that we help such industries through subsidies for job-retraining, technical assistance and other similar programs.

The Wall Street Journal, on October 5, 1967, put the case against trade barriers most succinctly when it stated:

"Trade restrictions, in sum, provide benefits for U.S. firms in the domestic market, though these gains may be only temporary. On the other hand, import curbs endanger the nation's exports, impose penalties on consumers and tend to weaken the vigor of the country's economy. Looked at from all sides, the package hardly seems appealing."

My purpose in speaking on this subject on this occasion is more than to merely warn you of the growing support for protectionist legislation. Rather, my purpose is to enlist you, meaning the entire maritime industry, in the effort to head off such legislation.

As chairman of the Senate Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, I am well aware that the maritime industry divided can mount a most effective lobbying effort. I stand in awe of what you can do united.

It seems to me that the men who build the ships to sail the seas of the world, and the men who buy and operate those ships should be united in the effort to see that world trade continues to grow, for ships will be built only if there is commerce to be carried. Certainly the American Mail Line and the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Company will profit.

Problems we have, but problems we have always had, and problems have never deterred us from moving ahead.

This launching is an example of moving ahead in the face of problems. It is not secret that many persons believe our days are numbered as a great maritime nation, that we cannot cure the sickness that decays our merchant fleet, that we cannot compete with foreign maritime nations.

Well, to those who feel that way, I say come to the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company and see what we can build. Come to Newport News and inspect the *Alaskan Mail*, a modern ship built to compete in a modern world. Come to Newport News to see the launching of four more such liners, and then tell me we are through as a great maritime nation. We are not if we but have the will to rebuild our fleet and I salute Mr. Fowler and Donald A. Holden, president and chairman of the board of directors of the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company, and all who work with them, from highest to lowest, for showing the way.

Yes, problems we have, but problems we have always had. Let us attack the problems of today with the same confidence and ingenuity we attacked our problems of the past.

Let us not bow to pressures calling for short-lived solutions.

Let us band together to create pressures for meaningful and fair solutions to these problems.

Let the spirit stirred by this launching be translated into action.

Secretaries Week

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in what has become one of the most widely noted annual events, Secretaries Week is being observed for the 17th consecutive year from April 21 through 27, 1968, with Wednesday, April 24, highlighted as Secretaries Day. This event is sponsored by The National Secretaries Association, International, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce.

While NSA is first and foremost a professional association devoted to raising the performance standards of the secretarial profession, NSA members spent 103,996 volunteer-after-job hours on local community projects. This is equivalent to 2,599 40-hour weeks or 52 work years.

Beneficiaries of this volunteer secretarial work were, for the most part, health and medical, social welfare, and civic organizations. The two most frequently designated were hospitals, 14,788 hours, and Easter Seal Society, 8,773. Others most recurrently listed were: American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, American Red Cross, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, Community Chests and Councils of America, Girls' Clubs of America, March of Dimes, National Association for Mental Health, National Tuberculosis Association, Service to the Blind, YMCA, YWCA, and chambers of commerce.

This is a remarkable expression by skilled and conscientious secretaries of responsible citizenship at the grassroots level.

Gallup Poll: Nixon Leads

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit the leading article of the Pittsburgh Press for April 21, 1968, on the present ratings by the Gallup poll, of the leading candidates for President. Under this latest national poll Dick Nixon shows surprising strength and backing by the American people.

The article follows:

THE GALLUP POLL: NIXON LEADS THREE TOP DEMOCRATS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Richard Nixon leads each of the three top Democratic presidential hopefuls—Sen. Robert Kennedy, Vice President Hubert Humphrey and Sen. Eugene McCarthy—in nationwide "test elections" just completed.

Of the three Democrats, Sens. McCarthy and Kennedy make the best showing, falling just 3 percentage points behind Mr. Nixon.

Ex-Gov. George Wallace of Alabama, the candidate of the American Independent Party, runs behind the major-party candidates, winning the support of approximately one-tenth of the nation's votes.

Test Election Races

[In percent]

Nixon	41
McCarthy	38
Wallace	10
Undecided	11
Nixon	41
Kennedy	38
Wallace	10
Undecided	11
Nixon	43
Humphrey	34
Wallace	9
Undecided	14

Between April 6 and 11, a representative national sample of 1168 registered voters asked the following questions:

"Suppose the presidential election were being held today. If Richard Nixon were the Republican candidate, and Robert Kennedy (Hubert Humphrey/Eugene McCarthy) were the Democratic candidate and George Wallace of Alabama were the candidate of a third party, which one would you like to see win?"

In interpreting the results, it is important to keep in mind that the personal interviews for this survey were obtained at a point in time when a series of events had just occurred which had forceful impact: President Johnson's withdrawal from this year's presidential race, his announcement of a relaxation in the bombing of North Vietnam, the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and the beginning of the urban rioting which resulted.

Despite the fact that Sen. McCarthy runs as strong as Sen. Kennedy against Mr. Nixon, the Minnesota senator is the third choice of Democratic voters nationally to receive the party's nomination.

As reported earlier, among rank-and-file Democrats, nomination preferences are: Sen.

Kennedy, 35 per cent; Mr. Humphrey, 31 per cent; and, Sen. McCarthy, 23 per cent.

Sen. McCarthy's strength in test elections is due to his appeal to voters outside his own party. Among independents, for example, the McCarthy-Nixon race is extremely close. Mr. Nixon, however, overpowers both Sen. Kennedy and Mr. Humphrey in this important voting group.

The results of the three test election races by party affiliation follows:

NIXON—McCARTHY—WALLACE

[In percent]

	Republican	Democrat	Independent
Nixon	80	18	38
McCarthy	11	56	36
Wallace	2	12	15
Undecided	7	14	11

NIXON—KENNEDY—WALLACE

Nixon	78	16	43
Kennedy	12	61	30
Wallace	3	11	16
Undecided	7	12	11

NIXON—HUMPHREY—WALLACE

Nixon	85	15	44
Humphrey	6	59	25
Wallace	2	9	16
Undecided	7	17	15

Speak to Ho, Mr. Kosygin

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include an editorial from the Florida Times-Union of April 19, 1968, relating to the present dilemma in our peace negotiations with the North Vietnamese. I think this very fine editorial points to the fallacy of the North Vietnamese argument in which they have refused all of the sites offered by the United States for negotiations. I offer it for the benefit of my colleagues:

SPEAK TO HO, MR. KOSYGIN

Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin was talking to the wrong country when he urged the United States to stop the bombing of North Vietnam and to "start negotiations immediately" for peace.

Kosygin's admonition was another of the artful Communist declarations which contain insinuations and word plays that always manage to place the Reds in a good light and their foes in the dark.

It is not the United States which is refusing to meet on neutral ground to negotiate openly for peace. It is North Vietnam. The North Vietnamese have turned down every U.S. recommendation because they want to "save face."

Likewise it must be noted that the North Vietnamese have not agreed to talk "peace." Only President Johnson, speaking as the leader of the United States, has offered to negotiate for "peace" in Vietnam. The regime of Ho Chi Minh seeks only negotiations to end the bombing of North Vietnam.

Obviously, the North Vietnamese government would like to stop the bombing because of the strain the attacks are placing on its efforts to keep Red units in the south fully manned and supplied. The growing failure of the Red supply effort is being understood now in many areas and can help explain the devastating defeat of the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese during the Tet offensive and the siege of Khe Sanh.

Red artillery and rocket attacks in the south have decreased in ferocity during recent months. The shelling at Khe Sanh diminished daily in what could be said was a ratio to the aerial bombardment being sustained by the Reds. Red manpower in the area also was seriously reduced.

If Premier Kosygin wants the peace talks to get under way, he had better talk like a Dutch uncle to the North Vietnamese. He has a right to do so, as his country is spending an estimated $18 billion a year in the fight.

Kosygin should tell the North Vietnamese to quit trying to accomplish at the negotiating table what they cannot accomplish in the battle area, namely to halt air attacks that are interdicting their supply routes and playing havoc with their ground forces.

As long as the Reds believe they can bring about a total and unconditional cessation of the bombing thus leaving their supply lines free to beef up Communist forces in South Vietnam, they will not willingly go to the bargaining table to talk about true peace in Southeast Asia.

Of Racial Strife

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Robert Wilson, of Carmichael, Calif., several months ago, wrote a poem about Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which was to be one of a book of poems he is authoring.

With the untimely death of Dr. King, he has submitted the poem to me with the following message:

I ask nothing from it but that it may in some small measure help bring reason and understanding to this country.

I am today sharing his poem with my colleagues:

OF RACIAL STRIFE

(By Robert Wilson)

In the heat of my life I have prayed. I have prayed to the Lord for him to intercede. I have said unto him:

"Impede, Dear Lord, the hands of time
'Til in some future land I climb
Where pigment is but fashion's face
And man for love has vanquished race.
What now for me but suffer more
And bear the cross my father bore?"

For I have understood my historic circumstance and I have asked my God to conceive:

"Conceive, Dear God, my shallow sea,
A race without its history.
No ancient gods nor timeless men
To give the child who bears my skin.
Just slavery and social caste,
The institutions from my past."

I have had a prayer and I have had a dream. I have dreamed of a simple justice for I have had a thought:

"A thought, Dear Lord, a just embrace
To press man's soul into his face
And let him see of inner man
Until he wills to understand
That thought alone is fashioned free,
The inner of society."

But, alas, my brethren, I have known my only alternative, and your only alternative, our only course and the only course for all of mankind:

"Alas, Dear God, the why of life—
To dignify of racial strife.
A mission clear to teach mankind
That tyranny inverts the mind
And breeds the guilt which seals its fate
To suffer death in seas of hate."

Dissent, 1968 Style

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Solicitor General of the United States and former dean of the Harvard Law School, Erwin N. Griswold spoke for many of us in the Congress and in the Nation when he delivered his thought-provoking address, "Dissent, 1968 Style" at the Tulane University School of Law on April 16, 1968.

Dean Griswold's thesis was that a citizen has a moral right to engage in civil disobedience only after the most objective and searching inquiry into his own motives to make certain that the goals he seeks cannot be achieved by addressing his cause to the law or the national conscience. Further, he states that those who engage in civil disobedience must be prepared to pay the consequences. While admitting that circumstances may morally justify such a course of action, Dean Griswold rejects the contention that anyone promoting any cause has a legal justification for civil disobedience. He recognizes that many marches and demonstrations—which are intended to be peaceful in fact become violent civil disorders and sometimes even riots.

I call your attention especially to several excerpts from the address which certainly reflect my own personal viewpoint:

Our society has become increasingly tolerant of the mischievous attempts to excuse deliberate violations of the law committed in furtherance of what the actor personally regards as a lofty cause.

. . . I suggest that (the) intellectual and practical consequences of indiscriminate civil disobedience is the 'Legitimation of violence' of which we have seen too much of in America.

A climate that tends towards the approval and encouragement of violence as a form of protest has been created by white terrorism directed against nonviolent protest, including instances of murder of some civil rights workers, by the open defiance of law and federal authority by state and local officials resisting desegregation, and by protest groups engaging in civil disobedience who turn their backs on non-violence, go beyond 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.

Our law and custom have long been clear that the right to differ with society and to reject its code of behavior has limits, and the First Amendment will not do service to sanction every sort of activity that is sought to be justified as an expression of nonconformity.

Today much protest seems reflexive rather than cerebral, motivated more by the desire to reject established positions and policies than by deliberate preference for some alternative. Perhaps I am not perceptive enough to discern the latent wisdom and goals of the movements that seek the elevation of dirty

words on campus, or that exalt the virtues of "flower power", or that conduct a "strip in" in a public park. The message, if there is one, escapes me.

I doubt that personal ridicule or broad gauge contumely has ever produced light rather than heat.

The fact that one is a dissenter with a right to express his opposition entitles him to no special license . . . no roving commission to ignore the rules and underlying assumption of society.

The mere fact that a person wishes to make a public point does not sanction any method he chooses to use to make it . . . Such an argument has as its major unarticulated premise the assumption that people who want to propagandize protests or views have a constitutional right to do so whenever and however and wherever they please. That notion the (Supreme) Court vigorously and forthrightly rejected.

The text of Dean Griswold's statement follows:

DISSENT, 1968 STYLE

(The George Abel Dreyfous Lecture on Civil Liberties, given at the Tulane University School of Law, New Orleans, La., on Tuesday, April 16, 1968, Central Standard Time by Erwin N. Griswold, Solicitor General of the United States.)

"Preserving civil peace is the first responsibility of government." [1]

*"Unfortunately, since the populace has been sluggish and complacent, occasional violence seems to be advantageous to wake people up * * *."* [2]

When I first accepted the invitation to deliver this year's Dreyfous Lecture, it was my intention to discuss, in a rather abstract way, some of the changes that have taken place in the modes of dissent over the years. The sad events of the past ten days, however, have led me to revise my emphasis somewhat. Rather than recite the changes of the past, I wish to speak to you tonight about some fundamental postulates of our democratic society, principles which I believe must be kept in vivid focus and which must be meaningfully communicated to the community as a whole if true freedom—not frenetic license—is to endure.

Let me begin by confessing that I am aware that between the polar extremes which I shall discuss there are confusing overlays of principle and policy and there will remain very substantial areas where the conscientious judgment of the informed individual is the only operative standard. But for the individual to make a rational choice, he must be aware of the values and consequences at stake when he forms his conscience and determines to follow it, and it is in the hope that it will encourage reflective appreciation of what is truly involved in "civil disobedience"—which has become the most pervasive contemporary aspect of civil liberties—that I submit these remarks for your attention.

I

Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz touched on the core of the problem in his address last month before a conference organized by the American Assembly and the American Bar Association when he suggested that in recent years there has been a material change in the public attitude toward law. He observed that law is now too often viewed "not as the living model for a free society, but rather as a mode of callous repression, or—no less disturbingly—as a collection of precatory suggestions which can be flouted or ignored." [3]

The focus of these remarks, just as with the Ambassador's observation, is not professional crime engaged in by those who are indifferent to legal obstacles to their own enrichment. What is of more concern is that our society has become increasingly tolerant of the mischievous attempts to excuse deliberate violations of the law committed in furtherance of what the actor personally regards as a lofty cause. I shall advert later on to justifiable examples of civil disobedience, but what I suggest is that intellectual and practical consequence of indiscriminate civil disobedience is the "Legitimation of violence" of which we have seen too much in America. I borrow this phrase from the recent Presidential Riot Commission, which listed this sorry fact of American society as one of the basic causes of riots. The Commission's conclusion, under this heading is as follows: [4]

"A climate that tends toward the approval and encouragement of violence as a form of protest has been created by white terrorism directed against nonviolent protest, including instances of abuse and even murder of some civil rights workers in the South, 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 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. This condition has been reenforced by a general erosion of respect for authority in American society and the reduced effectiveness of social standards and community restraints on violence and crime."

The ink is not yet dry on the latest confirmation of this conclusion. The almost inevitable retaliation that the Commission spoke of was not long in coming, and over a hundred cities have been wracked by the manifestation of grim, mindless destruction. To argue that massive retaliation against society at large is both unjustifiable and self-defeating [5]—while unquestionably correct—misses the point that our national temperament has become too much acclimated to violence as a method of social protest.

Perhaps you may interject that no one who champions the right of protest in general, or the privilege of civil disobedience in particular, would seek to justify either political assassinations or riots. Of course I would not dispute this caveat, but the troubling circumstances I have sketched have both a logical and a practical relevance to issues of protest and dissent. They are logically related to our focus because they represent the ultimate mode of dissent—rejection not merely of the position of the majority but of the very foundation of civilized society itself: Civil Order. They have a practical impact on our topic too, for these extreme acts I have adverted to are in a sense the product of the same undiscriminating and uncritical attitude toward individual choice about the binding nature of law that underlies less dramatic but similarly irresponsible forms of protest.

II

We Americans have always taken a considerable measure of pride in our personal independence and right to nonconformity. But in my view, effective self-government is nevertheless the greatest achievement of mankind. I trust that most Americans share the conclusion that Government is not merely inevitable but highly desirable. And from this axiom, certain corollaries flow.

The first of these is, I think that civil disobedience differs quite radically in important respects from ordinary modes of protest and dissent. The crucial attribute of civil disobedience is that it is expressed through deliberate violation of the law.[6] Read in the context of its origin, the First Amendment not only creates a right to dissent but in a very real sense encourages the exercise of this prerogative. That is why we are concerned about "chilling" First Amendment freedoms. But our law and custom have long been clear that the right to differ with society and to reject its code of behavior has limits, and the First Amendment will not do service to sanction every sort of activity that is sought to be justified as an expression of non-conformity.

Second, equally important and sometimes profoundly troubling, our political tradition has long recognized that a man's abiding duty to his conscience transcends his obligation to the State. Chief Justice Hughes once put it this way: [7]

"Much has been said of the paramount duty to the State, a duty to be recognized, it is urged, even though it conflicts with convictions of duty to God. Undoubtedly that duty to the State exists within the domain of power, for government may enforce obedience to laws regardless of scruples. When one's belief collides with the power of the State, the latter is Supreme within its sphere and submission or punishment follows. But, in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the State has always been maintained."

Third, in a democracy such as ours, each individual shares both a political and a moral duty "actively to participate—to some degree, at least—in the processes of government and law-making." I am quoting the words of my friend, Professor J. N. D. Anderson of the University of London.[8] He continues: "In a democracy, indeed, every citizen bears a measure of personal responsibility for misgovernment, bad laws, or wrong policies, unless he has played his full part in trying to get a better government into power, better laws on the statute book, and better policies adopted."

As my *fourth* corollary, and here perhaps I will meet with slightly less universal agreement, I suggest that what we have been classically concerned about protecting is the dissemination of ideas—protecting the individual's access to the intellectual marketplace where he may offer his conception of the ills and remedies for social or political problems. Thus, historically, our motivation and our objective have been the attempt to encourage the search for truth or wisdom, or both. To quote Chief Justice Hughes again.[9]

"The maintenance of the opportunity for free political discussion to the end that government may be responsive to the will of the people and that changes may be obtained by lawful means, an opportunity essential to the security of the Republic, is a fundamental principle of our constitutional system."

Given these principles, which I regard as not merely orthodox but sound, let me turn to the forms of dissent and protest which are currently the vogue so that we may proceed to consider some of the problems of dissent and in particular of civil disobedience.

III

Toward the end of the last century, Justice Holmes observed that on the basis of his experience, "Behind every scheme to make the

---

[1] Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders 171 (March 1, 1968).

[2] Goodman, "The Resisters Support U.S. Traditions and Interests," in *On Civil Disobedience, 1967,* N.Y. Times Magazine, November 26, 1967, p. 124.

[3] "Some Reflections on the Challenges to Lawyers and the Law," March 16, 1968.

[4] *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* 92 (March 1, 1968).

[5] *E.g.,* Leibman, *Civil Disobedience: A Threat to Our Law Society,* 51 A B.A.J. 645, 646 (1965).

[6] One of the more thoughful analysis of this topic is that given by Dean Francis Allen in *Civil Disobedience and the Legal Order,* 36 U. Cin. L. Rev. 1, 175 (1967)

[7] *United States* v. *Macintosh,* 283 U.S. 605, 633 (Hughes, C. J., and Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone, JJ., dissenting).

[8] Anderson, *Into the World—the Need and Limits of Christian Involvement* 41 (London 1968).

[9] *Stromberg* v. *California,* 283 U.S. 359, 369.

world over, lies the question, What kind of world do you want?" [10] It may well have been true in those times that dissent and protest and agitation—for women's suffrage, or prohibition, or socialism, or anarchism, or whatever—had a more or less conscious and systematic design for the objective which was sought to be achieved. But today, much protest seems reflexive rather than cerebral, motivated more by the desire to reject established positions and policies than by deliberate preference for some alternatives. Perhaps I am not perceptive enough to discern the latent wisdom and goals of movements that seek the elevation of dirty words on campus, or that exalt the virtues of "flower power", or that conduct a "strip in" in a public park. The message, if there is one, escapes me.

We have in this country, of course, recognized that the display of symbols as an expression of some dissenting position is entitled to constitutional protection. That was settled as long ago at least as the "red flag" case.[11] But all this presupposes that there is some intelligible and definable nexus between the form of the protest and what is being protested. Thus, when a prominent New York couple several years ago decided to express their indignation at increased municipal taxes by stringing clotheslines draped with rags and tattered uniforms in their front yard, the state courts found this "bizarre" manner of symbolic dissent unprotected, with Judge Stanley Fuld writing that it was clear that the "value of their 'protest' lay not in its message but in its offensiveness." [12] And the Supreme Court summarily ruled that their claims of "free speech" were in the circumstances clearly frivolous.

I have similar difficulty with other popular forms of modern "dissent". Have we reached the point in this country where anything is contributed to our shared desire for progress and achievement by "writing dirty words on a fence about the President of the country? Or calling members of his Administration names?" [13] No less prominent a spokesman for dissent than Bayard Rustin has expressed his "puzzlement" at the tactics employed by some young people in proclaiming their disenchantment with present conditions. He remarks rather pointedly that he is "concerned about their believing that you can educate people on the basis of simplistic slogans . . . rather than on the basis of a concrete program of concrete recommendations." [14] While satire and sharp rapier-thrusts have long been among the accepted, and effective, modes of social and political criticism, I doubt that personal ridicule or broad-gauge contumely has ever produced light rather than heat, or constructively contributed to the resolution of major questions.

I do not question the constitutional right to be irrelevant or intemperate or even unfair. Our jurisprudence has made it clear that it is a prerogative of American citizenship "to criticize public men and measures—and that means not only informed and responsible criticism but the freedom to speak foolishly and without moderation." [15] In part this is the consequence of the assumption of our democratic system that the people can be trusted to test competing ideas and proposals, after free discussion, and "to withstand ideas that are wrong." [16] And in part it reflects our policy that even damaging and false assertions, and those unrelated to alternative programs, must be suffered lest the submission of important and constructive suggestions be deterred.[17]

IV

There is a contemporary aspect of the problem to which, I think, too little attention has been given.

When our basic notions of freedom of speech, and of the right to dissent, were developed—largely in the eighteenth century—communication was very different from what it is now. There were fewer people—only three million in the United States. Most of them were close to the soil, and many were not unduly literate. The market place for political ideas was more limited than it is now.

Perhaps of even greater importance, though, was the fact that the speed of communication of ideas was very slow. Freedom of speech and press meant freedom for Thomas Paine to publish "Common Sense," or for John Adams to write an article for a newspaper and for the newspaper to publish it. When these and other things were printed, they were read in the privacy of the home, with few other persons around. Ideas had an opportunity to percolate, to be examined and considered, and to be refined and reformed in the thoughts of the people.

Of course, there was speech making, too. But one person's voice could reach perhaps a thousand people, perhaps somewhat more under very special circumstances. The speech, could, of course, be printed, but it would be the next day before it was read in the same community, and days or weeks before it was read elsewhere. Almost always, there was time for thoughtful consideration. Moreover, the volume of material which was communicated, in print or by speech, was very limited. There was adequate opportunity for thoughtful people to comprehend, to absorb, and digest. In the modern world, though, this has been changed completely. The change has been developing over the years, with the telegraph and telephone, and the speed of transportation. With the coming of the radio, it was possible for President Roosevelt to address fifty or one hundred million people at once, with an impact that had never been known before.

In recent years, the facilities of communication have continued to develop until our situation is utterly different from what it was even a generation ago. In older days, a person who had an idea to express—whether of dissent, or otherwise, had some difficulty in bringing this about. To publish it in a book or pamphlet might be beyond his means. There were few newspapers, and these did not have much space. Unless the idea was extremely good, or well expressed, it was not likely that a newspaper could be found to publish it.

Today, however, the news media are avid for news. Television stations are putting out news through all the hours of the day, and they are always seeking something new or different, something that will attract viewers to their station. Almost anyone who wants to do something bizarre on a public street can find his way on television, and be seen by millions or tens of millions of people all over the country, and, indeed, through much of the world.

Because the newspapers are in competition with the television stations, they have to present the same news. Thus, there has been an enormous increase in the opportunity to express dissent, and, perhaps even more important, an even greater increase in the immediacy of dissent and the impact which it can make. There may be real room to question whether we have psychologically caught up with the developments in communications' speed and distribution, whether we are capable of absorbing and evaluating all of the materials which are now communicated daily to hundreds of millions of people.

I do not mean to suggest that the communications agencies have acted irresponsibly. They, too, have had to learn their power while the public was beginning to become aware of it. There are clear signs that television and newspapers are aware of their responsibilities in these areas, and are accepting them. There is a hard line for them to follow. For they must serve the ideals of a free press. Yet, all of the problems are enormously magnified, and the essential nature of responsibility in the exercise of a free press stands out more clearly as the magnification increases. The power of communication, through press, radio and television, has become an awesome power. Its use is essential to the preservation of a free society. Only time will tell, I suppose, whether our system can adequately adjust itself to the impact of modern communications methods. I am only trying to point out here the importance of the exercise of responsibility in the expression of dissent in the modern world.

V

We must draw two fundamental distinctions when we speak of dissent; the first involves primarily legal and moral variables and divides permissible from unpermissible dissent; the second presupposes that the dissent is tolerable but involves the social and political considerations of whether, or when or how the protest *should* be made. The latter is not a question of right, but of judgment and morals, even of taste, and a proper sense of restraint and responsibility, qualities which are or should be inherent in the very concept of civil liberties.

We must begin any analysis of these questions with the undoubted fact that we live in a society, an imperfect and struggling one no doubt, but one where Government and order are not only a necessity but are the preference of an overwhelming majority of the citizenry. The rules that society has developed to organize and order itself are found in a body of law which has not been imposed from outside, but has been slowly built up from experience expressed through the consent of the governed, and now pervades all aspects of human activity. Inevitably there are occasions when individuals or groups will chafe under a particular legal bond, or will bridle in opposition to a particular governmental policy, and the question presents itself, what can be done?

Vocal objection, of course—even slanderous or inane—is permissible. But the fact that one is a dissenter with a right to express his opposition entitles him to no special license. Thus, in expressing views that are themselves wholly immune to official strictures he gains no roving commission to ignore the rules and underlying assumption of society that relate in a neutral way to activity rather than to the maintenance or expression of ideas. Thus, I submit that one cannot rightly engage in conduct which is otherwise unlawful merely because he intends that either that conduct or the idea he wishes to express in the course of the conduct is intended to manifest his dissent from some governmental policy. I cannot distinguish in principle the legal quality of the determination to halt a troop train to protest the Vietnam war or to block workmen from entering a segregated job site to protest employment discrimination, from the determination to fire shots into a civil rights leader's home to protest integration. The right to disagree—and to manifest disagreement—which the constitution allows to the individuals in those situations—does not authorize them to carry on their campaign of education and persuasion at the expense of someone else's liberty, or in violation of some laws whose independent validity is unquestionable.

---

[10] *The Occasional Speeches of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes* 75 (Howe ed. 1962).

[11] *Stromberg* v. *California*, 283 U.S. 359. Compare *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624.

[12] *People* v. *Stover*, 12 N.Y. 2d 462, 470, 240 N.Y.S. 2d 734, 191 N.E. 2d 272 (1963), appeal dismissed, 375 U.S. 42.

[13] Farrell, "Today's Disobedience Is Uncivil," in *On Civil Disobedience, 1967*, N.Y. Times Magazine, November 26, 1967, p. 29.

[14] Rustin, in *Civil Disobedience* 10 (Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions 1966).

[15] *Baumgartner* v. *United States*, 322 U.S. 665, 673–674. See also *Bridges* v. *California*, 314 U.S. 252.

[16] *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 146 (Black, J. dissenting).

[17] See generally *New York Times Co.* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254.

This distinction runs deep in our history, but has too frequently been ignored in this decade. But the line is a clear one, and we should reestablish it in the thinking and understanding of our people. While I share Professor Harry Kalven's assessment that the "generosity and empathy with which [public streets and parks] are made available [as a "public forum"] is an index of freedom,[18] I regard as unassailable the limitation that the *mere fact that a person wishes to make a public point does not sanction any method he chooses to use to make it.* Yet there seems to be currently a considerable tendency to ignore if not to reject this limitation. Certainly many of the modern forms of dissent, including those I have just mentioned, proceed on the basis of the contrary proposition. Only last Term the Supreme Court was asked to sustain the right of demonstrators active in a cause that most of us here and the Court itself no doubt regarded as laudable, to lodge their demand for an end to segregation on the grounds of a city jail where, it seemed, biased treatment was being accorded prisoners. The argument was made that a demonstration at that site was "particularly appropriate", irrespective of the consequences. Speaking for the Court, Justice Black rejected this rationale, explaining that[19] "Such an argument has as its major unarticulated premise the assumption that people who want to propagandize protests or views have a constitutional right to do so whenever and however and wherever they please."

That notion the Court expressly *"vigorously and forthrightly rejected."*

Another form of protest that can never, in my view, be excused or tolerated, is that which assumes the posture of a violent and forcible assault on public order, whatever the motivation. The interests at stake in such a situation must transcend the validity of the particular cause and the permissibility of adhering to it. Violent opposition to law—any law—or forcible disregard of another's freedom to disagree falls beyond the pale of leigtimate dissent or even of civil disobedience, properly understood; it is nothing short of rebellion.

The utter indefensibility of violent opposition to law is that it proceeds on the foolhardy and immoral principle that might makes right. Centuries ago Rousseau rejected this approach as a viable political alternative:[20]

"For, if force creates right, the effect changes with the cause: every force that is greater than the first succeeds to its right. As soon as it is possible to disobey with impunity, disobedience is legitimate; and, the strongest being always in the right, the only thing that matters is to act so as to become the strongest. But what kind of right is that which perishes when force fails?"

To permit factions the resort to force when they feel—however correctly—that a particular law or policy is wrong would be to renounce our own experience and that of the Founders. In support of this view, I offer two sentences written by Jusice Frankfurter: "Law alone saves a society from being rent by internecine strife or ruled by mere brute power however disguised."[21] And, "Violent resistance to law cannot be made a legal reason for its suspension without loosening the fabric of our society."[22]

What is at stake is not mere order but also the lessons of history. True freedom and substantial justice come not from violent altercations or incendiary dissent. "No mob has ever protected any liberty, even its own."[23] While the First Amendment embodies a distrust of the collective conscience of the majority in areas of fundamental liberty, it no more intended to leave the limits of freedom to the judgment of coercive dissenters. "Civil government cannot let any group ride rough-shod over others simply because their 'consciences' tell them to do so."[24]

VI

These reflections have dealt with the question when law and government may tolerate dissent, or dissent manifested in certain ways, and I have suggested that it is illicit to violate otherwise valid laws either as a symbol of protest or in the course of protest, and secondly that I regard it as indefensible to attempt to promote a viewpoint either by flagrant violence or by organized coercion. Now I will turn finally to the second distinction to which I referred earlier in this lecture. That is, assuming a legal or moral right to protest, what considerations of prudence and responsibility should infuse the determination to exercise these rights.

First, you will note that I imply that a line may be drawn between legal and moral rights to dissent. I am not now referring to what I accept as the genuine possibility that one may exercise his constitutional right to dissent in a way that, because of recklessness or unfairness, makes his conduct ethically improper. I mention this distinction, however, because I believe awareness and evaluation of it should always be taken into account in considering an exercise of the right to dissent. But for the present, I mean to concentrate on the converse of this distinction, that there may be a moral right to dissent without a corresponding legal privilege to do so. It is in this context that "civil disobedience" must be viewed.

Earlier, I observed that our system contemplates that there may be a moral right to "civil disobedience" (properly understood) that exists notwithstanding a "legal" duty to obey. I also referred to the source of this moral right: the ultimate sanctity of a man's own conscience, as the intellectual and volitional composite that governs his conception of his relation to Eternal Truth. I wish now to emphasize the considerations which, in my view, condition the existence and exercise of this moral right, because I believe the current rhetoric—which sometimes seems to consecrate "civil disobedience" as the noblest response in the pantheon of virtues—has obscured the nature and consequence of this activity. To define my term—I mean by "civil disobedience" the deliberate violation of a rule ordained by constituted government because of a conscientious conviction that the law is so unjust that it cannot morally be observed by the individual.

The most important point to be stressed is that this decision is one that should be made only after the most painful and introspective reflection, and only when the firm conclusion is reached that obedience offends the most fundamental personal values. It is self-evident that routine or random noncompliance with the law for transient or superficial reasons would negate the first principles of civilized behavior. Unless society can safely assume that *almost* without exception individuals will accept the will of the majority even when to do so is grudging and distasteful, the foundation of secure liberty will rather rapidly erode. John Locke, who in his profound *Letter Concerning Toleration* analyzed and defended the right of obedience to conscience over civil law in case of severe conflict, thereafter cautioned in his essay *Concerning Civil Government*:[25]

"May [the sovereign] be resisted, as often as any one shall find himself aggrieved, and but imagine he has not right done him? This will unhinge and overturn all polities, and instead of government and order, leave nothing but anarchy and confusion."

Last year, in delivering this Lecture, Arthur Goodhart observed, "Thus, it has been correctly said that obedience to the law is a major part of patriotism."[26] He meant this not as a castigation of dissent or as an outburst of flag-waving chauvinism, but rather as a formulation of a central political truth: That if human society is to enjoy freedom, it cannot tolerate license. Henry David Thoreau is generally regarded as the most notable American exponent of civil disobedience, and all of us share admiration for his determination. But we must not ignore the vital aspect of Thoreau's nonconformity—his passionate attempt to dissociate himself from society. He was, as Harry Kalven has put it, "a man who does not see himself as belonging very intensely to the community in which he was raised,"[27] and who sought constantly but futilely to reject the society to which he had not voluntarily adhered.

Thoreau's poignant attitude was charming enough in mid-nineteenth century America. But it was, essentially, an effort to withdraw from the realities of life and it was, I suggest, myopic even then, for it was painfully inconsistent with the fact that man is a part of society by nature, by geography, and by citizenship. Unlike a member of a purely artificial group, like a bar association or country club, a citizen cannot resign from the "social compact" because he protests policies of the regime. Now in the last third of the Twentieth Century, we must be even more cognizant that there is nothing noble or salutary about foredoomed attempts to abdicate membership in society. Complex problems demand rational attention that can come only from personal focus on solutions and never from stubbornly turning one's back on harsh and unpleasant realities.

This is precisely what non-conformity as a way of life is. It is the essential irrationality of the "hippie movement"—a mass endeavor to drop out of life. It is a protest of sorts, of course, but one that can bear no fruit, because it takes issue with what is not only inevitable, but more importantly, indispensible—social regulation of individual behavior.

Stretched to its logical extreme, this also is civil disobedience, and for this reason I urge that before any man embarks upon a unilateral nullification of any law he must appreciate that his judgment has not merely a personal significance but also portends grave consequences for his fellows.

In determining whether and when to exercise the moral right to disobey the dictates of the law, it must also be recognized that society not only does not but cannot recognize this determination as entitled to legal privilege. It is part of the Gandhian tradition of civil disobedience that the sincerity of the individual's conscience presupposes that the law will punish this assertion of personal principle. In the very formation of our country, in the Federalist Papers, Hamilton explained the reason why government cannot compromise its authority by offering a dispensation for individual conscience:[28]

"Government implies the power of making laws. It is essential to the idea of a law, that it be attended with a sanction; or, in other words, a penalty or punishment for disobedience. If there be no penalty annexed to disobedience, the resolutions or commands which pretend to be laws will, in fact, amount to nothing more than advice or recommendation."

---

[18] Kalven, *The Concept of the Public Forum: Cox* v. *Louisiana*, 1965 Supreme Court Review 12.

[19] *Adderly* v. *Florida*, 385 U.S. 39, 47–48.

[20] *The Social Contract*, Bk. I, Ch. 3.

[21] *United States* v. *United Mine Workers*, 330 U.S. 258, 308.

[22] *Cooper* v. *Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 22.

[23] *Terminiello* v. *Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1, 32 (Jackson, J., dissenting).

[24] *Douglas* v. *City of Jeanette*, 319 U.S. 157, 179 (opinion of Jackson, J.).

[25] Ch. XVIII, para. 203.

[26] *Recognition of the Binding Nature of Law*, 41 Tul. L. Rev. 769, 773 (1967).

[27] "On Thoreau" in *Civil Disobedience*, 25, 28 (Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions 1966).

[28] *The Federalist, Number 15.*

Thus, it is of the essence of law that it is equally applied to all, that it binds all alike, irrespective of personal motive. For this reason, one who contemplates civil disobedience out of moral conviction should not be surprised and must not be bitter if a criminal conviction ensues. And he must accept the fact that organized society cannot endure on any other basis. His hope is that he may aid in getting the law changed. But if he does not succeed in that, he cannot complain if the law is applied to him.

VII

Though I speak with seriousness about civil disobedience, I hope that my remarks are not misunderstood. I endeavored to make it plain in my opening analysis that a proper recognition of the rights of conscience is one of the basic assumptions of our society. The problem, of course, is to determine what is "proper." Like all questions worth discussing, it is inevitably one of degree.

In considering this question, it is well to examine not only *whether* civil disobedience is appropriate in a particular situation, but also *how* it is to be carried out. We have a vivid illustration of this in the experience of this generation. We are all aware of the fact that for many long years the legal structure was often used to perpetuate deprivations which were at odds with the most basic constitutional and moral values. During this time, conditions of political, social, and economic inequality made ineffective meaningful attempts to change these regulations and policies by petition within the customary channels of reform. In this situation, the only realistic recourse was deliberate refusal to abide by the restrictions any longer. Lunch-counter sit-ins and freedom rides are among the most dramatic examples of the techniques that were used to expose the injustices that were perpetrated under the banner of law. In many of these cases, these actions were not, indeed, illegal, since the restrictive laws were plainly invalid if one had the time, energy, and money to take them up to higher courts. In other cases, though, the line was not clear, and sometimes the actions taken were undoubtedly illegal. We cannot fail to recognize the fact that it was these tactics which succeeded in putting the basic issues squarely before the courts and the public. And it was in this way that the law was clarified in the courts and that legislative changes were brought about.

There are great lessons to be learned from this experience. Perhaps the greatest of these is that what mattered was not merely the moral fervor of the demonstrators, or the justice of their cause, but also the way in which they conducted themselves. They and their leaders were aware of the moral dimensions of their cause, and they knew that this required an equal adherence to morality in the means by which they sought to vindicate their cause. Because of this, rigid adherence to the philosophy of non-violence was sought and widely achieved. In retrospect, I am sure that our Nation will point with pride not only to the courage of those who risked punishment in order to challenge injustice, but also to the morality of their actions in scrupulously avoiding violence, even in reaction to the force which was exerted on them. The affirmation of the close relation between morality and non-violence will be one of the many monuments of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As this experience shows, the ultimate legal success as well as the intrinsic moral quality of civil disobedience turns on the restraint with which it is exercised. This is an extremely hard line to draw, but it is one which must be earnestly sought out. Unfortunately, some of those who claim this mantle today do not appreciate the moral quality of thought and action which made their predecessors worthy to wear it.

Of course, it has not been my intention to disparage the objectives of any individual or group, or to discourage the honest and forthright and candid prophylaxis and therapy that are the legacy of reflective and constructive criticism. My only concern has been that some contemporary forms and philosophies of protest may in fact unwittingly retard the improvements in society which we all seek. I hope the ideas I have sought to present here may contribute to the thoughtful consideration of critical issues with which we must all deal in the creative evolution of our cherished land.

Constitutional Americanism

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as colleagues representing districts of small communities and rural areas know well, there are few better examples of meeting a community need by voluntary community action than the volunteer fire companies of our Nation.

There is hard work to be found in these organizations, but there is time for humor, too, and for forthright discussion of public questions in which the visitor, if he is a willing listener, can receive a cross section of opinion on how things are going, or how they should go, in the United States.

I had opportunity, recently, to attend the annual banquet of the Flint Hill, Va., Volunteer Fire Department, where the principal speaker was James J. "Jack" Crawford, who is editor and general manager of the Northern Virginia Daily, published in my home community of Strasburg, Va.

Because I found it an interesting and hopeful statement of the enduring quality of "Constitutional Americanism," I take the liberty of commending it to the House at this time:

CONSTITUTIONAL AMERICANISM

In view of the turmoil which has beset our land these past few weeks, it may be difficult to remember that we have a Constitution.

But, we have!

And, at the outset, let me say it is comforting to know that after the emotionalism which rules today's events subsides, we will, you may be sure, return to the basis of our constitutional heritage.

Let's examine the record of history and see how our Constitution has weathered many storms, and, at the same time, grown apace.

In the relatively short life of our American Republic there have been many restless times.

In 1776 through 1783, when our forefathers brought forth this nation out of revolution and, down through the nearly 200 years which have followed—through the vicissitudes of maturing—disagreements, sometimes violent disagreements, have been a part of our national life and growth.

We have seen eras of quiet progress and we have seen periods of violent change. Each of the periods has affected the Constitution in its own way.

Our own War Between the States was four years of bloody conflict that was a most severe testing of a nation of free men.

Then, there was World War I, which witnessed the emergence of the United States as a world power with which to reckon.

And, World War II which confirmed the place of the United States as the world's most powerful nation and with it imposed upon our nation a whole new set of values and responsibilities.

Then came the Korean War, euphemistically referred to as a police action, and of course, today, Vietnam. However one may wish to categorize Korea and Vietnam—the United States is and was involved in these two conflicts because of this country's responsibilities as a world power.

Then there has been a procession of conflicts not on the battlefield.

For instance, the peacetime birth and expansion of the American labor movement, starting at the close of the War Between the States and continuing for approximately 40 years, is an example of another kind of violent upheaval in this nation's growth.

In this struggle, men who had nothing to fight with but the desire for a better life struggled upward toward the goal.

There was violence in these early struggles of labor to organize for representation. This was a revolution of sorts.

The push westward at the close of the war, and the pioneer settlement of the vast reaches of territory west of the Mississippi, against great odds, is another example of America maturing. And, indeed, this, too, was often a violent and painful process.

Through good times and bad, peaceful and tremulous, our nation has gone through the process of growing up and measuring up.

And we learned in our early school days that through it all, our nation, the government, the courts and the people have leaned upon the most unique instrument of government ever devised, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as the rugged foundation of democracy upon which to build permanently.

And so it is—though the Constitution has been subjected to generations of judicial probing, and the attacks of varied political philosophies, it has withstood. For, through times of devisiveness, it is not the Constitution itself which is wanting. It stands despite the diverse views that assail it.

The trouble comes from the interpretations which men put upon it in seeking to weave new threads of social and political justice into the national fabric. Sometimes it seems it is not a time of weaving at all, but a time of unravelling threads already sewn by previous carefully contrived interpretations.

Whatever it is, my friends, there is little doubt we are again living in a time of vast change, a time of social upheaval, a time in which a revolution of sorts stalks the land.

The American political system requires rebels who will continually argue the case against the status quo, formulate alternatives and try to create a constituency committed to those alternatives. When this kind of skepticism and resistance to established authority ceases, democracy becomes a mere facade for preserving the status quo—as, indeed, some radicals think it has.

Yet at the same time every political system also needs dutiful civil servants who will carry out whatever program their political superiors inaugurate. If every civil servant had strong convictions of his own and then blocked anything which did not conform to these convictions, politics would become meaningless.

America has been built on a mixture of discipline and rebellion, but the balance between them has constantly shifted over the years.

During the nineteen-forties and fifties the antiauthoritarian side of the American tradition lay politically dormant. Politicians and voters were mainly concerned with national security and prosperity. Conservatives expressed some alarm when pursuit of these objectives led to the growth and centralization of government power, and liberals expressed similar alarm when it led to the growth and centralization of corporate power, but almost nobody opposed either trend in any serious way.

The nineten-sixties, on the other hand, have seen a spectacular revival of the anti-authoritarian tradition. The most visible spokesman today for this revival are black militants. These groups have produced a time of national stress with which we are all familiar.

Some call it the black man's revolution. More moderate advocates call it the black man's reach for a place in the sun, a place too long denied him. In any case, this revolution, if indeed it is a revolution, is said to be an inevitable swing of the pendulum toward justice and equality for all Americans. Like the struggle of the American labor movement, what is happening today is an unavoidable part of our evolutionary maturing.

It is, of course, history that the stage for today's events was set in 1954 when the Supreme Court handed down its now famous decision barring segregation in the public schools.

The immediate result of this far-reaching decision was that it created a vacuum which resulted from the inability of many of our states, both in the north and in the south, to carry out the dictum of the court "with all deliberate speed." In filling the vacuum the court has, since 1954 delivered itself of a rash of additional decisions which strike at what to a great many Americans is the traditional meeting of the Constitution.

As a result, our people are confused. They are bewildered by a steady flow of what appear to be court-inspired paradoxes. For example, we are told that it is unconstitutional to have publicly authorized prayer in the public schools. This seems to deny God. By the same token, the court has also said that a man cannot be barred from holding a job, even a sensitive job, in a defense plant simply because he is a Communist. This seems to aid our enemies.

Paradox after paradox appears to strike at the very heart of the order we conceive is necessary if we are to preserve our integrity as a nation.

The court has sanctioned wholly new concepts of social and political behavior undreamed of in our fathers' day.

Many of our citizens, though sympathetic to the black man's position in our society do not understand the seeming urgency on the part of the court to suddenly right all the wrongs which it conceives to exist. Especially since the very existence of these so-called wrongs is for the most part soundly based on previous decisions of a long procession of equally exalted Supreme Courts.

What are we to think of today's revolution? Was it violent treatment of the Constitution itself which brought it about? Many authorities think so; many feel that violence has been done, not once but many times, and that it was often dictated by political expediency. The question is certainly debatable.

However, I strongly believe that the struggle we are witnessing today is just another step forward in the process of national maturing, one which had to come sooner or later. It was just a question of when. And, this struggle will pass because it will also be resolved. The promise of equality, of opportunity, as well as citizenship will be fulfilled, because in a virile democracy, it must.

But, the very nature of the problem suggests the need for time. The greatest danger today is the unabiding impatience of civil libertarians and civil rights leaders, many of whom are more political opportunists than seekers after justice.

These are the people who threaten to burn down our cities unless their demands are met at once. These are some of the leaders who are even now directing a gigantic demonstration of the poor to take place in already ravaged Washington—the purpose of which they unabashedly tell us, is to force Congress to grant their demands for a guaranteed wage and more jobs.

This is the kind of pressure which is nothing more than an attempt to get legislation by intimidation.

Some of these are the people who would use the revolution to build "Black Power" into a sinister force. Don't misunderstand me, I am for Black Power. I am for the kind of Black Power which produces men like Sen. Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, Mayor Claude Stokes of Cleveland, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Thurgood Marshall, and countless Negro athletes, professional men, businessmen, men of science, and men of letters, etc. These men represent constructive Black Power. All of these men, and many others, are as much a credit to their country as they are to their race. I am for this kind of constructive Black Power.

I am against the Black Power of Adam Clayton Powell, Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown. Theirs is a destructive approach which will not only harm their country, but the cause they profess to represent as well.

What is the rationale for the militancy of pressure tactics employed by many civil rights leaders today? If we could break it down into parts, what part of the exhibition such as is now being planned for Washington is motivated by love of equality and justice and what part by opportunism. We may never know the whole answer to this, at least not in contemporary times.

However, we do know that in between the militant far-left civil rights groups and the far-right conservatives there is a third group. A very important and a very representative third group.

These are the millions of Americans, Negro and white, who are uncommitted to either side, who do not think of themselves as either conservatives or liberals, who do not consider themselves either black or white racists, whose views of contemporary civil rights problems, social justice and equal opportunity are that these questions must and will be worked out. These are the people who are saying—O.K.—let's get with it. Let's solve our problems but let's do it within the framework of the Constitution.

These are the people, and there are many constitutional authorities among them, who believe that though the Constitution confers equal rights upon every citizen, it does not confer upon anyone the right to substitute the rule of force for the rule of law.

They believe the Constitution does not envision rule by pressure groups, or legislation by intimidation, or that all the ills of our society can be cured by Executive fiat or judicial dictum. I think these Americans believe, as I do, that the Constitution does not confer absolute rights on anyone, white or black.

They believe, as I do, that freedom cannot become license for license can easily be used to abort the very blessings that freedom is meant to give. They believe, as I believe, that the Constitution meant to measure the freedoms it guarantees. By this I mean that there are no freedoms which are completely uninhibited and without any restrictions imposed upon the citizens who would enjoy them. No one may run around helter-skelter irresponsibly using his constitutional freedoms in such a manner as to injure his neighbor, though some are trying, as has always been the case in each stage of our nation's history.

No one may do these things we say, yet for the past decade we have witnessed instance after instance in case after case, in which our Supreme Court has appeared to refute that doctrine. It is perhaps the crowning paradox of our age that the court has sometimes seemed to pursue a double standard.

Though I do not claim to be an expert in the intricacies of constitutional law, I think that it requires a good deal less than legal genius to recognize the fact that in the orgies of civil disorders, trespass on private property, demonstrations—often uncontrolled demonstrations—which have frequently made a mockery of public property and hallowed shrines—and which have frequently brought the functional life in our cities to a standstill and have impeded government—that all of these things do violence to the constitutional rights of others.

These things we have experienced and we have found no relief in many cases, and this makes one wonder if, indeed, there is a double standard. It is almost impossible sometimes to escape the conviction that this is so.

And, yet, I believe it is logical to say that what is happening today is a part of the maturing process of our nation, and not the end of the line as some predict. Because, judges are transitory, political philosophies change, but the fundamental law as expressed in the Constitution has remained immutable from all the assaults which have been made upon it. It will continue to do so.

The Constitution is based upon the most reasonable, most mature and at the same time the most visionary concepts of men. Among these is the right and the duty of men to reason together for the good of the whole community.

Ladies and gentlemen—in summary, let me say—

We have seen violence to our democratic system in the attacks made on religion in the name of religious freedom. We have seen it in the attacks made on private property rights in the name of civil rights. We have seen it in the undermining of patriotism by maladjusted, flag defiling, draft card burning dissidents parading in the name of freedom to dissent. We have seen all of this and we wonder what is happening to our democracy.

But we must not underrate the dynamics of democracy—the very fluidity in the ebb and flow of change today, and the adjustments which we have and are making to meet that change. For the dynamics assert themselves in the underlying fact that our constitutional form of government is resilient. The Constitution is living law. If it were not, we would have long since perished.

Our Constitution, thank God, can and will survive the tests, the stresses and the strains to which it is now being subjected. It has survived far greater tests.

We will not only emerge, we will emerge stronger than before.

At least, this is the way I see it.

Glory

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess, it was my privilege to hear a fired-up recitation of the following poem. Upon learning that the young lady had also written it, I was so touched that I wanted to share it with my colleagues. The author and rhetorical speaker is 9-year-old Deborah Leigh Waldrop, 4116 Appalachian Way, Columbus, Ga.:

GLORY

Glory, ol' Glory! way up in the sky,
Tell me, answer me, why, oh why,
Does man tend to ignore your glorious cry,
Of freedom, and justice and liberty to live by?
Tho' slavery and sorrow this country hath bound,
A truth, a light, has always been found,
O' Glory, fly high, and proud, and true,
So all may see the red, white and blue!

Hungry Americans

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last week Members of Congress have received copies of two reports issued by private organizations on the subject of hunger in these United States. The most recent, issued by the Citizens' Board of Inquiry Into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, is a sweeping indictment of the myth that no American goes to bed hungry. This report flatly asserts:

First. There is a shocking absence of knowledge in this country about the extent and severity of hunger and malnutrition.

Second. Federal food programs fail to reach a significant portion of the poor, and many of those aided are not helped in any substantial degree.

Third. Millions of Americans suffer hunger and malnutrition and these conditions are increasing both in degree and numbers annually.

Fourth. Hunger and malnutrition, here as elsewhere in the world, take their toll in infant deaths, organic brain damage, retarded growth, and impaired ability to learn.

The dimensions of the problem strain credulity. A 1965 U.S. Department of Agriculture survey showed that 10.7-million Americans were eating two-thirds or less of the minimum daily dietary requirements, and another 9.2 million were eating less than the satisfactory levels. Yet only 5.4-million people were participating in Federal food programs in 1967. It is impossible to tell whether these were a part of or in addition to the 19.9 million who fail to achieve the minimum nutritional requirements. However, the few studies which have been done show that the present programs do not appreciably affect the recipients' diet, from which it seems fair to assume that a substantial portion of hungry Americans are participants in the Federal food programs.

The second report issued on April 16 by the Committee on School Lunch Participation concentrates on the operation and effectiveness of the national school lunch program. This report also indicts the comfortable assumption that all American schoolchildren participate in the program. This group finds:

First. Only 18.5 million schoolchildren benefit from the program.

Second. Fewer than 2 million children receive reduced price or free lunches, yet there are more than 6 million poor children of school age.

Third. The participation in the program is lowest where the need is greatest—geographically in the urban ghettos and isolated rural areas, and agewise among the youngest children in the elementary grades.

I stress that these reports are the work of private citizens who have donated their time and talents to accumulate information which has been published with funds from private sources. Those responsible for this contribution, as listed at the close of my remarks, deserve a grateful vote of thanks from the Congress. That they had to perform this service is a sad commentary on the efficiency of the Government over which we preside.

Few of us will agree in every detail with the findings and conclusions of these groups. Indeed, I differ with many of the recommendations, and question some of the findings. Both of these groups have dealt with areas of our national life which suffer from lack of scientific investigation or reliable statistical data. Moreover, they have been compelled to function without the authority of the Government to reinforce their investigative efforts.

On the other hand, none can read the results of this work without concluding that a problem of staggering magnitude has been vividly outlined. None can refute that immediate action of both long and short range is demanded.

Both of these citizens committees urge intensive study of the problem on a well-funded national basis. I believe this can best be accomplished by a national commission authorized and financed by the Congress similar in kind and scope to the National Commission on Mental Health and Illness established by President Eisenhower. In the short range, I urge that the Committee on Education and Labor hold hearings to determine the short-range administrative improvements which can enhance the effectiveness of existing programs, and lay some foundation for legislative change.

From the inception of the poverty hearings in 1964, I have joined with many of my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee in urging such an intensive study of the problems of poverty, its incidence, its composition, the effectiveness of existing programs, and new measures for its alleviation and elimination. We did not know then and we do not now know who the poor are or where they are located with sufficient accuracy to say that this child or that family is or is not receiving the assistance that the peculiar circumstances of the situation demand.

Nothing could demonstrate this need more accurately than these two reports. It is abundantly clear that we do not know who among the undernourished poor are receiving nutritional assistance. Moreover, it is impossible to determine if the assistance extended in fact alleviates the problem. Despite this astonishing ignorance of program effectiveness, we spend upward of $317 million annually in money and commodities in the food stamp and surplus commodities programs.

The administration of the national school lunch program is even more astonishing. It demonstrates the same ignorance of program effectiveness, but demonstrates also the absence of realistic priorities, a failure to conform with the declared intent of both the Congress and the Executive, and the administrative confusion which prevails through so many of the social welfare agencies. Moreover, there is absent any evidence of an effort to integrate this program into the broad policy of alleviating poverty.

I have been long concerned with the failure of our poverty programs to focus on the very young among the poor. These should be the highest priority groups. Almost without exception, the experts advise that both humanitarian considerations and cost effectiveness dictate this course. In the field of nutrition, there can be no doubt that adequate nourishment for young people is of vital importance in breaking the cycle of poverty. Malnutrition invites retarded growth, both mental and physical, thus inviting a nonproductive maturity. Less serious degrees of hunger cause a dulling of perception, thus thwarting the efforts of the schools to provide education for future self-sufficiency. The psychological impact of hunger on the youthful mind is unexplored, but it seems a safe assumption that it invites alienation, despair, and the delinquency and destructiveness which can flow therefrom.

The national school lunch program offers the unique vehicle for nutritional support of schoolage poor children. It is possible today to provide the minimum daily dietary requirements for normal growth in a single meal. The schools are the single institution which provides contact with the great majority of young people in poverty. It is logical to assume that a national school lunch program would provide reduced price or free meals for the more than 6 million schoolage among the young who are poor. However it does not.

Data available in Washington reveals only that one-eighth of the children served received free or reduced cost meals. There is no information available to establish how many are free. According to the school lunch committee the vast majority of these students receive only a reduced price. Moreover there are no established national standards. Thus the committee reports that in many areas those who receive welfare payments are excluded from the free lunch program. Here again it is impossible to determine if the assistance offered is in fact reaching those in greatest need. In addition to this sorry fact, we are told that the program is least effective in the elementary schools in isolated rural areas and the urban ghettos. Apparently this situation results from a combination of inadequate funds and lack of cafeterias. Notable efforts have been made in New York City and elsewhere to provide "sack lunches" in the urban ghettos, but the program still fails to reach vast numbers of children. We are, in short, spending at the level of about $350 million annually on this program which offers major potential in the battle against poverty, yet it is neither focused on the problem nor integrated with the overall program effort.

It must be noted that much of the confusion emanates from the legislative history of the major food programs, which were conceived first as a method of utilizing agricultural surpluses and only secondarily for social betterment. While some reorientation has occurred in recent years, the program funding flows to a level of about 50 percent from an allocation of tariff collections, and thus escapes the scrutiny of either legislative review or the Appropriations Commit-

tees. The program has never become an integral aspect of the legislative determination to eliminate poverty and accordingly remains largely outside of the massive concentration of money and resources so directed today. This is a condition which demands our immediate attention, and our considered action.

CITIZENS' BOARD OF INQUIRY INTO HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION IN THE UNITED STATES

Benjamin E. Mays, *Co-Chairman, President Emeritus, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia.*

Leslie W. Dunbar, *Co-Chairman, Executive Director, The Field Foundation, New York, New York.*

MEMBERS

Harry S. Ashore, *Author, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California.*

James P. Carter, M.D., *Pediatrician, Division of Nutrition, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.*

Rt. Rev. Daniel Corrigan, *Director, Home Department, Executive Council of the Episcopal Chuch, New York, New York.*

Norman Dorsen, *Professor of Law and Director, Arthur Garfield Hays Civil Liberties Program, New York University School of Law, New York, New York.*

Rashi Fein, *Senior Staff Member for Economic Studies, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.*

M. Alfred Haynes, M.D., *Associate Professor of International Health, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland.*

Vivian W. Henderson, *President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia.*

Fay Bennett, *Executive Secretary, National Sharecroppers Fund, New York, New York.*

Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, *Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C.*

Vine Deloria, Jr., *Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians, Denver, Colorado.*

George H. Esser, *Executive Director, The North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina.*

Stanley N. Gershoff, *Associate Professor of Nutrition, Harvard University, School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts.*

Ralph Helstein, *President, United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers, Chicago, Illinois.*

Dolores Huerta, *Secretary, United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, Delano, California.*

Harry Huge, *Attorney, Arnold & Porter, Washington, D.C.*

Rabbi Robert Kahn, *Congregation Emanuel, Houston, Texas.*

James O'Connor, *President, American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, New York, New York.*

Gilber Ortiz, M.D., *Chairman of ASPIRA, Bronx, New York.*

Edward Sparer, *Professor of Law, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.*

Walter Mitchell, *President, International Chemical Workers Union, Akron, Ohio.*

Milton Ogle, *Executive Director, Appalachian Volunteers, Bristol, Tennessee.*

Philip Sorensen, *Executive Director, Irwin-Sweeney-Miller Foundation, Columbus, Indiana.*

Raymond Wheeler, M.D., *Charlotte Medical Clinic, Charlotte, North Carolina.*

COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL LUNCH PARTICIPATION

CHURCH WOMEN UNITED

Mrs. Margaret M. Morris, Project Director, National Committee on Household Employment; formerly, Chief of Technical Services, National School Lunch Program, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Technical Secretary for Home and Community, President's Commission on the Status of Women; Home Economics Consultant, President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

Mrs. Katharine P. Riddle, Associate Secretary and Home Economist, Committee on Agriculture and Rural Life, Division of Overseas Ministries, National Council of Churches of Christ/USA; nutrition consultant, Church Women United.

NATIONAL BOARD OF THE Y.W.C.A.

Julia F. Allen, Dean of Women, Emeritus, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky; member, Executive Committee, National Board of the Y.W.C.A.; member, Board, Central Kentucky Civil Liberties Union.

Dorothy B. Ferebee, M.D., Assistant Professor of Preventive Medicine and Medical Supervisor of Health Activities, Howard University, Washington, D.C.; Medical Consultant, U.S. Department of State and Peace Corps and U.S. delegate, World Health Organization Assembly, 1967; President, Southeast (Washington) Settlement House; former Medical Director, Mississippi Health Project; National Chairman of Publications, Y.W.C.A.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

Sister Melathon Heister, C.S.C.; M.S.W. Director, Sisters Urban Center, Washington, D.C.; Assistant Director, Southeast (Washington) Catholic Center; member, Archdiocesan Board of Education; formerly, teacher, elementary school principal and superintendent of a boys' home; articles in *Catholic Charities Review* and *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin.*

Mrs. Maxwell H. Stokes, National Director, National Council of Catholic Women; Secretary, District of Columbia Public Welfare Advisory Council; Treasurer, National Christ Child Society.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

Mrs. William J. Cooper, Education System Representative, Burroughs Corporation; Program Adviser, Omaha Job Corps Center for Women; corporate member and first President, Women in Community Services (WICS); formerly member, National Board of the National Council of Jewish Women.

Mrs. Daniel Schreiber, Chairman, Education Subcommittee, Program Development Committee, National Council of Jewish Women; member, Inter-Religious Relations Committee, National Community Relations Advisory Council; corrective reading teacher, ESEA (Title I) program, New York City.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN

Janet L. Douglass, Projector Director, National Council of Negro Women; member, Board of the Association of Black Social Workers.

Mrs. Dorothy Shaed Proctor, School psychologist and former teacher, public schools, Washington, D.C.; member, Board of Directors, Social Hygiene Society of Metropolitan Washington and Ionia Whipper Home for Unwed Mothers; National Consumer Representative, National Council of Negro Women.

CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL LUNCH PARTICIPATION

Jean Fairfax, Director, Division of Legal Information and Community Service, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; delegate, Fourth Assembly, World Council of Churches, 1968; formerly, National Representative for Southern Programs, Community Relations Division, American Friends Service Committee; Vice-Chairman, Council for Christian Social, United Church of Christ.

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's Fine Career

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Larry O'Brien has enjoyed a very brilliant career in public service.

He has been an outstanding political leader, a close, valued friend, confidant, and remarkably successful campaign manager and assistant for our great, dearly beloved, late colleague, and admired leader and friend, President John F. Kennedy.

Postmaster General, Cabinet member, and head of our greatest postal system in the world for the past 6 years, Larry O'Brien is recognized as one of the greatest, most efficient, esteemed, and humane of all the able, distinguished men who have held this most powerful, indispensable Cabinet office. He has been a loyal, trusted, valuable member of our great President's official family.

A resourceful, wise, and just administrator, considerate of his staff and the personnel of the huge complex system under his charge, Postmaster General O'Brien has inaugurated many modern improvements in the Department that have efficiently adapted its functions to the marked growth in its workload that has taken place during his tenure.

His regime will stand out for its modern approach in streamlining this great organization that is so vital to the American people and our Nation.

In expressing my regret that Larry has decided to leave the Post Office Department at this time, I can well understand his desire to launch his career in private business and perhaps resume his interest and participation in active politics, to which he is so deeply committed.

I heartily congratulate Postmaster General O'Brien on his fine, constructive, memorable administration of the great Post Office Department—where he leaves a deep, enduring impression—and I wish for him, his gracious wife and helpmate, and lovely family, continued good health, success in their endeavors, and prosperity, happiness, and peace together for many years to come. Happy landings, Larry.

Louisiana Joins Ranks of Concerned

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that another State public service commission has adopted a resolution concerning the serious situation facing our Nation's railroads.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the resolution of the Louisiana Public Service Commission follows:

RESOLUTION, LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Whereas, the Interstate Commerce Commission, acting under Section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C., Sec. 13a), has permitted the discontinuance of hundreds of passenger trains in the past several years with the result that rail passenger service is at best sparse throughout the Nation and in some areas has ceased to exist; and

Whereas, the rising tide of passenger train discontinuances has been intensified by the policy of the United States Post Office Department regarding the removal of the mail from passenger trains; and

Whereas, this Commission and its sister State regulatory agencies within the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) are vitally concerned with the development of a sound and adequate rail passenger service which will be responsive to the needs of a growing America; and

Whereas, we believe that the decline in the use of rail passenger service is merely a temporary episode in the Nation's transportation history because our crowded airways and clogged highways will not be equal to tomorrow's transportation tasks; and

Whereas, the preservation of safe, dependable, all-weather mass rail passenger service is essential not only to the traveling public, but also to the national defense; and

Whereas, Japan's Tokaido Line and the European railroads prove the feasibility and desirability of modern rail passenger systems; and

Whereas, it is *crucial* to the future welfare of America that the Congress now take prompt action to conserve a nucleus of rail passenger service to provide the foundation for expanding to meet tomorrow's transportation needs, otherwise an enormous expenditure of government funds will be required in the future to restore essential passenger service now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Louisiana Public Service Commission hereby strongly urges the Congress of the United States to promptly enact legislation imposing a moratorium on rail passenger service discontinuances pending the completion of a study, and the submission of recommendations thereon, by the Department of Transportation, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, relative to practical means for preserving essential real passenger service, and the role best suited for rail passenger service in joining with other modes to meet America's growing transportation needs; and be it further

Resolved, that this Commission hereby strongly urges the Congress to promptly amend Section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act as proposed by S. 1685 (introduced by Senator Case of New Jersey on May 4, 1967) and as further proposed by the NARUC in testimony before the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives relative to multi-State passenger train discontinuance petitions being first heard and determined by State joint boards with aggrieved parties having right of appeal to the ICC for correction of errors of law; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of this Resolution be furnished to the Governor of Louisiana, Members of the United States Congressional Delegation of this State, to Members of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, and to the press.

By order of the commission: Baton Rouge, Louisiana, April 1, 1968.

L. T. RAND,
Secretary.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are few events in recent history which will be remembered with such great emotion as the tragic and brave struggle of the Polish Jews of Warsaw in the spring of 1943, which began on April 19. One need not visit Warsaw, where even today the memorial to the victims of Nazi brutality stands on a plain of rubble, to visualize the devastation and horror perpetrated by the insane world vision of the Third German Reich. Documents, diaries, and memoirs which survive the holocaust are vivid testimony to the unlimited suffering of the ghetto prisoners. Never has a people so greatly oppressed suffered with greater dignity and defiance than did the Jews of Poland. In paying tribute to those who died in Warsaw, we also grieve for those other thousands of Polish Jews pressed into the ghettos of Lodz, Lublin, Cracow, Czestochowa, Kielce, and Vilna, as well as the Jewish populations of every other country under German occupation during the war.

Of Warsaw, one journalist who lived there in 1958 and 1959, A. M. Rosenthal, wrote in the New York Times:

> There was once a Jewish tang to Warsaw, a ferment, a bustle, a shrill wonderment . . . The taste still lingers, but faintly. There are Jews in Poland, some 20,000 of them, who live with their Jewishness, and some few thousand more who try to forget it, but no real flavor of Warsaw's Jewishness survives the fire.

The statistics alone are incredible. In August 1939, there were 3½ million Jews in Poland; during the war, between 2½ and 3 million were exterminated in the death camps, those compounds of horror scientifically designed for the purpose of efficient murder on a massive scale.

On October 16, 1940, the Germans began collecting the Jews of Warsaw in a 100-square-block area of the city. In November of that year, the 450,000 ghetto inhabitants were sealed off from the rest of the city by a wall. The ultimate purpose was to starve the population. When this proved ineffective, the Nazis began removing the ghetto inhabitants to Treblinka and other camps in Poland. Initially the Jews went willingly, preferring the hardship of a labor camp to the hunger, sickness, and despair of the ghetto. Between July and October, an average of 10,000 people a day were sent away. When news began to come back that those who left were being murdered, all hope of salvation through cooperation was relinquished. In July 1942, a group of young men in the ghetto formed the Jewish fighting organization under the command of Mordechai Anielewicz. Arms were painstakingly smuggled into the sector through the sewers, and primitive weapons were constructed.

When a detachment of SS troops entered the ghetto on January 18, they were greeted with unexpected gunfire and quickly withdrew. Himmler responded by ordering the complete destruction of the enclosed area, and Lieutenant General Stroop was called from German headquarters in Greece to conduct the operation. On Passover Eve, April 19, 1943, German troops surrounded the walls and attacked early the following morning. On April 23, the Germans began the block-by-block destruction of the ghetto, using tanks and firebombs against the meager hand weapons of the Jews. Despite the overwhelming odds, the ghetto resisted until May 16. Those who remained alive took their own lives rather than surrender. Over 50,000 died; only a handful of men escaped.

Mankind must never forget the Warsaw ghetto uprising. One sometimes hears the words, "we did not know what was happening." But never again should these words be used. We must be vigilant to the dangers of demagoguery, of mass movements dedicated to evil purposes, of germinating prejudice and of claiming uninvolvement in issues not of immediate, personal concern.

The Congress of the United States on August 13, 1964, passed a joint resolution requesting the President to designate a day between April 8 and May 6 each year to observe the Warsaw ghetto uprising. This day must be symbolic of our continual remembrance and constant determination that no similar tragedy will ever again scar the progress of civilization. The deep shame cannot be limited to a particular day; the human heart observes no calendar.

Essay Contest Winners

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association, dedicated to the best interests of the public and the home improvement industry, recently conducted an essay contest on "The Star-Spangled Banner: Flag of Freedom." The project was dedicated to the 190th anniversary of the U.S. flag.

Mrs. Barbara Lee Conrad, Baltimore, Md., was selected as the first prize winner. She is a former police department secretary and the wife of a police officer.

Mrs. Billie Wells Keller, Baltimore, Md., was named winner of second place. A secretary and homemaker, she was the first prize winner of the "Why I Like Baltimore, Our Baltimore" essay contest sponsored by Maryland Improvement Contractors Association in 1966.

Mrs. Patricia Kathleen O'Doherty, Baltimore, Md., mother of three sons and two daughters, and grandmother of 30 grandchildren, was named the winner of third place honors.

The contest was conducted by the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association officers and board members. The officers included Paul Caplan, president; Philip Baron, vice president; Aaron Glatt, secretary; and James J. Oliver, treasurer. The board included William H. Klarner, chairman; Milton Bates, Robert O. Downs, Richard W. Goswellen, William Lobe, and Fred Stoddard.

In conjunction with the 190th anniversary of the U.S. flag, marked in 1967, it is fitting to recall that the oldest official American flag known to exist measures only 3 by 6 feet and its colors have long since faded. But it is hanging proudly in its lighted display case in the Maryland State House in Annapolis.

The full story was contained in an Associated Press story published in the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, on June 14, 1967. The text is as follows:

OLDEST OFFICIAL U.S. FLAG HANGS IN STATE HOUSE

ANNAPOLIS.—It's not very big—it measures only 3 by 6 feet—and its colors have long since faded, but hanging proudly in its lighted display case in the Maryland State House is the oldest official American flag known to exist.

It was exactly 190 years ago, on June 14, 1777, when the Continental Congress passed the Flag Act specifying "that the flag of the United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

It was sometime between that date and 1781 that the Flag of Cowpens was patiently stitched from homespun flax with coarse brown thread, its ring of stars appliqued on a blue field.

It first appeared in American history when it was carried into the Revolutionary War Battle of Cowpens, S.C., as the standard of the Maryland 3rd Infantry by a soldier from Baltimore, William Bachelor.

It was soon forgotten, but reappeared 33 years later when, during the War of 1812, the British attacked Baltimore, bombarded Fort McHenry and landed an army at North Point.

This time, the battle flag accompanied members of the 26th Maryland Infantry as they marched to engage the British at North Point. It was carried by William Bachelor's son.

Thus, Maryland's Flag of Cowpens became the battle companion of Maryland's Star-Spangled Banner. But the progress of the two was quite different.

The banner entered American history as a symbol of triumph—and looked the part. It was new; it was huge; and it flew from a giant staff—87 feet high. It was sheer magnificence.

The faded little flag of the Revolution, on the other hand, just slogged patiently up North Point to meet the assault by land, carried in the sweaty hands of the Maryland militiamen.

As far as Defense Department records show, it is the only existing national flag made during the Revolutionary period.

It also is the only flag to be carried in both the Revolution and the War of 1812.

And it has 21 bullet holes to show for it.

The flag contest conducted by Maryland Improvement Contractors Association takes on added importance in view of the recent announcement that a series of 10 flag stamps, to be issued on July 4th, will include the first Stars and Stripes, 1777; and the flag which flew over Fort McHenry, the 15-star, 15-stripe flag which inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star-Spangled Banner."

It is my pleasure to include, for publication, the three inspiring essays written by the Maryland Improvement Contractors Association prize winners. The texts follow:

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER: FLAG OF FREEDOM

(By Barbara Lee Conrad, Baltimore, Md., first prize winner)

What is the American flag? Merely a banner to fly on national holidays and mechanically honor before a big game? Or does it have a deeper meaning—one too deep for us to consider in our hectic world?

It has a glorious past, our flag. It recalls to us our founding fathers—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, Adams—who turned the ideas of men into the ideals of a democracy. It was the inspiration of Revolutionary Regiments, so anxious to reveal to the world a united army that they created their standards from a scant recording in the Congressional journal of June 14, 1777: "Resolved: that the flag of the United States be made of thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." It was this flag that emerged victorious from Civil War and saw a young nation rally and grow into the fifty firmly-united states of today. On foreign battlefields it has been the victor—always the victor, never the conqueror.

It is the reality of today—the men in Vietnam who, because it is their duty, fight and die for many who denounce them and for many who are just indifferent to them, but for thousands and thousands of others who realize their dangers and their sacrifices. It symbolizes 200 million imperfect individuals living in an imperfect society, striving so hard for perfection that sometimes they hate themselves and, sometimes, each other. It is the tears of women and the unselfish convictions of men; the delightful laughter of children and the ear-piercing racket of the teenager. It is the latest legatee to the fact that generosity and sacrifice are sometimes returned in ingratitude and hatred.

It is the hope of the future—the dreams of youth placed upon a foundation of the toils of the aged and built toward a better tomorrow. It is the genius of invention; the miracles of modern medicine; a nation reaching for the stars. These things cannot be burned or destroyed. The desecrator shows the greatest amount of disrespect to himself.

It is a strong, determined population devoted to the doctrine of personal liberty. They are Americans, you and I. Fly your flag high. It is the flag of freedom.

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER: FLAG OF FREEDOM

(By Billie Wells Keller, Baltimore, Md., second prize winner)

On June 14, 1777, sandwiched in with the minor detail and petty routine of "small matters", the Continental Congress approved the first legally adopted national flag of the new United States, and worded simply, directly, even tersely was her birth certificate: "*Resolved*, That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

The "Star-Spangled Banner: Flag of Freedom" is now in her 190th year.

She has flown from the mastheads of old sailing ships, modern freighters and ocean liners; traveled by covered wagon, train and airliner. Always, she has been saluted as the emblem of a free and mighty nation.

She was there at the birth of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution; at the launching of our first peacetime warships—the *United States*, the *Constitution*, and the *Constellation*.

She has been carried through seven memorable conflicts with other nations, but never yet borne into any battle fought for a cause other than liberty.

With all her valiant years and service, the role she played during the British land and naval attack on Baltimore, September 13–14, 1814, gained for her immortality. Inspiration for The Star-Spangled Banner, she is the only flag in the world to be the subject of a national anthem.

In 1928, on the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the flag of the United States, Calvin Coolidge made an appeal to the American people:

"It will be futile merely to show outward respect to our National Emblem if we do not cherish in our hearts an unquenchable love of and devotion to the unseen which it represents."

White for purity, red for valor, blue for justice; a living symbol of those virtues for which our nation stands. How strong in stature, how firm in respect she has grown across the face of the earth. We can walk in her shadow, tread in her footsteps and feel as big as a giant.

Spirit of her people, she has seen the adoring eyes of the young, looked into the knowing hearts of the old; heard our silent benediction, "Thank God, I am an American."

The Star-Spangled Banner, true to God; to country; to every man who has played a role in helping her fulfill her destiny. Even from infancy she has spoken out proudly and distinctly of our precious inheritance. She seems to say to each and every one of us that Freedom is the root and foundation of our lives, and that we have a responsibility to the past and a responsibility to the future to:

"Fervently reach out with heart and hand to erase hatred, eradicate bigotry; deny not the goodness of God, or worth of man: Maintain the American way of life each day for the dawn of all tomorrows, so that the core of America's character shines ever a testimonial to the world."

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER—FLAG OF FREEDOM—KEEP IT FLYING

(By Patricia Kathleen O'Doherty, Baltimore, Md., third prize winner)

May the hearts of grateful citizens of these United States, be kindled into a glowing flame of love and tenderness, especially we immigrants when we gather in brotherly love, neath the folds of the Star Spangled Banner. We, who have known the sting of a foreign master's lash, finger its pleats reverently and press our lips to that emblem of Freedom. If Emma Lazarus could write from the core of a thankful heart that beautiful inscription engraved on the base of the Statue of Liberty, then why not we, the privileged ones alive to-day, prove our indebtedness to this Land of Liberty and Fly our Flag on every occasion? Those also born here neath its Stars and Bars should know like a prayer the history of its symbolic tenor.

Fly that Flag of Freedom with great pride, it never went down in defeat or disgrace. A hastily improvised banner of thirteen red and white stripes and thirteen white stars on the blue upper dexter corner of it, was authorized by the Continental Congress in the Resolution of June fourteenth, 1777, on the admission of Vermont and Kentucky and was raised for the first time over Port Stanwiz, Rome, New York, August 2, 1777; on the approach of the British force. Valourous and intrepid men, young and old beheld the red bars of that emblem of Freedom dyed a deeper crimson at Valley Forge the winter of 1777, there was very little warmth but there was no flag burning as a pretense of disbelief in the reason or cause for the fight against tyranny. Our Maryland Legislature on December 3rd., 1777, in the Preamble to an Act declared "that in every Free State, allegiance and protection are reciprocal and no man is entitled to the one, who refuses to yield to the other, and every free male 18 years and over should take the oath of Fidelity to the State", and our Emblem was not burned to dust; Maryland had no weaklings or lily livers.

Our Maryland line under command of General Smallwood took quarters at Wilmington and proudly carrying their Banner, marched on to Monmouth where their line, thinned down to 1400 men, held the enemy in check until other reinforcements came forward and victory was theirs at Monmouth. The Marylanders carried that Flag to victory under brave men like Col. Howard, Williams, Greene and others. Through the war of 1812 the Flying Flag "Mid shot and shell", gave to this Nation its National Anthem. Through World Wars one and two, on to Iwo Jima, to Korea, now Viet Nam, the Flag of Freedom, was and is carried proudly.

In God's Name, in Freedom's name, let it Fly defiantly in War, blissfully in Peace, but keep it flying. Lower it only when enshrouding the caskets of our Patriot Dead.

Electronics in Transition

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 20 of this year the International Electrical & Electronic Engineers met in New York City and presented their Founders Award to Mr. P. E. Haggerty, president of Texas Instruments, Inc., of Dallas, Tex.

This is a well-deserved honor for one of the outstanding scientists in our Nation and one of the finest men in our land.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith for the benefit of my colleagues the remarks Pat Haggerty made in accepting the award. I believe these comments on our times provide an insight and concern which speak better than I am able to do of the tremendous intellectual capacity of Pat Haggerty. All too often those in scientific endeavors do not take the time or expend the energy to see the full ramifications of their efforts on mankind. Pat Haggerty certainly has more capacity in this area than any other man I have had the opportunity to know.

In his speech, Mr. Haggerty asks of his award and those presented to some of his colleagues:

> Are these awards exclamation marks at the end of the middle paragraphs in the composition of our life's work, or are they periods following the summary sentences?

I believe I can speak for all those who know Pat Haggerty well enough to be aware of his great capabilities for even more significant contributions to society. We sincerely hope this award is just a short pause for a time of recognition to encourage his further efforts. America needs more men like Pat Haggerty today.

The address referred to follows:

ELECTRONICS IN TRANSITION

(Address by P. E. Haggerty, on receipt of IEEE Founders Award, March 20, 1968)

This is one of those times in the life of a man when, having been honored by his peers for some of his labors, he must, while accepting the honors with appreciation and humility, yet look at himself and his work against a background of the time in which he lives and the problems of the society of which he is a part. Mixed feelings of pride and humility are especially strong for me tonight, because among so many worthy men being honored tonight by the institute are two of my associates, Roger Webster and James Biard, newly elected Fellows of the Institute, and especially because, by one of those coincidences of life, you have chosen to bestow that senior award of the Institute, the Medal of Honor, upon another respected friend and associate, Gordon Teal. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, these four threads that you have tied together tonight extend back over two decades to Gordon's inspired work with single crystal germanium and silicon, which, together with the contribution of Morton, Brattain, Bardeen, Shockley and many more of his then associates at the Bell Telephone Laboratories, must be evaluated as the discovery of a new technological world, the exploration and development of which has brought the four of us and a large proportion of all of you here tonight.

By their very nature, awards such as these must often represent culminations of one kind or another; and among the emotions and satisfactions the Founders Award has stirred in me, particularly in juxtaposition with the award of the Medal of Honor to Gordon Teal, a nagging question insists on intruding itself: Are these awards exclamation marks at the end of middle paragraphs in the composition of our life's work, or are they periods following the summary sentences?

We are engineers and these are engineering awards, and engineering has to do with the creation of useful products and services. Thus, any judgment of where these threads you have pulled together tonight fit into the total future scheme of our profession must begin with an evaluation of the pertinence of that profession to the needs and problems of today.

These are exciting times, but troubled ones! The embattled marines at Khe Sanh know it's a troubled world. The Pueblo is still in North Korea. The communist Chinese shout slogans and explode their A-bombs. There is still a wall in Berlin; and meetings like this here and in the USSR help to keep the drapes making up the Iron Curtain from meeting as tightly as they once did, but the Iron Curtain is still there.

Myriads of new nations find that independence is but a first step, and that the stability and the affluence they seek can be found only at the end of a long and arduous road demanding ability, dedication, diligence, and responsibility from both government and citizen.

International trade is disturbed and there is a gold crisis. Britain devalues the pound and initiates an austerity program; France pursues an at-times agonizing nationalism. The United States faces balance of payments problem and now, after decades as advocates of an increasing free trade, the administration proposes travel bans and overseas investment limitations; and a distressing number of our senators and representatives are recommending quotas and limitations on that trade.

It took an estimated eight million years from man's beginnings to reach a world population of 300 million at the time of Christ. It has taken less than two thousand years to increase that 300 million tenfold and one billion of the three billion have been added in less than forty years. On the basis of present trends we'll have added another billion by 1975 and still another billion for a total of five billion by the early 1980's.

So the world divides into the "have" and "have-not" nations. The "have" nations pay themselves well and enjoy high standards of living. The "have-not" nations have low incomes and poor standards of living.

The United States is a great nation and for most of us Americans the benefits of citizenship are legion. Belatedly, sometimes inadequately, but still genuinely, we are trying to remove the barriers imposed by prejudice so that all of our citizens may have a full share of those benefits. Yet riots have torn our cities; and even without riots we must often be afraid to walk on our streets after dark.

Lake Erie is becoming a Dead Sea; Los Angeles in sunny California rarely sees the sun.

This disturbing look into the world's Pandora's Box leads back to the question with which I began. Are the talents of the electronics industry and, more particularly, the skills of the scientists and engineers who have made it what it is, pertinent to the solution of such problems from among this catalog of ailments as:

1. The problems of war and national defense
2. The problem of the restoration and conservation of our environment
3. The problems of our cities
4. For the "have-not" nations, the problem of transformation into industrial societies
5. For the "have" nations, the problem of sustaining and improving their already high standards of living in the face of the need of the "have-not" nations to industrialize and the relatively much lower wages and salaries they pay themselves while in the process.

Let's see how electronics might be pertinent to problem solutions in some of these areas.

So far as the problems of war and national defense are concerned, the needs are so obvious and the contributions made by electronics so vital that little elaboration is necessary except to observe perhaps that every new military need from strategic missiles to antiballistic missile systems, from helicopters to supersonic aircraft, from reconnaissance to attack, demands more and better electronics.

A principal problem from any heavily populated, reasonably complex society is the orderly development, redistribution, use, and reclamation of its water resources. The hardware and software of electronics allow us to develop atmospheric models, watershed models, sediment models, surface water quality and quantity models—in fact, models of all of the necessary major components to simulate regional water resources. The hardware and software of electronics can further provide the sensors, the memories, the information processes, the data displays and the control mechanisms necessary for the orderly development, the redistribution and use of the water resources. But to apply the tools, somewhere there must be a governmental unit with the comprehension, imagination, authority, and the funds to use them.

Or, take the problem of traffic in any major city. It would now be completely feasible technically to calculate for every artery the conditions for maximum rate of flow of traffic, to identify every vehicle entering that flow of traffic and direct it into arteries not yet at maximum flow and forbid it entry when its addition would simply slow the total flow. There is a saturation point for every system of traffic arteries and electronics can insure that every traffic system carries the maximum amount of traffic of which it is capable under the specified circumstances. Electronics cannot make the artery carry more than that specified maximum. It can help detect and correct breakdowns and make clear what further steps must be taken to increase that maximum flow.

To switch to another problem area, the United States is a high standard of living country. We pay ourselves more for our hours of work than does any other country in the world. The United States must sell to and compete with the rest of the industrialized world. Simultaneously, it must sell to and buy from, the underdeveloped world while assisting the underdeveloped nations in their own strivings toward industrialization. If the United States is to sustain its high standard of living, then its over-all industrial effectiveness must be sufficiently higher than that of any other nation so that when the high wages we pay ourselves for our hours of labor are multiplied by our relative effectiveness, we still come out in total as competitive.

Those of us who are engaged in developing, manufacturing and selling products and services around the world know that in many respects this has become increasingly difficult over the past decade. For example, even though the rate of increase in wages for semiskilled labor in Japan has been increasing faster than it has in the United States,

the absolute difference in cents per hour has increased from about $1.80 per hour in 1957 to nearly $2.15 an hour in 1966—or by comparison with Italy, from $1.72 per hour difference in 1957 to $2.08 in 1966. Or to make a comparison with another Far Eastern nation, striving with considerable success to move into the modern industrial world, in 1957 Taiwan's semiskilled labor received on an average $1.98 an hour less than a similar worker here in the United States; in 1966 that difference has increased to nearly $2.60. While these illustrations are all with respect to semiskilled labor, the relative differences are even greater if unskilled labor is compared and only moderately less if one compares highly skilled labor and costs for professionals and managers.

Obviously, if the United States is to compete with wages and salary differences such as these, the over-all effectiveness of its total industrial machine must be extraordinarily high. To the extent that we cannot meet the challenge, our standard of living must also respond by either slowing down the rate of improvement or actually dropping. The United States has thus far by and large sustained the upward trend of its over-all standard of living by a combination of advanced technology in its products and services and a superior way of organizing to produce those products and services. Both the technology and our way of organizing to produce our goods and services, that is, the way we manage, have been diffused throughout the world since the end of World War II.

Japan is an excellent example of rapid growth into an efficient industrial nation while still paying itself at wage and salary rates appreciably below ours. Inevitably, we are unable to compete in certain areas. The problem we face with respect to the other industrialized nations, they too face in varying degrees with respect to one another, and all of the Western industrial nations face with respect to Japan; but the whole spectrum of industrial development from the United States through Western Europe and Japan and down through the underdeveloped world is such that inevitably every industrialized nation, including Japan, already does and will continue to face similar competition from other nations struggling to evolve an industrial society.

Thus, it seems there must be an inexorable pressure, not just in the United States but on a somewhat descending scale, throughout the entire industrialized world for a constantly improving effectiveness in every segment of each nation's industrial machine. This pressure for improvement in effectiveness must change fundamentally the way in which we design, manufacture, and market our products; but what may be even more significant, it will change the way we organize and manage our businesses.

It is difficult to draw any other conclusion except that the sensors, the logic, the memory, the displays, the controllers of electronics and their associated software are the principal and essential tools which must be applied to increase the effectiveness first of our own industrial machine sufficiently to compensate for our very high wage and salary costs but over a relatively short span of time must be applied extensively and for the same reasons by every industrialized nation.

These are just a few examples, but the solutions to all of these problems have major elements in common. In all of them we need to acquire information through a wide variety of sensors. We need to convert that information into usable signals. We need to separate these useful signals from the inevitable noise which accompanies them. We need to store the raw data accumulated; we need to process the data. We need to interpret it. We need to store the processed and interpreted data. We need to display the interpreted data. We need to cause action in response to the information and create feedback signals to correct the error in the actions taken; and much of the action must be in real time. Thus, there is a startling coincidence between these needs and what much of electronics is all about today.

Thirty years ago we could have made only the most rudimentary kind of contribution to the solution of these problems. And it is really only in the last ten years, with the advent of solid-state componentry and sophisticated data processing hardware and software, that we can truthfully say we can tackle these difficult problems with tools whose sophistication is commensurate with the difficulty of the problems. It is probably also accurate that almost every tool which is necessary is at least in sight or will be in the 1970's.

Of course, what is really common about these contributions electronics can make to the solutions of some of the world's most pressing problems is, as President Herwald has already emphasized, that in each case man is using electronics to extend his mind, his senses, and to some degree his spirit. The Industrial Revolution that began with the invention of the steam engine by Watt was a revolution that depended upon the extension of man's muscles. The even more significant revolution which is just beginning in these middle decades of the 20th Century is an extension, not just in capability of mind and senses, but in space and time. With electronics man can see, hear, and measure space and time with sensitivity, breadth of response, and precision far beyond that of his unaided senses. With the logic and the memory of electronics, man can expand his mind, not just in size but in speed and apply that logic and memory at a distance. With television and radio, man can already see and be seen, hear and be heard, with few limitations in space and time. With laser holography, in the relatively near future managers and professionals will stay in their offices and laboratories and still participate personally in distant conferences and meetings in three dimensions and in color. Since they can also manipulate and process information with electronic logic and memories at a distance, they may be more effective participants in such a meeting or conference than if they were truly present in person.

So, whether these awards represent exclamation marks or periods as far as Gordon Teal and I are concerned, I have no doubt whatsoever that our profession has barely begun its work, and our industry is still at a relatively early stage in its growth. It may be true that the growth rates of electronics over the next five to ten years will be slowed while we develop and expand the tools on hand and in sight and while we evolve the procedures and institutions, both public and private, to apply them. After that, and for as far into the future as any of us are likely to be interested, I believe that growth in quality, complexity, and size will continue at a rate well beyond that of the Gross National Product. The match between the capabilities the tools of electronics provide and the most pressing needs, not just of the United States but of the entire industrialized world, is too close for it to be otherwise.

Of all this, as an engineer, I am sure. But it is not enough. I hope that as man expands his sight, he will really see; and his hearing, that he will really hear; and his touch, that he will really feel; that as his mind grows, so will his wisdom and his heart. But all this we must add—as men, not engineers.

Positive Approach in Fun City

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK.. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of April 17 carried two stories concerning the issue of how to deal with looters and arsonists in New York City. Criticizing Chicago's Mayor Richard Daley for ordering the use of firearms in combatting vandalism by looters and arsonists, Mayor John Lindsay was quoted as saying:

We happen to think that protection of life, particularly innocent life, is more important than protecting property or anything else. . . . We are not going to turn disorder into chaos through the unprincipled use of armed force. In short, we are not going to shoot children in New York City.

According to the Times the Chicago mayor "had added that he did not want children shot, but suggested that his police use the temporarily disabling chemical spray, Mace, on young looters." Mayor Lindsay also disagreed with the recommendation that Mace should be used on looters.

Despite the dissent of its mayor, New York City has come up with a positive approach to protect the property of its merchants from the firebombers and looters. The merchants in areas of possible danger have been advised to clear their store windows of merchandise at night to reduce the attraction for looters. Perhaps this new "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" policy will prove to be a model for other urban areas in the days and months to come. Or, perhaps more New York merchants will seek greener business pastures—outside of New York City.

I include the article, "Displays Called Lure to Looters," from the New York Times of April 17, 1968, to be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

DISPLAYS CALLED LURE TO LOOTERS—POLICE ADVISE MERCHANTS TO CLEAR WINDOWS AT NIGHT

(By Martin Gansberg)

Merchants in areas of the city that suffered damage through the looting and arson that followed the slaying of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4 are being urged by the police to clear out their window displays when they close for the day.

"This is not an order," a high official in the Police Department said yesterday. "We can't order store owners to do such a thing. But it would be the kind of thing that any sensible police officer would tell any sensible merchant to do."

He explained that the request to merchants to remove window displays at the end of the day would be made by precinct officers who believed this could reduce the attraction for looters, most of whom have been 16 to 19 years of age.

So far, it was reported, requests have been made to owners of stores selling jewelry, liquor or apparel. Most of the looting reported during the six-day period following the assassination of Dr. King was in these types of stores, the police said. They noted that they had made 480 arrests.

SHOPOWNER AGREES

A woman who operates a specialty shop near 158th Street and Broadway in Washington Heights said she had agreed to clear her windows after a policeman had suggested it.

"But please don't use my name in the papers," she asked.

"Six stores in this neighborhood have been looted in the last week," she said, "and we'll do anything to improve protection here. I have some jewelry in one section that is valuable, and I wouldn't want to have it stolen."

William R. Sloane, executive director of the Fifth Avenue Association, said many of his members were not able to clear their windows because "it takes a whole day to dress them up."

He said, however, that some stores featuring apparel that might be attractive to looters have been removing the clothing at night. He cited Blye's, at Fifth Avenue and 46th Street, as an example.

Blye's, which suffered heavy damage last summer after young vandals broke windows and stole display merchandise, has been removing sweaters every night because it has found these particularly appealing to looters.

Another area that has been asked to clear its windows is the jewelry district on 47th Street between Fifth Avenue and the Avenue of the Americas.

"We had a panic meeting," said Michael C. Fina, president of the West 47th Street Jewelers and Merchants Association, "and we decided to do whatever was asked. We've had millions of dollars worth of jewelry in our windows and the police told us frankly that they were worried about it."

An official of a major department store, who asked that his name be withheld, said that merchants had been invited to the Police Academy, 235 East 20th Street, after Macy's, Klein's and Bloomingdale's were hit by Molotov cocktails on March 30.

"We were shown what these bombs look like and told to take several precautions," he said. "The police also advised us to cut down on our window displays at night."

A Harlem liquor merchant, a member of the Uptown Chamber of Commerce, said he had been urged to remove his displays at night.

"I can't do it," he said, "there's too much work. Instead I'm inserting plywood boards between the protective railing and the windows. I hope this will discourage looting."

A Second Golden Age of Greek Comedy

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the military dictatorship in Greece has been in power for 1 year. During this time, it has done little of value in that land. The unhappy fact is that it has embarrassed Greece in the eyes of the world and cast doubt on the integrity of democratic nations and individuals who have excused the coup or kept silent about it.

The Greek junta has provided comic relief at times, with its ban on miniskirts and the like. Their actions have provided fertile soil for the Greek love of anecdote and ridicule. But underneath it all, they realize they are paying the price now and will pay in the future. Economic crisis looms. Even if the junta falls, Greece will suffer the economic consequences of this dictatorship for some time.

A second consequence of the dictatorship which seldom is mentioned is the stifling of creativity. The most creative people, those who had begun to move Greece into a belief that a "second golden age" was possible, are either silenced or in exile. The regime is pulling the public tastes down into a pedestrian mediocrity. The arts are suffering. In the discipline of the film, for example, the most distinguished international artists—actresses Melina Mercouri, Irene Papas, and Director Michael Cacoyannis—are estranged from their native land. In every discipline, a similar situation exists.

I insert below three new stories which reflect the regime's clownish aspects and their insensitivity to the arts:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1968]

GREEK POSTCARDS TO FLOOD THE UNITED STATES—JUNTA IS SEEKING TO OFFSET EXILES' BOYCOTT DRIVE

ATHENS, April 13.—The year-old revolutionary regime is planning to flood the United States with a million publicity postcards to combat what it calls "an unholy Communist-led defamation campaign."

The campaign is to be the first of a series designed to offset a major effort by expatriates for an economic boycott of Greece until the military regime restores democratic rule.

Greek businesses have been asked by the Trade Minister, George Papadimitrakopoulos, to subscribe to a $230,000 fund for the drive, sponsored by the Athens Chamber of Commerce.

He wrote in a circular letter: "The unholy defamation campaign launched by international Communist against Greece has already fallen through. Yet the professional lyth-makers and slanderers will not give up.

"And, as is known, slander always leaves traces, at least for the naive and the credulous. The lawful defense against this brutal anti-Greek campaign is the duty of all Greeks."

The plan is to mail the cards to a million American companies and individuals, drawing their attention to the fact that Greece, along with Finland, is the only European country exempt from the United States and on foreign investments.

The colored picture postcards will also send greetings and slogans, plus the compliments of subscribing companies.

Each card will cost the subscriber 7 drachmas (about 23 cents), including printing and postage, and there will also be the cost of buying an American mailing list.

SLOGAN IS SUGGESTED

The companies were told they could subscribe to a minimum of 1,000 cards. A suggested slogan was: "1968, the year of Greece. In your thoughts, in your texts, follow the sun in the land of gods. Invest money in the country of the greatest opportunities."

An instruction sheet from the Chamber of Commerce said that the National Bank of Greece would be able to sponsor the sending of 100,000 such cards to American banking concerns while Hellenic Shipyards, owned by Stavros Niarchos, could send 50,000 messages to American maritime concerns.

"The Anti-Greek propaganda abroad, beyond its purely political aspects, presents elements which may seriously affect economic developments," the Chamber said. "It would be impermissible negligence if the Greek productive class left unanswered such an appeal, which might have a serious impact on the country's national economy."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1968]

PREMARITAL TESTS ORDERED IN GREECE

ATHENS.—The army-backed Government, which seized power a year ago, is trying to improve the health of future Greek generations with compulsory methods.

A new law requires all couples planning to wed to obtain a premarital medical certificate. Social Welfare minister Efstratios Poulantzas said the premarital medical examination was aimed at protecting the health of future generations as well as of the present society.

About 75,000 Greeks take marriage vows each year. Men and women suffering from various ailments or hereditary illnesses now are unable to marry.

Among prohibitive illnesses mentioned in the law are syphilis, tuberculosis, cancer, insanity, heart ailments, alcoholism, leprosy, epilepsy and hemophilia.

Statistics show these illnesses are the cause of about a third of Greece's 68,000 deaths each year, with heart ailments and cancer accounting for about 10,000 deaths apiece.

The certificates are delivered by any qualified doctor chosen by the persons planning to marry.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1968]

GREECE ORDERS CURB ON THE SALE OF MELINA MERCOURI'S RECORDINGS

(By Alvin Shuster)

ATHENS, April 19.—The army-backed regime has decided that Greeks should stop listening to records of one of the regime's most vocal critics abroad, Melina Mercouri, the actress and singer.

It also announced an amnesty to another group of prisoners, but there was no word on how many were involved.

Gen. Odesseus Anghelis, chief of the defense staff, issued a directive to prevent the sale, purchase or lending of any records or tapes containing the voice of Miss Mercouri. She is now in London preparing to mark the junta's first anniversary by leading a protest demonstration Sunday in Trafalgar Square.

Previously the regime had banned the music of Mikis Theodorakis, an acknowledged Communist, after having put him in prison last August on charge of subversion. He was released in January, and the prohibition on his music, including the score of "Zorba the Greek," was reported to have been lifted. Some here say that they have heard them played recently.

The order regarding Miss Mercouri was sent to the Athens newspapers, which are under Government censorship, but it was understood that they were later told not to publish it.

DOUBLE CELEBRATION

The amnesty was expected to be part of a series of announcements from the Government this weekend to celebrate not only its rise to power but the Orthodox Easter as well.

According to a brief announcement, the amnesty applies to those peoples charged with offenses punishable with terms up to a year in prison as well as those already convicted and sentenced to terms of up to six months. Those involved in irregularities in foreign exchange are exempt from the amnesty.

In another action, a second former Premier, Panayotis Canellopoulos, urged the United States to cease any support of the army-backed regime. The appeal from Mr. Canellopoulos, the 64-year-old rightest leader of the National Radical Union, who is under house arrest, came during a talk with a group of British members of Parliament here on a visit, which had been authorized by the junta.

DETAINED ON MONDAY

Mr. Canellopoulos was placed under house arrest last Monday as was George Papandreou, the 80-year-old former Premier and leader of the Center Union.

The British visitors said that the former Premier had told them that "Britain and the United States would cease to be symbols of liberty if they supported the colonels" of the army-backed regime.

According to the Britons, Mr. Canellopoulos said he did not intend to issue a detailed statement to follow the bitter denunciation of the regime made by Mr. Papandreou in a statement that reached foreign correspondents earlier this week.

Like Mr. Papandreou, he was said to have expressed the view that the junta colonels had misled the Greek people when they contended that they had had to assume power to avoid a Communist take-over in Greece.

Our National Crime Crisis

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, crime in our Nation, and especially in our cities, is rising with a terrible rate of increase. It is, without doubt, our most crucial domestic problem, our Nation's shame, and a disgrace to this great country.

I have devoted most of my April newsletter to a discussion of this problem and the responsibilities of every individual in bringing about a solution to the crime crisis. I herewith present the newsletter for my congressional colleagues:

CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT REPORTS, APRIL 1968

RIOTS SCAR NATION'S CITIES

The death of Dr. Martin Luther King set off scores of violent disturbances in the cities of this nation early this month. Few areas of the country were immune, as the looting and burning spread from the deep South to Portland, Oregon.

Violence and lawlessness are tragic directions for the civil rights movement to take. They are doubly tragic, since the majority of the damage is wreaked upon the Negro himself at the same time the riot alienates much of the white community from his cause.

Looting, arson, murder can never be condoned. This nation was established on the basis of law and order. When that law is broken and that order destroyed the basis for individual freedom is undermined—the very freedom that is being sought through the civil rights movement.

WYATT VISITS WASHINGTON RIOT AREAS

In order to get a first-hand appraisal of the situation I spent a full day with two Washington, D.C. police detectives touring the riot-torn areas of that city. The devastation and destruction reminded me of some of the bombed cities during the Second World War. This comparison was all the more obvious because of the presence of U.S. Army and Marine troops in the troubled areas.

TROOPS REQUIRED TO RESTORE ORDER

The armed forces were brought into Washington, D.C., to guard the Capitol and its grounds during the violence. It is a sad situation when the armed might of our military is needed to keep the peace in this country.

RIOTING, CRIME OF ALL KINDS THE MAJOR DOMESTIC PROBLEM

The rate of crime in our nation in the past ten years has soared. Exclusive of the rioting and looting, crime in our streets presents the major domestic problem of our day. The looting, arson, and murder of the recent race riots shows this crime problem even more immediately in need of urgent solution.

Burglaries, larcenies and auto thefts alone accounted for over $600 million in unrecovered losses in 1966. In many of our cities it is unsafe for people to walk the streets after dark. Policemen must walk in two and threes or with police dogs, simply for their own protection. Organized crime is flourishing in light of recent Supreme Court opinions which allow for legal loopholes whereby mobsters may avoid punishment.

OREGON HAS HIGH CRIME RATE

Even Oregon is not immune to the wave of crime and lawlessness that is sweeping our land. According to a 1967 study, sad to say, our state ranks among the top 16 nationally in the number of crimes committed annually per capita.

Though we have been lucky to have escaped much of the racial violence of recent weeks and months, the potential for disturbance is there. Unrest last summer, and again early this month indicate that there may be problems even in Portland.

CRIME PREVENTION AN INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

The growing incidence of crime, including rioting, burning and looting, can be traced to the same root—the increasing tendency in recent years for individuals to abrogate their basic duty as citizens of this country—the duty to uphold the law and to respect it as the basis for our freedoms.

REBIRTH OF RESPECT FOR LAW AND RESPONSIBILITY NEEDED

Every individual in this nation must experience a rebirth of respect for our laws and law enforcement officials. We each must assume part of the responsibility for keeping and preserving the peace, and for combatting crime.

We cannot expect our police forces to control crime when we deny them our support and cooperation. We cannot eliminate looting and rioting if we join the rioters or silently look on with passive assent.

Congress is presently working on a measure which will aid in police training and in local law enforcement. I have given my wholehearted support to this measure as it passed the House. But this alone is not enough. Our police need help, our help. If every one of us makes it his personal duty to go out of his way to respect our laws and to cooperate in their enforcement, only then can we begin to stem the tide of crime.

MEETING HONORS PAST HOUSE MINORITY LEADER

A luncheon meeting honoring retiring Congressman and past Minority Leader Charles Halleck of Indiana was held last month by Beta Theta Pi fraternity. I attended this meeting along with several other Members of Congress, including Congressmen Halleck; Al Ullman, Oregon; Charles Teague, California; John Rhodes, Arizona; Wayne Aspinall, Colorado; and Senator Mark Hatfield, Oregon.

BILL TO FREE DRUG DMSO INTRODUCED

On the ninth of April I introduced a bill in the House which would take jurisdiction over all new drug applications from the Food and Drug Administration and place it in the hands of the National Academy of Sciences. I believe this measure would break the log-jam of pressures which have tied the release of DMSO for full clinical testing in FDA red tape. The bill will now be considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Cosponsoring this bill with me in the House are Congressmen John Dellenback (Ore.), Al Ullman (Ore.), Donald Lukens (Ohio), Henry Schadeberg (Wis.) and Congresswomen Edith Green (Ore.) and Catherine May (Wash.). A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senators Wayne Morse and Mark Hatfield of Oregon.

Senator H. F. Byrd, Jr., Praised

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, Virginia's senior Senator, the Honorable H. F. BYRD, JR., quite worthily continues to grow in stature throughout the Nation. During the years that he has been in Congress, he has manifested the same intense interest in fiscal responsibility and other matters which marked the service of his distinguished late father, one of the dominant figures of the U.S. Senate for more than three decades.

I am glad to note the newspapers and others recognize the astute qualities of our distinguished senior Senator and that the newspapers are calling the attention of their readers to the same, especially his legislative wisdom and political sagacity. During the last month or so, several have made reference to the outstanding work of the Senator, one of them describing him as "one of the foremost thinkers in Congress." Their comments have been so complimentary and, in my opinion, so well merited that I should like to have the same included as a part of the RECORD. They are as follows:

[From the Chicago, Ill., Tribune, Apr. 2, 1968]

With the President's announced abdication, the burden of fixing the nation's course will inevitably devolve upon Congress. We are encouraged to believe that there are some able men of good sense in that body, among whom we would mention such senators as Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Mundt of South Dakota, and Mr. Lausche of Ohio. We hope they will acquit themselves well in the test to come.

[From the Fremont, Ohio, News-Messenger, Mar. 6, 1968]

Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., D.-Va., a newspaper publisher, says military restrictions are justified on news of damage inflicted by the enemy on fixed targets in Vietnam.

Byrd said in a Senate speech that news media should show greater restraint and said some newsmen have "gone far beyond the call of duty" in reporting troop morale, strengths and weaknesses of American positions and probability of enemy success in overrunning outposts.

And Sen. Byrd will find no one here to contradict his beliefs.

[From the Miami, Fla., Herald, Mar. 5, 1968]

Father and son for 35 years the senatorial Byrds of Virginia have stood watch over the public till. Thus we have Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. warning that the 1969 fiscal year budget not only calls for $16 billion more in new appropriations than Congress approved for last year, but far exceeds the revenue of the proposed Johnson tax surcharge.

At 10 percent, the tax nobody wants would bring in $12.9 billion. The deficit gap thus is sizable.

Ten billion dollars of the $16 billion increase, notes Sen. Byrd, is for expanded non-defense spending. Among other things it would provide funds to hire 45,600 additional civilian employees.

If the Byrd guard detail has not been particularly effective at least it has been informative. One day an aroused electorate will have had enough of the fiscal nonsense which it has been fed for a generation and more.

[From the Pontiac, Mich., Press, Mar. 18, 1968]

On page one today, The Press prints a statement by Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., D.-Va. Sen. Byrd is a long-time friend and I evaluate the man first hand. I commend his remarks to you most highly.

He is one of the most forthright thinkers in Congress. Sen. Byrd is a Democrat but he's an American first and places his duty to his country far ahead of everything else. No one anywhere has any strings on him. He has no "entangling alliances."

[From the Elyria, Ohio, Chronicle-Telegram, Mar. 16, 1968]

"No one has yet invented a way to finance government without cost to the taxpayer. There are only ways of putting off the day of reckoning."

That fact of economic life is pointed out again by Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., (D-Va.) in an article in Spotlight, a publication of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

The article was written before the gold crisis developments of the last few days, but it is especially timely in view of that crisis.

"No government," Sen. Byrd wrote, "can play a constructive role in the lives of its citizens except on the basis of economic strength. It is not that dollars are more important than people and their needs. It is simply that without a sound dollar, all programs and projects financed by the government will be undermined."

Sen. Byrd's warning deserves thoughtful consideration by all Americans. The day of reckoning may be nearer than most Americans have believed.

[From the Staunton, Va., Leader, Apr. 4, 1968]

The Senate would have won considerable applause had it also written into its excise tax bill the proposal of Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., D-Va., to ban loans to countries trading with the Communist enemy in Vietnam.

Andreas Papandreou Meets the Press

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 10 the guest on the National Broadcasting Co.'s "Meet the Press" was Andreas Papandreou, chairman of the Panhellenic Liberation Movement and former Greek Cabinet member, Mr. Papandreou, who was freed in December after 8 months' imprisonment, spoke forcefully for restoration of liberties in Greece and against the oppressive military rulers who have governed for more than a year. It is particularly fitting that Mr. Papandreou's comments be reprinted at this time, because yesterday, April 21, was the anniversary of the coup that plunged Greece into darkness.

The "Meet the Press" interviewers were Robert Novak, of the Chicago Sun-Times, Philip L. Geyelin, of the Washington Post, and James Robinson and Lawrence E. Spivak, of NBC. Edwin Newman of NBC was the moderator. The full text of the interview follows:

Mr. NEWMAN. Our guest today on "Meet the Press" is Andreas Papandreou, the exiled Greek political leader who is coordinating the Greek resistance movement. Mr. Papandreou was a member of the Greek Cabinet and Parliament, and he served as chief aide to his father, George Papandreou when he was Prime Minister.

A former naturalized American, Mr. Papandreou was an economics professor at the University of California before he returned to Greece in 1963 to enter politics.

He was charged with high treason under the government of King Constantine and later arrested by the military junta. He was recently released from prison and has just arrived in this country on a visit.

We will have the first questions now from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, in your speech before the ADA last night, you said, "I must add that the U. S. Embassy in Athens gave strong moral support to the King and the Greek establishment in their violation of the democratic processes in Greece, thus paving the way for the military coup of April 21, 1967."

Are you charging the United States with responsibility for the coup?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. The United States Embassy I charge with historic responsibility, not necessarily involvement in the coup itself. Actually coups don't occur accidentally. An atmosphere has to precede a coup, and the U.S. Embassy, I think, participated in creating the atmosphere that led to the coup, Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. You went further. The Washington Post quotes you as saying that the "present Prime Minister of Greece, Mr. Papadopoulos, is probably the first CIA agent who has managed to become a Prime Minister."

Are you saying that the United States helped put him in power?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. That is a fact, what I said in Oslo. Namely, Mr. Papadopoulos was the key coordinator of the Natsainas KYP, the KYP leader in Greece. KYP is the CIA of Greece, the Greek CIA. Papadopoulos was the contact man with the American CIA.

And I add that the American CIA finances the Greek CIA directly, not via the Greek Government, as Mr. Sulzberger himself, has disclosed in an editorial in The New York Times.

Mr. SPIVAK. Are you saying that the United States could have prevented the coup?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. The United States might not have been in a position to prevent the coup, but the United States could surely have overthrown the junta, had it wished.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you say now that the United States ought to help overthrow the dictatorship?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. No less than that, Mr. Spivak. I would, however, qualify by saying surely it should not assist the junta, and the recent exhibitions of friendship, and the U.S.S. Roosevelt, the recent statements of Admiral Horatio Rivero in favor of the junta in Greece surely shocked the democratic forces of Greece that are struggling for a free country, for a country that can take its place among the western nations.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, when you look back to the period when you and your father ran the government, do you find you too may have been to blame for the coup to some degree?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Mr. Spivak, no one is ever free, totally, of some historic responsibility. No one. And it is not for me to judge whether I am or not. It is for others to judge.

Mr. GEYELIN. Mr. Papandreou, I understood you to say that you thought we should have moved in and thrown the junta out in the first instance. How do you do that?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. This is more complicated than that, Mr. Geyelin. If the United States did not lend its moral and material support to the government of the junta, the junta would collapse of its own weight, for it has no strength among the Greek people, and it has no strength in fact among the Greek armed services.

Mr. GEYELIN. Was there no danger of a civil war at that time?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Of course not. The junta has charged that the Communists had arms with which they would threaten to overtake the country. In the ten months of their government they have not been able to discover one single cache of arms. And, after all, the Democratic Center forces were overwhelmingly in the majority in Greece.

Mr. GEYELIN. Is it your view now that the Communists are possibly getting stronger, although you apparently believe there was no threat at the time of the coup? Do you think the junta is creating a threat?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I should think that as time goes on it is quite likely that the more extremist forces in the country will become dominant.

Mr. GEYELIN. All you would have us do now, as I understand it, is what? Withdraw recognition from this government or withdraw all aid? What would you have us do, specifically?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Let me put it this way: Recognition is a formal thing. Sometimes one recognizes even governments it doesn't like. First of all: to stop the display of enthusiasm, love and affection for the government; second: to stop shipping arms to the junta with which they subjugate the Greek people. After all, what are the Greek people to say when the alliance which they joined to protect their freedoms arms this mafia, these few officers, to keep the country in bondage.

Mr. NOVAK. Following up Mr. Geyelin's question about extremist elements in the resistance, Mr. Papandreou, the government-controlled Greek newspapers are now contending that your call for a united liberation front is in effect an invitation for the Communists to cooperate with you, is that correct?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Mr. Novak, the Panhellenic Liberation Movement, which I have the honor to lead today, calls upon all Greeks, not upon parties, not upon party platforms, to join in the effort to overthrow the junta and establish on a permanent and solid basis a democratic process, democratic institutions. Those Greeks who wish to offer time, effort and their life in the effort to establish democracy in Greece—which, after all, is the key principle of the Western World—those Greeks are all welcome. None excluded.

Mr. NOVAK. Even if they are Communists?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I will not look at the files of an individual. Any individual who wishes to offer his services for democracy may offer his services. We do not form a front among parties. We merely call upon the Greeks to join the effort to one single objective: overthrow the junta and establish a democratic government where the Greek people freely, with judicial protection, may express their views and run their own country.

Mr. NOVAK. As far as not forming a front among parties is concerned, as I understand it, the leader of the Greek Communist Party, the KKE, speaking from Rumania, had endorsed your purposes.

Do you rebuff that endorsement or do you refuse to in any way collaborate with him?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. My position, Mr. Novak, I have made very clear. The Panhellenic Liberation Movement is a coordination of resistance movements. It is not a collaboration among parties.

Mr. NOVAK. Going back, Mr. Papandreou, in April, at the time of the coup, some of the colonels claimed that if you had—if the elections had taken place and the Center Union Party had won, you would have invited Communists into the government in a coalition popular front. Was that charge correct or not?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Mr. Novak, why should it be valid—after all, our party had 53 per cent of the vote in '64. On the basis of objective estimates, we would have had more than 53 per cent of the total national vote in '67. Why would any party invite any other party to collaborate when it can run the country on the basis of its own strength? So the question itself is not a sensible question—not your question, but the question that has been put and which you transmit.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreou, you have made some very serious charges saying that the Central Intelligence Agency of this country is directly supporting the junta leaders,

and you have said you would bring out proof of these charges. When could we see these proofs?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. When did I make the charge that it is supporting? And in what fashion did I make the charge?

Mr. ROBINSON. You said the Prime Minister Papadopoulos was in the pay of the CIA. You said that the Minister of Coordination—

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Not in the pay. What I said was that Mr. Papadopoulos was the contact man between the Greek CIA and the American CIA and that the American CIA financed directly the activities of the Greek CIA, not via the government, a question which as Minister to the Prime Minister I raised—one of the reasons in fact that I have been charged, early, as being anti-American, a charge that is false, [but] I am against interference of the irresponsible agencies in the internal affairs of other countries.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreou, as far as I can see from your country, you have had no support there. The Center Union Party has denounced you, Karamanlis, probably one of the most famous Greek exiles, has not come to your support. The Royal Family has not come to your support. Where is your backing?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Mr. Robinson, the Center Party has never denounced me. One man dared say something under the pressure from the junta, and he has been scratched from books of the party officially in Greece. Mr. Spanoriggas who made this statement is no longer a member of the Center Union. As for Mr. Karamanlis, I don't need Mr. Karamanlis' support. He is the head of a different party. As for the King, he has no business supporting anybody, me included.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreou, when you went to the United States Embassy in Athens a few weeks ago to get a visa——

Mr. PAPANDREOU. No, not to get a visa; I got my visa in Paris.

Mr. ROBINSON. The United States Embassy anyway reported back to this government here that you gave them assurances that you would not indulge in political activities while in this country. Is this true?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Quite to the contrary, there was no discussion about what I would be doing. When asked by Mr. Pattakos, the Deputy Premier of the junta what I would do abroad, I said I would be true to myself; you know my history and you can guess the rest. And my discussion with Mr. Talbot had nothing to do with my own personal plans.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, as you know you have been called far left by some and Communist by others. How do you describe your politics?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. My politics can be described in very few words. Politically I am a fanatic democrat. I believe in the Bill of Rights, the freedom of speech, of press, of syndicalist and political organization.

I believe, second, in a judicial system which is independent of the executive and can protect the citizen from police and arbitrary executive intervention.

Socially and economically, I am what you may call a New Dealer. Insofar as foreign policy is concerned, I believe that Greece as a member of the western alliance ought to have a voice in matters that affect its own future. It should not be a satellite, but an ally. And I do want to register my great chagrin, Mr. Spivak, that today this alliance that Greece joined to protect its freedom is supplying the junta with arms. This is unacceptable, Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Would you under any circumstances support a Communist regime in Greece or would you fight it as you are now fighting the junta?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I am against totalitarianism of all forms, Mr. Spivak, and this is something that is in the record. I shall fight for freedom no matter who threatens it.

Mr. GEYELIN. Mr. Papandreou, when you attack the United States government for its policy in Greece, are you talking about President Johnson's policy or the Secretary of State's, or are you suggesting that there are agencies such as CIA that are out of control and beyond the effective discipline of the government?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I have myself been very puzzled to understand the way the political process leads to a policy, a foreign policy. I am aware from my experience in Greece that the various agencies of the U. S. government have often not been in accord and that often the more irresponsible elements make out—the responsible elements being forced to follow a fait accompli.

Mr. GEYELIN. Would you have us now cut off economic assistance of all kinds to the junta at the expense of the people in order to weaken them?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Indeed I would. For the Greek people have to bear one kind of sacrifice or another. One is the economic sacrifice for the short run. But if the junta were to survive because of economic and military support of the West, then the sacrifices would be much greater for they would have to engage in an active resistance effort, very costly, very costly indeed to Greece, Europe and the free world as well.

Mr. GEYELIN. The junta is making a campaign now through a public relations agency in this country to attract private American investment. What is your advice to those potential investors?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Stay out, for when we return to Greece, we shall question all those who decided to help the junta during this period.

Mr. NOVAK. Mr. Papandreou, in your address to the ADA last night, you said that the junta did not even have the support of the Army last April. Do you feel that there is still lack of support in the Army, and that is the basis for a possible counter coup today?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Yes, Mr. Novak, I believe this quite deeply, because the Greek Army today resents the fact that a Mafia, using the intelligence apparataus at its disposal, has taken over control, has sacked over 2,000 NATO-trained officers, and is attempting through intelligence methods and through political commissars in every unit to run the Army. There is no longer an Army in Greece. It is a setup of political cliques. The Army resents this and will have the opportunity itself, we believe, to upset the junta.

Mr. NOVAK. Why didn't the Army then respond to King Constantine's attempted coup in December? In fact, why didn't the people, if they were as anti-junta as you say—why didn't they respond to the King in December?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. It is a monument of mismanagement, Mr. Novak. The Army, itself, had not been alerted. The King, himself, decided suddenly on the date of the coup, in response to Mr. Karamanlis' appeal to the Greek people the 9th of December—I think the King became concerned that Mr. Karamanlis would make the coup and chose to make it very rapidly himself to prevent Karamanlis from carrying through a coup against the junta. It was so badly managed. And, first of all, how would the people know? He didn't even have a radio station. A taped statement from Larissa, a second-rate station, reached some Greeks.

Now, of course, I have to add that the King could have stayed there and fought. He could have. In Macedonia there were military forces ready to fight and win. As for the Greek people, the King is not a symbol they can easily follow after the events of July, 1965, and thereafter.

Mr. NOVAK. Are you suggesting that if Mr. Karamanlis had led the coup, if it had gone as you say it was originally planned, that it might have been successful?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. His record is far superior to that of the King. I think it might have been better.

Mr. NOVAK. One thing I don't quite understand is that in the Nazi occupation in World War II there were repeated incidents throughout the villages of Greece against the occupation forces, even though it meant death. Why are there no such incidents against the junta if the people are against the junta?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. It is not quite true there is no resistance in Greece, Mr. Novak. Publicity is a little difficult to get. Let's not forget we have 4,000 prisoners today and heavy convictions; we have mass firings of Army officers and civil servants. What do these things suggest? Why the tortures today? One should read the Amnesty International Report, Mr. Novak, to know the extent to which this junta has surpassed the Nazi techniques in psychopathic punishment and torture, things which are not well known abroad, for the public relations firms, including the Litton firm, which has turned out to be nothing else but a public relations firm for the junta, managed to put a cover of secrecy over what happens in Greece.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreou, you were a very prominent personality in Greece. Don't you think it is strange that the junta let you go?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I do indeed. I think it is one of their critical errors. They will regret it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Might they think that you are not particularly dangerous to their——

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I think that this is what they thought, and it is not for me to judge whether I am or not, but I believe they will regret this mistake.

Mr. ROBINSON. Did you give the junta assurances that you would not engage in political activity when you went abroad?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. Quite to the contrary. None. Quite to the contrary. I said flatly that I would return to the Greek political life when the people called for me. Quite to the contrary. I have made the opposite statement.

Mr. ROBINSON. These statements you are making abroad, does this not endanger your father?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. It endangers my father, indeed, and possibly myself.

I think that I should mention to you today, Mr. Robinson, that a government newspaper asked that the prosecutor in Greece, the public prosecutor, visit my father and ask him whether he allies himself with me or not. If he allies himself with me, then he has to be charged before a court martial with high treason. If he disowns me, then, of course, this means something for his political—his great political and historic career. This is the kind of people they are, and so far as my personal safety is concerned—you asked earlier about evidence. Well, I have evidence. It is in a safe and it is my security.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Papandreou, just before the coup d'etat last year, you made a speech where you charged that the CIA formulated American policy, and you criticized this policy for trying to isolate the Soviet bloc from making gross errors in Vietnam, in Latin America and with our allies in NATO. Do you still stand on these charges?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I have made—it is not a charge; it is an observation, and it is an observation which I believe objective and which I make with a great deal of sadness, Mr. Robinson, because I have lived and worked and enjoyed my life here for 22 years. I, along with many others who today are Americans—I am no longer one—feel that the foreign policy formation process in this country does not satisfy the rules of democratic government which exist in all other sectors. The checks and balances which are so important in all democratic processes in your country don't work in the case of foreign policy. The Pentagon and CIA and State Department bureaucracy play more of a role than they should. This is my point, and it is a point of critical importance to the survi-

val, not only of your country, but of all the western world, Mr. Robinson.

Mr. NEWMAN. Gentleman, we have about three minutes left. Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, in a recent article you wrote "Above all, Greece insists that its allies cease interfering in its internal political affairs."

Aren't you in effect, by what you are saying here today, interfering in our political affairs?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. No, I think not. We are too small, Mr. Spivak, to interfere in the affairs of big, great, America. However, our own fate is tied up with what America does, and to make a clear plea, Mr. Spivak, to the American people and the American political world to come to the assistance of the democratic forces of Greece is surely not interference in the internal affairs of the United States.

Mr. SPIVAK. Aren't you then asking us though to interfere in the political affairs—

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I am.

Mr. SPIVAK. Where is the logic of that?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. The logic is very simple, Mr. Spivak. When a country is occupied by an enemy force, then we are entitled to ask all peoples to come to our assistance. The Greek people are not sovereign today. If they were sovereign, I would not ask for any interference.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Papandreou, there have been reports that you have been in touch with King Constantine and that you have been seeking to heal the breach between you. Are those reports true?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. They are not. I have taken no initiative. So far as the breach is concerned, it is irrelevant. In politics personal animosities should play no role.

Mr. SPIVAK. Would you like to see the King back on the throne?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. My personal view, Mr. Spivak, is that the Greek people ought to decide this question. My personal views are quite irrelevant.

Mr. NEWMAN. Two minutes, gentlemen.

Mr. GEYELIN. Mr. Papandreou, I understood you to say that the junta would fall, really, quite easily if we withheld our support, that it has no popularity amongst the people and not even any support in the Army.

What does keep it in power?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. An intelligence apparatus with modern technology. Use the tanks, the bazookas and a very good communications system and spy system and you can go a long way indeed, Mr. Geyelin.

Mr. NOVAK. Mr. Papandreou, you have met with some conservative exiled Greek leaders in Europe. Quite apart from the King, do you think it is possible that these conservatives will cooperate with you in the Liberation council?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I believe that members of the right, of the center and of the left, indeed, in an overwhelming majority, will join forces to overthrow the junta.

Mr. NOVAK. Can you name any members of the right now exiled cooperating with you?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. I prefer not to make any mention of names, Mr. Novak.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is charged that in 1938 you were arrested by the Metaxas regime and that you confessed at that time to being a member of the Communist Party, that you were a Trotskyite. Is this true?

Mr. PAPANDREOU. First of all, let's make a distinction. Member of the Communist Party and Trotskyite are not the same thing, Mr. Robinson.

Mr. ROBINSON. You said you were a Trotskyite.

Mr. PAPANDREOU. No, excuse me, Mr. Robinson. I was tortured for many days. My jaw was broken, and at some point when I was punch drunk a piece of paper, already prepared was brought to me and I did sign the paper, whatever it contained—which I do not remember at this moment, as a matter of fact. This is the story of that incident. I was fighting for democracy then too, against a brutal dictatorship.

Mr. NEWMAN. I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up. Thank you, Mr. Papandreou, for being with us today on "Meet the Press."

Judicial Legislation

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a good part of the uncertainty and confusion that troubles our country is due to judges writing legislation into judicial decisions rather than deciding cases according to precedent as a proper interpretative function. When the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court—often by the narrowest of margins, 5 to 4—add the "hooker" that a contrary view is unconstitutional, the only remedy is by constitutional amendment, which they well know is laborious, time consuming, and unlikely.

Lawyers around the country are becoming increasingly concerned as they seek to advise clients on what courses of action are permissible. One such lawyer is Edward F. Cummerford of the New York bar, who wrote of the "judicial jumble" in the Wall Street Journal of April 22, 1968. Mr. Cummerford's remarks are well taken and I am including them in the RECORD at this point since it is without question of the most fundamental importance that we preserve in America a government of law and not of men:

JUDICIAL JUMBLE: ACTIVISM IS THREAT TO GOVERNMENT OF LAWS AND NOT OF MEN

(By Edward F. Cummerford)

The formal boundary between responsible self-government on the one side and tyranny or anarchy on the other is often termed "the rule of law." Never has that tenuous line been in such danger of obliteration in this country. The rule of law is mocked and attacked, not only by the criminal multitude, but by supposedly responsible elements. Educators and clergy urge us to break laws we do not like, and eager mobs implement their ideas with destructive violence: labor unions violate laws that impinge upon their power and defy court orders, usually with impunity; public officials blandly refuse to enforce the law if their political futures might suffer.

But ironically, it is within the courts themselves that the most serious threat to the rule of law has developed. This comes from a radically new concept of the judicial function called "activism." Judicial activism had its genesis in the Supreme Court about 25 years ago, when some of the Justices began to abandon the age-old principle of *stare decisis* upon which American and English law had been based for centuries. *Stare decisis* meant simply that the principles derived from previous decisions formed a body of controlling law for future decisions. The primary duty of the judge, after the facts of a case were determined, was to find the law applicable to such facts and decide accordingly, regardless of his personal feelings. On this system rested what Americans proudly called "a government of laws and not of men."

Judicial activism means that judges strive for what they deem a "just" result in a case in the light of their own philosophies and socio-economic values, with settled legal principles being accorded little or no weight. Thus decisions turn more and more upon "who" is the judge than upon "what" is the law. As a result, law is rapidly losing its certainty, stability and continuity. Jurisprudence is becoming the handmaiden of sociology.

This concept of the judicial function reaches its apogee in the doctrine, if that is what it may be called, that even the meaning of the Constitution itself may be changed by the Supreme Court if necessary to achieve "justice" or "equality." While the power of the Court to clarify parts of the Constitution in the first instance cannot be doubted, it is no corollary that the Court may, at its pleasure, keep changing such meaning. The Constitution specifically provides for its own amendment with procedures that completely exclude the Supreme Court.

Some contemporary pseudo-scholars of the law would have us believe that judicial activism is a proper function of courts, entirely consistent with the historical development of law. This is just not true.

WILL OF THE LAW

Let us consider what some of the leading legal minds of the past, men whom proponents of activism claim as philosophical antecedents, have thought about the question. John Marshall, our greatest Chief Justice, declared bluntly in a landmark case: "Judicial power is never exercised for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the judge; always for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the legislature; or in other words, to the will of the law." Charles Evans Hughes, usually ranked second only to Marshall among Chief Justices, is often cited as an authority for the notion that the Supreme Court can change the meaning of the Constitution. This is based on a fragment from an extemporaneous speech in 1907—"the Constitution is what the judges say it is." Mr. Hughes angrily denied having meant any such thing, but the out-of-context words plagued him for the rest of his life and to this day are quoted in textbooks and by professors to justify a concept he abhorred.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, a most influential legal scholar and for 30 years a Supreme Court Justice, maintained that judges should keep their own social and economic views out of decision-making. Benjamin N. Cardozo, Mr. Holmes' disciple and successor on the Court, set forth in painstaking detail the historical and philosophical criteria to be employed by judges in reaching decisions. A liberal like Justice Holmes, he did not believe that the law must be static and never change.

He would have been shocked, however, at decisions that lightly discard decades of settled law on the strength of sociological or economic theories. Justice Cardozo observed: "Lawyers who are unwilling to study the law as it is may discover, as they think, that study is unnecessary; sentiment or benevolence or some vague notion of social welfare becomes the only equipment needed. I hardly need to say that this is not my point of view."

Sir Frederick Pollock, probably the chief authority in modern times on Anglo-American jurisprudence, repeatedly cautioned that judges should follow established precedents and legislative intent, not their personal views, in reaching decisions. Two other important jurist-scholars, Felix Frankfurter and Learned Hand, were extremely critical of judicial activism. Mr. Frankfurter, a protege of Holmes, went on the Supreme Court a "liberal" in 1939 and retired a "conservative" in 1962—but it was the Court, not Mr. Frankfurter, which had undergone the greater change. Justice Harlan speaks of the idea that all social ills can be cured by courts as having "subtle capacity for serious mischief."

PURE GUESSWORK

The criticism is not confined to Olympian levels. The legal profession finds it increasingly difficult to know just what the "law"

is; hence, attorneys cannot advise clients of the merits of their cases with much assurance. If the outcome of a case depends more on the personal philosophy of the judge than on any other consideration, it is pure guesswork. What was once "Constitutional" suddenly becomes "unconstitutional." Countless Supreme Court decisions are by 5-to-4 votes, often accompanied by several different opinions and bitter, sarcastic dissents. This is the precarious state of law today.

Some activist judges go to great lengths to make sure that they will not be thought of as having unbiased minds. In speeches, articles and letters to editors they frequently take positions on controversial questions. High-ranking judges have even publicly expressed opinions on delicate questions involved in cases awaiting decisions in their own courts—judicial behavior that a generation ago would have been considered reprehensible.

No matter what euphemisms are employed to disguise its effects, careful reflection must lead to only one conclusion: Judicial activism is not merely inconsistent with the rule of law, it is the total negation of the rule of law. If cases are decided on the personal philosophies of judges, then in reality there is no law. If the Constitution has no objective meaning but means only what judges think it ought to mean, it is not a constitution at all but an empty symbol, a sort of national totem. History shows that vague laws, subjectively interpreted and arbitrarily applied, are the tools of tyrants. The equation is as old as the human race—power minus responsibility equals despotism.

Out of the vast crucible of human experience and travail we have constructed a splendid system of law and courts that it is our duty to sustain and improve. The beating heart of that system is the judge. If his mind is a closed one, which recognizes no authority save his own predilections, then all the long shelves filled with lawbooks, the great marble columns and the black robes are but superficial trappings cloaking a traversty.

Judges, like other mortals, need a large measure of humility—the conviction that one human mind can embrace but a tiny particle of all wisdom and knowledge. As one of our most respected living judges, Harold R. Medina, has expressed it so well: "I don't think I have any propensity or desire to mold the law to my own views . . . If I had a question of statutory interpretation and I was convinced the statute meant, and was intended to mean, one thing, I would never decide it meant just the opposite because I though it was desirable social or economic policy to do so. This twisting and stretching is not for me."

Nor should it be for any judge.

Baltimore's Friendship Airport

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago last Thursday, April 18, Baltimore's Friendship International Airport was like a bride left waiting at the altar—all dressed up and no place to go.

As airports go, Friendship was not exactly a booming enterprise back there in 1958. In fact, she was acquiring the label: "That ghost airport over there in Maryland."

Friendship, to be precise, was not even an international airport from a practical standpoint 10 years ago. It did not originate a single international flight.

Happily all that has changed.

The change began when Pan American World Airways, using a DC–6B, began three-a-week flights from Baltimore to San Juan, P.R. The date was April 18, 1958—10 years ago this past Thursday.

Then and there, Friendship began to grow, to attract other carriers, and to slowly but steadily assume stature among the great international air terminals of the continent.

The story of this growth is impressive:

In 1958, Friendship handled fewer passengers than live in Indianapolis, Ind., a city of 460,000 plus. Last year, 1967, 2½ million passengers passed through Friendship—almost 2½ times as many persons as live in nearby Baltimore.

Today swift jets fly daily from Friendship to London, Paris, and service to Latin America has been expanded.

Pan American, an early partner in Friendship's expanding operations, flew only 3,000 passengers and 100,000 pounds of cargo to and from the airport in that first year, 1958.

Last year, those figures had swollen to 60,000 passengers and 2,600,000 pounds of cargo.

If 10 years ago, Friendship was a bride abandoned, then certainly today she is a happy wife with a dazzling future.

In the supersonic age just ahead, Friendship International will be able to handle the biggest jets on her fine strong runways.

It is a distinct pleasure to be able to pay this tribute today to that airport they once called a "ghost."

The ghost is dead, killed by the faith and daring of the people of Baltimore, of Maryland, and the confidence of the airline industry in the success of this splendid facility.

The determination 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker, to make Friendship an international airport was reached by a man who is considered the world's greatest authority on international flight—Mr. Juan T. Trippe, chairman of the Board of Pan American World Airways. We in Maryland are particularly proud of Mr. Trippe's contributions to international flight because the Trippe family has a Maryland history and background dating back to Revolutionary days. It was like a native son returning when Mr. Trippe directed the commencement of Pan American operations out of Friendship 10 years ago.

April 18, 1968, Mr. Speaker, is indeed a day to remember in Baltimore.

Times of Tragedy and Challenge

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this year, the Merchants & Manufacturers Association of Bush Terminal, Inc., one of the truly outstanding organizations in Brooklyn, is celebrating its 52d anniversary.

I was deeply honored to be invited to address the association's spring speaker's luncheon on April 18—the first woman to be awarded this distinction in the history of the association.

It was an exciting experience for me to be able to exchange views on some of the basic problems confronting our community and country with this distinguished group of businessmen headed by Mr. Ted Hambley, president of the M. & M. Association.

As a Representative in Congress from the Borough of Brooklyn, I shall continue to work for the interests of our people, our community, and our country.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my remarks at the April 18 luncheon follows:

TIMES OF TRAGEDY AND CHALLENGE

I appreciate your kind invitation to join you for this monthly luncheon—and to share with you my views on some of the crucial issues confronting our country and city.

I can begin by pointing out that we do not meet under the most auspicious signs.

The din of clashing arms fills the air. Violence and anger are having their day. Logic, reason, and understanding seem to have lost their appeal.

The fiber of our people—the fabric of our society—the power and the resolve of our nation, are being severely tested both at home and abroad.

These times place heavy demands on all of us.

At home, we have lived with violence—or under its dreadful shadow—for nearly two weeks.

Sparked by the tragic and senseless murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, this violence found its vent in the equally senseless and tragic destruction of human lives and material resources in a score or more of our cities.

At a time when we were beginning to grope our way out of the woods—when our elective governments—on all levels—were beginning to address themselves to long-neglected problems; when our community organizations—ignoring color and religious barriers—were joining together in a common effort to help the disadvantaged and the dispossessed; when individuals—young and old, black and white, rich and poor—were laying the predicate for a viable, cooperating, healthy society—just at that very moment, the assassin's bullet found its mark—violence flared—and lawlessness reigned.

Before long, the reaction began to set in and to undo the progress of the past ten years.

And this Nation hesitated on the verge of taking a giant step into the darkness, and ignorance, and prejudice of the past.

I am not an alarmist by nature.

Neither am I the permissive type who insists that a child, or an adolescent, will be permanently repressed unless you allow him to beat your brains out.

I stand some place in the middle—believing that we must move with the times—having faith in the good will and the intelligence of each succeeding generation—admitting to the wrongs of the past—yet insisting, and insisting with every ounce of our conviction in my bones, that—you cannot have progress without some semblance of order; you cannot have freedom without responsibility; you cannot achieve a better society by destroying society itself—and the law which is the foundation of our freedom.

I sorrowed with the millions who wept at Dr. Martin Luther King's death—I hoped with the millions who shared his dream of a new America—an America reformed without bloodshed and violence; and I bowed my head in shame that my own nation would kill two leaders of our time in a single, brief period of five years.

But I have never condoned—and I shall never attempt to excuse or justify—those who, with mindless anger, tear at the very

sinews of our society, attempt to set us against each other, defy the law which is their ultimate personal protection, and try to lead us down the path of violence and hate to the denial of everything that has been worthwhile in our country's past.

And for this reason, I will continue to support—effective anti-crime legislation; federal controls on the indiscriminate proliferation of guns in our cities; better pay, training and equipment for our law-enforcement agencies; improved education, fair-priced housing, consumer protection, and an opportunity to earn a decent living, for the dispossessed, the disadvantaged, and the discriminated-against members of our community who want to make a better world for their children; and I shall support every other program or project which has as its goal the awakening of civic consciousness, and respect for law, among the young, the willful, and the indifferent segments of our society.

For the time has come to set aright many things in this country—and each one of us must play his, or her, part in this historic process.

I also feel that the time has come to take stock of certain developments abroad—to review our national priorities—and to set our course into the wind which will carry our ship of state into a more peaceful, more purposeful and more fruitful decade than the tragedy- and trouble-ridden years of the 1960's.

For we cannot carry—virtually alone—the heavy burdens of free world security.

We cannot continue to overspend abroad, risking the downfall of the dollar and, with it, of the monetary and trading systems of the world on which our own prosperity so heavily depends.

And we cannot continue to pay only slightly more than lip service to the cause of the anguished millions in Central and Latin America—in Africa, the Middle East and the Far East—the millions who, by the sheer weight of their numbers, will ordain the course of progress, of peace, or of growing conflict, in the decade of the 1970's.

During the past three years, our attention and our resources have been committed to the bloody struggle in South Vietnam.

We have lost nearly 20,000 American boys—and some 100 billion dollars of our national treasure—in that conflict.

I do not think that those sacrifices were ill-conceived.

Perhaps because I have lived longer than many of those who are dedicated to getting out of Vietnam at any cost—perhaps because I have eight grandchildren who will some day benefit from our foresight and suffer from our shortsightedness—perhaps because I have lived through two World Wars and some 50 smaller world conflicts—or, perhaps for all of these reasons, I do not believe that you can build peace, and order, and security, by yielding to violence, to lawlessness, and to aggression.

I believe that we must meet these disruptive forces with resasoned, controlled strength—or else, we shall reap the whirlwind unleashed by our own cowardice or indifference.

Whether we like it or not, we are a world power of the first rank.

We also live in an age in which the forces of revolution—stimulated, enticed and guided by Communist ideology—are hellbent on destroying the existing order and plunging the world into mass violence and disorder to be followed by an era of totalitarian, Communist regimes.

We have to stand up to these forces.

We must blunt their destructive purpose.

And we must allow change, and revolution, to occur within a framework of at least a modicum of order, freedom and security.

We have been trying to do this in Vietnam. We have thwarted a Communist take-over of that country—we have given the South Vietnamese the opportunity to establish a viable Government and a sizeable defense force—and we have stood ready, at all times, to talk peace with the aggressors—but not to surrender.

Today the dividends of our policy and of our national resolve are beginning to appear on the horizon, judging from all indications, Hanoi and the Viet Cong are getting ready to negotiate. If this is really the case—as I earnestly hope it is—then peace may soon come to Vietnam, freedom may come to be strengthened, and our forces will be able to return to their home bases.

With the challenge in Vietnam met—and, hopefully, resolved—we can start looking forward to the task of reshaping our priorities and reallocating our resources.

In doing this, we must remember—first, that we have to retain our strong strategic defense force—for without it, there will be no security for free men anywhere; and second, that we have to live up to our commitments to Western Europe and the Middle East, as we did in Vietnam.

The difference here, however, particularly with respect to our commitment to Western Europe, is profound. For while our word must continue to be good—and while we may have to continue to contribute more than 70 per cent of the cost of our common defense by maintaining our strategic nuclear strike force, we should not have to pay for keeping more than half a million troops and dependents in Western Europe.

Surely the need for those expenditures on our part can be reexamined.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have urged strongly that we either substantially reduce the number of our troops and dependents stationed in Western Europe—or secure a much more substantial contribution to their support from our NATO allies.

This, it seems to me, is a course dictated by prudence.

Perhaps we could not have embarked upon that course while the tide seemed to be running against us in Vietnam. Many Europeans seemed ready to construe such a move as a sign of weakness, of our readiness to abandon Europe for the sake of our goals in Vietnam.

We never intended this to be the case. Western Europe remains a vital component of our national security, and of our economic well-being. We are tied to her by heritage and by our common respect for the fundamental principles of the Western Civilization. We shall never abandon our allies on that continent.

But facts are facts. The Western Europeans *can* pay *more* of the cost of our common defense. And we should insist that they do so.

We can improve our balance of payments position in other ways, also.

For one, we really ought to reduce the number of Americans assigned to our Embassies and other posts abroad. There are too many of them for the work which they are doing. And they are costing us a sizeable amount of money each year.

We can save that money by reforming our foreign service system—the career system—and reducing our personnel costs abroad.

We can also—at least temporarily—discourage foreign spending by our tourists.

Last year, our tourists spent $3.6 billion abroad. That was equivalent to the deficit in our balance of payments.

I do not believe that our Government should interfere with our citizen's right to travel abroad. I also feel that legitimate business trips should not be made more difficult or expensive. But it seems to me that, by and large, many of our people could *defer* foreign travel for a year or two and see the United States instead.

It would help our balance of payments—and it would help their kids learn more about this wonderful land of ours.

Finally, I think that we ought to continue our present restraints on the outflow of investment capital to Western Europe.

It won't hurt us that much, and it can produce double dividends.

We have already invested nearly $30 billion dollars in Western Europe's productive facilities.

American interests already own some of the best, the most advanced, and sometimes the most profitable, factories of Europe.

The continuation of this policy of rapid acquisition of existing European factories can become a double-edged sword directed against us:

In the short run, it hurts our balance of payments; and in the long run it creates increasing resentment on the continent against the "rich," "acquisitive" Americans.

A measure of restraint is certainly indicated in this field.

There is one area of foreign expenditures in which I feel that we should not retrench but, rather, do more.

This is the area of foreign aid.

I realize that to many people, the term "foreign aid" has a vaguely unpleasant connotation.

It evokes the image of U.S. taxpayer's dollars being used to buy champagne glasses for a hotel in the Caribbean—to dump used and *unusable* equipment on some unsuspecting recipient in the Near-East—or, simply, to prop the regime of some penny-ante dictator.

There have been such instances in the history of our foreign aid. But do they really *represent* our foreign aid effort?

I know that they do not. And so do you. Because by comparing the amount of money involved in these exceptional instances with the overall size of our foreign aid effort, we can readily determine that the mistakes and the unwise investments account for only a small fraction of 1 per cent of our aid program.

This record compares favorably with the loss experience of most of our successful business enterprises.

I do not say this to excuse flaws in the administration of foreign aid. I am simply trying to put those flaws in a proper perspective. At the same time, I would like to call your attention to some facts which are seldom played up by our press.

What are these facts?

Fact No. 1 is that foreign aid advances our national interests in both the short-run and in the long-run.

In the short-run, over 95 per cent of the commodity requirements of the Agency for International Development—which administers foreign aid—are procured in the United States.

The proportion of *total* A.I.D. expenditures made in the United States is somewhat smaller. Nevertheless, in fiscal year 1967, it amounted to 88 percent of the total.

What do these figures mean?

They mean, first, that foreign aid administered through the Agency for International Development is used to buy between one-and-one-half and two billion dollars' worth of U.S. commodities each year.

They mean, further, that a minimum of 5 billion dollars' worth of American goods are exported annually through programs which are loosely called "foreign aid."

Included in this 5 billion dollar figure are P.L. 480 farm commodities, military equipment, as well as ordinary manufactures and other items.

Because of the peculiarities of our national bookkeeping system, most of these "foreign aid" transactions appear on the deficit side of our balance of payments.

They make a good target for those who argue on behalf of fiscal responsibility and the maintenance of the value of the dollar.

The fact is, however, that commodity and merchandise exports financed under these various programs—but *not* credited to foreign aid—directly contribute to our trade surplus.

In other words, if we eliminate these so-called "foreign aid" transactions, we will simultaneously reduce our exports, possibly lose our favorable trade balance, and may do little if anything to help our balance of payments.

In the long run, the course of abandoning foreign aid is even less advantageous. For we must remember that foreign aid also—assists our private investments abroad; helps to create expanding markets for American industries; promotes economic development and political stability; and ultimately, by doing all of these things, enhances our own well-being and national security.

I would think, therefore, that our own self-interest would dictate that we do *not* abandon these undertakings but that we continue to refine, improve, and strengthen them.

In these brief remarks, I have tried to touch upon the three basic problems confronting our country—the crisis in our cities; the war in Vietnam and the requirements of our national security; and, finally, the deficit in our balance of payments.

Each of these problems contains some elements of tragedy—but also a challenge for all of us. For if we—the richest, the strongest, the best educated country of our times—cannot solve these problems, then we better turn in our chips and let someone else have the floor.

Four and a half years ago, in St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, President John F. Kennedy's favorite passage from the Bible was read over his coffin.

I am certain you remember it. It appears in Chapter 3 of the Book of Ecclesiastes, and reads, in part, as follows:

"There is an appointed time for everything, and a time for every affair under the heavens . . .

"A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to tear down, and a time to build . . .

"A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace . . ."

We have been living in a time of rending, of tearing down and killing, of hate and of war.

Let's pray—and determine—that the years ahead will be different: that we will proceed with the tasks of healing and building; of love and of peace.

The decision to do this lies in our hands.

The Private College and the Pursuit of Quality in Education

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Friday past to attend the dedication ceremonies of a new library at Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va. Mary Baldwin is one of a number of privately operated institutions of higher learning in which we take pride in Virginia. Throughout its history, Mary Baldwin has emphasized quality in education. The aspiration to excellence is a tenet there.

The principal speaker at the library dedication was the Hon. Hulett C. Smith, the Governor of West Virginia. His address impressed me as a fine statement of the challenges facing the private colleges today, and of means to be considered in assisting them to meet these challenges.

I should like to share with the House key portions of Governor Smith's address, as follows:

We come together today for the dedication of a library, an "educational happening" that will enrich this college and this area.

Almost two centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson submitted to the Virginia legislature a "plan for the diffusion of knowledge." He and other famed founders of our country have believed that when people commit themselves to learning, a revolution of improvement of people begins that will never stop.

It was then, almost two centuries ago, that this type of revolution in education began in this state, in surrounding states, and indeed in this country.

It is continuing today.

We who have worked closely in education, particularly during the last decade, have witnessed, and have been a part of, an incessant change in the higher educational systems—both public and private.

We have been greatly concerned during the immediate past years with plans for "spreading knowledge."

There have been numerous federal programs implemented to aid in the construction of graduate and undergraduate facilities on our campuses.

Financial barriers have been reduced considerably for many students through new loan and scholarship programs.

New community junior colleges have opened up at a rapid rate, to make higher education available in many parts of a state. And in the states of the Southern Regional Education Board, junior colleges have become so numerous that the South has assumed national leadership in this movement.

Racial barriers are being removed, which means that advanced education is no longer limited to the majority or the privileged, but that it is open to everyone. However, our southern colleges are still somewhat less integrated than are those in other areas.

The federal government in the three-year period between 1964–1967 multiplied its commitment to education three times over.

Yet with all these factors—the new programs, the new facilities, more financial aid—the South still is behind national averages in the percentage of college-age persons attending college, in the percentage of advanced degrees awarded, and in many areas leading to full opportunity in education.

While the advancements made in our Southern colleges might well measure up when compared to others in the region, we must begin to evaluate these colleges by the same criteria of excellence which are applied everywhere. We must, as I have said so often in West Virginia, compete with what is good.

Likewise, we are forced to look at how our states are doing on their own to contribute to the advancement of higher education.

While the federal share of spending in the field of education increased from 16 to 24 percent during the last ten years, the state and local governments' share has remained virtually unchanged. While our colleges and universities are bulging with students—more than 5 million are enrolled in colleges today—the gap between income and expenses for higher education is continually increasing.

This revolution of education has, in years past, dealt with quantity—with guaranteeing the greatest number of individuals the fullest opportunity of maximum education. The goal has been to give every young man and woman all the education he can absorb. But, regrettably, we have reached what might be termed a point of diminishing returns in regard to quantity.

We are forced now to direct our sights toward quality.

Efforts to use our resources more wisely to attain quality education might possibly mean the relinquishing of some cherished, old traditions.

It was John F. Kennedy who said, "The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived and dishonest—but the myth—persistent, persuasive and unrealistic."

Therefore, we must dispel old myths, and recognize them for what they are.

In particular, I find this true when viewing the relationship between private and public institutions of higher education.

While our public and private colleges and universities may be considered similar in academic functions and the type of students they serve, they differ considerably in methods of financing.

State governments have clung to the age-old belief that States should not grant financial aid to private or denominational colleges. The main source of income for the private college, endowment and philanthropic giving, has continued to increase—but the purchasing power over the past decade has declined, which inevitably forces the private college to a higher tuition level.

The private colleges and universities are struggling with outstanding competition from state-supported schools, as the states make an all-out effort to develop high quality public colleges and universities, while at the same time, promote low tuitions.

Therefore, many of our fine, small, four-year private or denominational colleges have been forced to merge with a larger state-supported institution because of limited finances or lack of qualified professors.

In the long run, the state is eventually assuming the burden of the expense, while the student is the one slighted.

The absorption of a small college by a larger one often results in a weak university, as opposed to a strong college had the state assumed part of the financial responsibility.

West Virginia has begun already to establish a course of action for assisting its private colleges, along with its public institutions of higher learning, by making funds available to students who could not otherwise attend college.

Just during the past legislative session, a bill was passed which provided for the creation of a state scholarship and loan program, whereby $25,000 was appropriated to each program. And the bill clearly stated that the loans and scholarships would be made available to students planning to attend either private or public institutions of higher education in West Virginia.

This action, I think, reflects the thinking of the West Virginia legislators and educators toward the value of private colleges and universities, which shows that they have recognized the tremendous benefits received from the private schools by both the state and the students.

I believe the time has come when all states must make some important decisions reflecting their acknowledgment of the need for state aid to the private institutions.

Admittedly, this is a difficult problem, which may involve some legislative action, as it did in West Virginia.

But I am convinced that we are at that point in this educational revolution where it is incumbent on every state to analyze the educational and economic potentials of its private or denominational colleges, and evaluate the value received from subsidizing a private college, as opposed to the investment made.

We must then also consider the quality of knowledge and learning offered by a small, well-equipped, adequately staffed college, as opposed to a large university striving to meet the needs of thousands of students.

This is a question that many states, as has

West Virginia, have decided to answer. And the answer may well indeed benefit the students and the states.

The revolution of learning is in full swing.

Knowledge must be shared. The facilities of a New York library should be made available to a college student in Texas.

The teachings of the most skilled physician should be brought to a medical student in Virginia or West Virginia.

A student at a small college should be able to draw instantly on the resources of a large university.

Both the public and private, the small college and large university, are in the position where they must depend to a great extent on highly technical communication methods. Educational television has gained tremendous momentum in our educational systems recently, but nothing compared to what it will in the future. The enlistment of the use of the satellite for communication purposes is not an unrealistic consideration.

For the revolution of education to move equally as fast as the revolution of learning, it becomes necessary to reconstruct our methods for spreading knowledge and our attitudes toward these methods.

Eric Hoffer, the noted longshoreman-philosopher, has written: "If we are to awaken and cultivate the talents dormant in a whole population, we must change our conceptions of what is efficient, useful, practical, and wasteful."

We must look to the future. We must decide whether to continue with tradition, or whether to innovate; whether to direct our sights toward the needs of the private colleges or focus only on the public schools; whether to advance our communication and teaching methods, or cope with what we have.

I say we must show the world just how broad our visions are for education.

Today, at Mary Baldwin, you are taking a step in the right direction.

National Council of Adoptive Parents' Organizations Backs H.R. 19, the Adoption Opportunity Act

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was most gratified recently to learn that the National Council of Adoptive Parents' Organization in its March-April newsletter, National Adoptalk, has expressed its strong support for my bill, H.R. 19, the Adoption Opportunity Act.

The organization, whose motto is "Let Every Child Eligible for Adoption Become Available for Adoption," has urged its members to work for the passage of H.R. 19. As a result, I have been receiving letters of support from adoptive parents throughout the United States.

In addition, the Adoption Opportunity Act has received the endorsement of social welfare agencies, their officials and welfare experts in 34 States and the District of Columbia. It has also received approval of several other national organizations and publications.

This widespread support is truly heartening. It indicates growing awareness that, in justice and in wisdom, adoption expenses should be made tax deductible, as provided by H.R. 19.

Such a tax deduction would provide adoptive parents with tax treatment comparable to natural parents who may deduct medical expenses. It also would tend to promote adoptions, thereby providing more children with homes and decreasing welfare expenses.

It is my hope that the House Ways and Means Committee, before which H.R. 19 is pending, will soon hold hearings on the proposal.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the recent article from Adoptalk, along with a list of the organizations, agency officials, and other interested parties who have endorsed H.R. 19:

IT IS TIME FOR ACTION

There are six similar Federal bills in the House of Representatives on Ways and Means which would make it possible for the adoptive family to deduct costs of adopting (agency fees, court costs and lawyer's fees) from one's income tax.

They have been bottled up in the Committee and will not come out for a floor vote unless we persuade the members on the Committee of their merits. We urge you to write to the representative from your state. If you write to the others as well it might be very helpful. We should get these Representatives to realize that thru adoption the Community is saved many thousands of dollars on each child. Any child who becomes a ward of the state is very costly to the taxpayers. Let them know that adoptions should be encouraged in every possible way. Of course, this is not *our* primary reason since we are parents before we are taxpayers—but the Ways and Means Committee deals in money, not necessarily in human joy.

After careful reading and consideration of each of the six bills, N.C.A.P.O. feels that Mr. Zablocki's bill, H.R. 19 is the best because of its wording:

". . . (b) *Definition.*—As used in this section, the term 'adoption expenses' means expenses which pertain to the legal adoption of a child by the taxpayer, and which are incurred in accordance with applicable State or Federal laws, including social or adoption agency fees, court costs, attorneys' fees, and other necessary costs and fees in connection with the adoption of the child.

"(c) *Limitations.*—

"(1) *Dollar Limitations.*—The amount of the deduction allowable under this section with respect to any one child shall not exceed $1,250.

"(2) *Expenses Otherwise Allowable As Deductions.*—No amount which is allowable as a deduction under any other provision of this part shall be allowed as a deduction under this section."

Bills HR 7999 by Helstoski, HR 10620 by Brasco, HR 3353 by Foley are almost identical. However, let's put our efforts on HR 19. If we don't get it out of Committee this year it will be a lost bill and a wasted year. This is an opportunity for us all to work for important legislation. Let's see how much we can accomplish by banding together . . . our strength will grow only by such efforts. May we count on you?

Write your Representative on the Committee, or if none, to Rep. Zablocki, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

STATE BY STATE LIST OF AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS WHO HAVE ENDORSED H.R. 19

NATIONAL

Committee on Adoption, the American Bar Association, 112 State Street, Albany, New York.

Child Welfare League of America, Headquarters, 44 E. 23rd St., New York, New York.

National Committee for Children and Youth, Headquarters, 1145 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C.

National Council of Adoptive Parents Organizations, Box 543, Teaneck, New Jersey.

ALABAMA

Children's Aid Society of Jefferson County, 3600 8th Avenue South, Birmingham, Alabama.

ALASKA

State of Alaska, Department of Health and Welfare, Alaska Office Building, Juneau, Alaska 99801.

CALIFORNIA

California Assn. of Adoption Agencies, 3161 Plymouth Road, Lafayette, California.

Family and Children Division, Department of Social Welfare, State of California, P.O. Box 8074, Sacramento, California 95818

Board of Directors, Children's Home Society of Calif., 3100 West Adams Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90018

COLORADO

Jewish Family and Children's Service of Denver, 1375 Delaware Street #501, Denver, Colorado 80204

CONNECTICUT

Jewish Social Service of Hartford, 50 Gillett Street, Hartford, Connecticut.

C. Rollin Zane, Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut, Inc., 1680 Albany Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut.

DELAWARE

Board of Directors, Jewish Family Service of Delaware, % Atty. Jacob Balick, 1211 King Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Miss Elizabeth S. Townsend, Chairman, Inter-Agency Committee on Adoption, 1310 Delaware Avenue, Wilmington, Delaware.

FLORIDA

Department of Public Welfare, 227 Park Street, P.O. Box 2050, Jacksonville, Florida.

Executive Committee, The Children's Home Society of Florida, P.O. Box 10097, Jacksonville, Florida 32207

Mr. Wesley W. Jenkins, 928 Lakeview Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33705

GEORGIA

Children's Center of Metropolitan Atlanta, Inc., 44 Eleventh Street, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30309

ILLINOIS

Bernice Erwin, Lake Bluff Children's Home, 200 Scranton Avenue, Lake Bluff, Illinois.

Board of Directors and Staff, The Children's Bureau of Indianapolis, 615 North Alabama Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

INDIANA

The Children's Bureau of Indianapolis, 312 English Foundation Building, 615 North Alabama Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

IOWA

Miss Katharine B. Wheeler, Supervisor of Adoption, Iowa Children's Home Society, 1101 Walnut, Des Moines, Iowa 50309

MAINE

Child and Family Services, 187 Middle Street, Portland, Maine.

MARYLAND

State Department of Public Welfare of Maryland, State Office Building, 301 West Preston Street, Baltimore, Maryland. 21201

Mr. Clark L. Mock, Executive Director, Family and Children's Society, 204 West Lanvale Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

Miss M. Beatrice Pryor, Director, Wicomico County Welfare Board, Salisbury, Maryland.

Mrs. Esther Lazarus, Director, Department of Public Welfare, 1600 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland.

Rev. J. Francis Stafford, Associate Director, Catholic Center, Archiocese of Baltimore, 320 Cathedral Street, Baltimore, Maryland.

MASSACHUSETTS

The Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Office of the Dean, Boston College Law School, Brighton, Massachusetts 02135

Mr. Joseph W. Granata, Executive Dir., Child and Family Service of Springfield, 184 Mill Road, Springfield, Massachusetts 01108

Robert I. Beers, The New England Home for Little Wanderers, 161 South Huntington Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02130

Children's Aid and Family Society of Haverhill, 54 Merrimack Street, Haverhill, Massachusetts.

Mr. Robert M. Myers, Ex. Secretary, Children's Aid and Family Services, 42 Gothic Street, Northampton, Mass. 01060

MICHIGAN

Mr. Renald J. Nagelkirk, Ex. Director, D. A. Blodgett Home for Children, 805 Leonard Street, N.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503

Samuel Lerner, Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service, 10801 Curtis, Detroit, Michigan 48221

Mr. Leonard R. Jagels, Ex. Secretary, Catholic Social Services of Oakland County, 53 Franklin Boulevard, Pontiac, Michigan 48053

Michigan Children's Aid Society, 35427 Grand River, Farmington, Michigan.

Catholic Social Service of Upper Michigan, 400 Commercial Bank Building, Iron Mountain, Michigan.

MINNESOTA

Mr. Charles B. Olds, Children's Home Society of Minnesota, 2230 Como Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Mr. Callman Rawley, Ex. Director, Jewish Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis, 404 South 8 Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota. 55405.

Mr. Llewellyn H. Linde, Consultant, Private Child-caring Agencies, Standards and Licensing Division, Department of Public Welfare, St. Paul, Minnesota. 55101.

Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota, 2414 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404.

MISSOURI

Department of Children, Staff Catholic Charities of St. Louis, 4140 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri.

MONTANA

Miss Mary M. Wagner, State of Montana, Department of Public Welfare, P.O. Box 1723, Helena, Montana.

NEW JERSEY

Mr. G. Thomas Riti, Chief, Bureau of Children's Services, New Jersey Dept. of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, New Jersey 08625.

Miss Eugenia B. Stogdale, Ex. Sec., The Family and Children's Society, 60 South Fullerton Avenue, Montclair, New Jersey 07042.

Miss Barbara W. Smith, Ex. Director, Children's Aid and Adoption Society of New Jersey, 142 South Munn Avenue, East Orange, New Jersey 07018.

Mother's Auxiliary of Children's Aid and Adoption Society of New Jersey, Passaic County, New Jersey.

NEW YORK

Children's Aid and Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 330 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14202.

Adoption Service of Westchester, Inc., 19 Greenridge Avenue, White Plains, New York.

Mr. Perry J. Gangloff, The Family and Children's Society of Broome County, Inc., 32 Henry Street, Binghampton, New York.

Mr. Edmund G. Burbank, Ex. Director, Sheltering Arms Children's Service, 122 East 29th Street, New York, New York.

Mr. Lionel W. Lane, Executive Director, Child and Family Service of Syracuse and Onondaga County, 728 James Street, Syracuse, New York.

Adoption Staff of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, 112 State Street, Albany, New York.

NEVADA

Quenten L. Emery, State Welfare Administrator, Nevada Department of Health and Welfare, 515 East Musser Street, Carson City, Nevada.

NORTH CAROLINA

Division of Child Welfare, State Board of Public Welfare, P.O. Box, 2599, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Miss Harriet L. Tynes, Executive Dir., The Children's Home Society of North Carolina, P.O. Box 6587, 740 Chestnut Street, Greensboro, North Carolina 27405

NORTH DAKOTA

Lutheran Welfare Society of North Dakota, 1325 Eleventh Street South, Box 389, Fargo, North Dakota.

OHIO

Mr. John Kelleher, Ex. Secretary, the Catholic Service League of Akron, Ohio, 138 Fir Hill, Akron, Ohio 44304

Mr. Konrad Reisner, Ex. Director, Family and Children's Service Assn., 184 Salem Avenue, Dayton, Ohio.

Miss Thelma K. Flower, Ex. Director, Family and Children's Service Society, 90 N. Prospect Street, Okron, Ohio 44304

OREGON

Mr. Stuart R. Stimmel, the Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon, 2301 N.W. Glisan Street, Portland, Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA

Miss Roberta G. Andrews, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania, 311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107

Rollo A. Barnes, Executive Director, Family and Children's Service of Lancaster County, 630 Janet Avenue, Lancaster, Pa. 17601

RHODE ISLAND

Child Welfare Services, Department of Social Welfare, State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, 610 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, Providence, R.I. 02908

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lutheran Social Services, 600 West 12 Street, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57104

TENNESSEE

Roy S. Nicks, Commissioner, State of Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, State Office Building, Nashville, Tennessee.

Mr. William L. Galbraith, Ex. Director, Child and Family Services, 114 Dameron Avenue, Knoxville, Tennessee 37917

TEXAS

Lt. Col. Rachel Sparks, Director, The Volunteers of America, 518 Danciger Building, Fort Worth, Texas.

Mrs. Ruby Lee Piester, Ex. Director, The Edna Gladney Home, 2110 Hemphill, Fort Worth, Texas.

UTAH

Mrs. Josephine S. Patterson, Director, Relief Society General Board Assn., 18 East North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Mr. Rex R. Ashdown, The Children's Aid Society of Utah, 209 Howell Building, Ogden, Utah.

VIRGINIA

Executive Committee, Children's Home Society of Virginia, 322 South Third Street, Richmond, Virginia 23204.

Executive Committee, Children's Home Society of Virginia, P.O. Box 366, Arlington, Virginia 54305.

WASHINGTON

Board of Trustees, Children's Home Society of Washington, 3300 Northeast 65 Street, Seattle, Washington.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. Alice R. Smith, Chief, Child Welfare Division, 1291 Taylor Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Miss Jean Grigg, Lutheran Inner Mission Society, 2635 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Mr. George M. Pikser, Executive Director, Jewish Social Service Agency and Jewish Foster Home, 1131 Spring Road, N.W., Washington, D.C.

WISCONSIN

Lowell A. Grottveit, Madison Area Office, Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan, 704 E. Gorham Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

Mr. Robert G. Hintz, Casework Super., Catholic Welfare Bureau, 25 South Hancock Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

Mr. Gregory Speltz, A.A., Catholic Social Services, P.O. Box 597, La Crosse, Wisconsin 54602.

Department of Public Welfare, The State of Wisconsin, Division of Children and Youth, 1 West Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin 52702.

Pastor Mentor Kujath, Assoc. Dir. Public Relations, Lutheran Children's Friend Society, 8138 Harwood Avenue, Wauwatosa, Wisconsin 53213

The Rev. Benjamin A. Gjenvick, Ex. Dir., Lutheran Welfare Services, 3126 West Highland Boulevard, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208.

Catholic Social Services of The Archdiocese of Milwaukee, 207 E. Michigan Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202.

Mr. William Buchholz, 110 South Main Street, Edgerton, Wisconsin 53534. (Member of the Board, Lutheran Welfare Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan.)

Dr. C. David Hollister, School of Social Welfare, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The Rev. Canon G. R. Olson, President, Board of Directors, Children's Service Society of Wisconsin.

Green Bay Branch, Children's Service Society of Wisconsin.

Green Bay District Office, Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

The "Dead" Radio Industry

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in their April 15, 1968, issue, Forbes presents an illuminating article concerning the growing trafficking in broadcast licenses. Entitled, "A Loss Can Be a Profit," the presentation effectively deals with the myths surrounding the loss pattern of broadcasters.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the article to which I refer follows:

A LOSS CAN BE A PROFIT

Why should anyone want to get into the radio business?

In 1966, the most recent year for which the Federal Communications Commission has statistics, 28% of the 3,912 radio stations in the U.S. reported losses; and the four major radio networks together went into the red for a total of $1.7 million.

Sounds like a business anyone who can tell red ink from black would fight to avoid, doesn't it?

On the contrary. Trading in radio stations has never been more active; prices for radio stations have never been higher. Not only that, but they keep going higher every day. In 1953 J. Elroy McCaw bought New York's Station WINS from Crosley Corp. for $450,-

000. Ten years later Westinghouse Broadcasting paid him $10 million for it. Henry Rau bought WOL in Washington, D.C. in 1953 for $75,000. He sold it in 1965 to Sonderling Broadcasting for $1.25 million. Gordon McLendon paid $525,000 for KILT in Houston in 1957, sold it 11 years later to Lin Broadcasting for $7.25 million.

"There's a rule of thumb in this industry," says a radioman, only half jokingly, "that a station is worth ten times its earnings or 100 times its losses."

How To Keep Books. The reason is this: Those losses are often more apparent than real. Actually, radio today is a very profitable industry, despite television; and even the stations that show losses are usually making a handsome living for the men who own and operate them. It's largely a matter of bookkeeping.

Specifically, it's a matter of the way the federal income-tax regulations are written. Consider, first, a radio station that makes money. The man who owns it paid $1 million for it. Of this, $750,000 represented the value of the equipment, the other $250,000 "intangibles." It's now fully depreciated and shows earnings of $350,000 before taxes, roughly $175,000 after taxes. It can easily be sold for $3.5 million, not ten but 20 times earnings.

Under the federal income-tax regulations, the purchaser has a variety of ways of figuring his taxes, but a commonly accepted one is this: He says the intangibles are now worth three times earnings, or $525,000. The equipment, though fully depreciated, still is worth $750,000. That, of course, adds up to only $1.275 million, but this doesn't bother the purchaser, nor does it bother the Internal Revenue Service. The IRS permits the purchaser to write up the value of both the intangibles and the equipment proportionately to reach $3.5 million. By this process, for tax purposes, the intangibles become worth roughly $1.5 million and the equipment $2 million.

Now assume that the purchaser depreciates the legally inflated price of his equipment over ten years and that the station still shows an operating profit of $350,000. Under these circumstances the station will show only $150,000 pretax and $75,000 after taxes. But it will have "real earnings"—that is, cash flow—of $275,000, consisting of $200,000 depreciation and $75,000 profit, as opposed to only $175,000 for its previous owner who didn't have as good a tax break.

In this setting it is not hard to see that much of the trading in radio stations today—and much of the rise in station prices—stems from a kind of swapping among station owners. Two men, both with $1 million in a station, can each sell his for $3.5 million; and each owner, using the sample figures above, could thereby increase his annual cash flow by $100,000. Moreover, the depreciation portion has the added advantage of not being taxable as personal income.

The federal income-tax regulations also enable a man who owns a radio station to show losses and still live in at least reasonable affluence. Consider Ralph J. Baron, who now owns three stations. Baron went into the radio business in 1960 by purchasing WILA in Danville, Va. He ran it with his wife, a sales manager and three announcers. He paid his staff $2,000 a month. His mortgage and other expenses cost him $2,500 a month. On his books he showed a loss. But thanks to the cash throw-off from depreciation, he was able to pay himself $1,000 a month while getting to work upgrading Station WILA.

Specialize! This is one reason why even radio stations that appear to lose money can sell for incredible prices, "100 times losses," as the radio man said. However, there is also this fact about radio today: Even given the strange bookkeeping of the industry, even given the competition from television, the majority of radio stations make very good money.

When television came in, everyone said that radio was through. That's what everyone said about the magazine industry too. The fact is that radio has followed exactly the same route as the magazines. Just as the general magazine is on the ropes in its competition with television, while the specialized magazine has prospered as never before, so has the radio station that attempts to appeal to everyone died, while the specialized radio station has boomed.

One of the men who realized this before the industry did generally is Erny Tannen, 46, who now owns two radio stations and has a half interest in two others. Tannen bought his first, WDMV in the Delmarva Peninsula, which lies in Delaware, Maryland and Virginia, for $100,000 in 1960. WDMV was losing money, not merely on the books but in fact. Tannen decided that, with specialized programming, it could become a moneymaker. Eighty percent of the peninsula's economy consists of agriculture. Explains Tannen: "The farmers listened to their transistors in the barn, on the tractor and in the fields. We simply introduced programming they could identify with. We interviewed them. We were the official radio of every farm event. We attended all their meetings. And we reported all the farm news." Tannen's formula doubled WDMV's total billings in a little over three years.

When Tannen and a partner purchased another station, WYRE in Annapolis, Maryland, he again examined the area's economy, found it to be strong on pleasure boating. "So we became known as the marine weather station as well as the official radio of the Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club Association," he says.

As a result Tannen was able to add to the previous local advertisers on the station outsiders whose interest was in Tannen's boating market. Using this strategy he signed beer, marine engine, and boat insurance companies. And also as a result, he says that he has been offered $500,000 for the station which he purchased for $120,000 only five years ago.

Tannen's strategy has been repeated by many other owners in the last ten years. Often called "the magazine concept," its key is to analyze an area, then build specialized programming to reach the market. "I never buy stations," says Tannen, "only markets."

All over the country young entrepeneurs like Tannen are focusing the attention of their stations on their prime hours—early morning and early evening—and on auto drivers and owners of portable radios. In the larger markets they are selecting particular segments of the market. Today, for example, among New York's 34 AM and FM stations, there are three Spanish-language stations, two all-news stations, numerous "talk" stations, at least six separate varieties of music stations, and two stations aimed at Negro audiences.

Even in small markets like 46,000-population Danville, Va., specialization has paid off. When Ralph Baron bought WILA, a sunrise-to-sunset station, in 1960, it was competing directly with three other stations and floundering. Baron responded by switching its programming to what the industry calls "the ethnic format" beamed at Danville's Negroes, who comprised one-third of the population. "We convinced the merchants that WILA was in the advertising business and that we were reaching an audience they couldn't reach on the other stations," says Baron.

Today WILA advertising, which sells for $4 per minute, is booked to the limit (18 minutes per hour) during four months of the year. In the remaining months it is about 70% sold. WILA now has a staff of 12 and the station is paid for. Expenses run about $9,000 a month, and it makes over $60,000 a year. Baron, who paid $85,000 for the station, says he recently turned down an offer for $350,000.

While the effort to win people back to their radios has proceeded locally, it has resulted in some impressive national statistics. For example, in 1967 an estimated 47 million radios were sold, bringing the total number in operation to over 250 million. A RADAR study found that more people listen to a radio sometime during the week than turn on a television set.

Fighting TV. This specialization has not only captured radio's new audience but, just as important, it has fragmented radio audiences into age, sex, income and interest groups that are critical in selling advertising in competition with television. "With radio," says Miles David, president of the Radio Advertising Bureau, "the advertiser can pinpoint his audience much more than on television. This is one of the things the big national advertiser is looking for." David points out that companies like General Foods, Bristol-Myers, American Cyanamid and Mobil Oil all more than doubled their radio expenditures in the first nine months of 1967. Bristol-Myers, for example, increased its expenditures from $579,000 to $2.1 million.

With advertising revenues of $1.8 billion, the television industry has a commanding lead on radio, with only $912 million. Yet some of radio's gains are undoubtedly coming at the expense of television. In 1966, for example, total radio advertising income was up 10% as compared with 9% for television. In 1967, a bad year for advertising, radio was up about 3% while television held almost even. One result of this increased advertising is that, according to FCC figures, pretax radio income was up 24% in 1966, compared to only a 10% increase for television.

If radio is doing well now, the future looks just as bright. In the East, since almost all frequencies are already assigned, entry is limited and current owners are protected. Added to the promising outlook is the fact that stations are cheap to operate and costs are easy to hold in line as listenership grows. "This is a fixed-overhead business," says Ralph W. Beaudin, group vice president for radio at American Broadcasting Corp.

Yet the broadcaster who pursues aggressive growth in radio faces one obstacle: the FCC limitation on the number of stations one company may own to seven AM and seven FM. This restriction results in the "trading up" phenomenon where the big group broadcasters like Cox Broadcasting, Metromedia, Taft Broadcasting and Storer Broadcasting, all of whose sales are over $30 million, expand by selling their smaller stations and buying bigger ones. It also means that the bigger group broadcasters are normally heavily in television (where the limit is five VHF and two UHF stations) and in many cases have diversified out of radio and television.

One such company, Capitol Cities Broadcasting, which presently owns five television stations as well as seven AM and five FM radio stations, came close to skipping radio entirely. "We were like many other people during the Fifties," says President Thomas S. Murphy. "We were preoccupied with television. But we picked up a radio station in Providence along with a television station we were after, and finally we decided to go into the radio business seriously."

Unlike many operators, Capitol Cities has concentrated on making profitable stations more profitable by beefing up ad sales rather than trying to cure sick operations. That is perhaps just as well, for Murphy admits that Capitol Cities' first attempt at changing a station's programming ended in disaster. "It was my fault," he says. "We changed the programming of our Albany station in 1954 from a good-music format to rock-and-roll, not because we knew why we were making the change but because other people seemed to be making money with this format, so we

figured we could." The change converted a modest predepreciation profit of $29,000 to four years of losses averaging $52,000 per year.

Murphy says his unhappy experience in Albany is one explanation for Capitol Cities' subsequently strong record. "We hoped ourselves into that decision," he says. "We have never done that again."

His record confirms it: Capitol Cities paid about $250,000 for the Albany station in 1954. Now it is easily worth $2 million.

Not bad for an industry that was once presumed dead.

Statutory Limitations on Spending

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that whatever spending reductions the Congress imposes be required ones, not just left to the tender dispensation of the executive branch. There is no sense in passing a surtax if it is to be used to finance additional Government spending. It is the obligation of the Congress acting through its Committees on Appropriations, to see that this does not happen.

Just how much of a reduction can be forced by statute without upsetting the economy, reversewise, is a difficult problem. But again and again the experts—of whom William McChesney Martin is certainly the expert's expert—warn that unless firm action is taken now to apply the brakes, runaway inflation can become unmanageable. Financial mismanagement in a time of fiscal crisis resulting from years of dancing without paying the fiddler is inexcusable. The American people are beginning to realize that fiscal responsibility is a necessary qualification for public service.

In this connection the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 22, 1968, is important reading:

FOOL'S PARADISE

There is the bitter old joke about premature anti-fascists—they perceived the menace so far in advance that nobody remembered their warnings when the danger became generally obvious. Some of us may perhaps be forgiven if, a little wearily, we feel the same way about inflation.

Certainly one premature anti-inflationist is William McChesney Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. For years he has been trying to tell the nation that the danger signals were flying; on one specific occasion he cited ominous parallels with the crash year of 1929. This past weekend he put it even more strongly.

"The nation is in the midst of the worst financial crisis since 1931," he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors assembled in Washington for their annual convention. "In 1931 the problem was deflation. Today it is inflation and equally intolerable."

"Intolerable" recurred in the chairman's remarks. The domestic Federal budget deficit, reckoned now at about $20 billion for the next fiscal year, is intolerable. The same term he applied to the chronic U.S. international payments deficit, which in large part results from the domestic inflation. "Both have to be corrected over the next few years or the U.S. is going to face either an uncontrollable recession or an uncontrollable inflation." In a word, potential disaster pretty much sums up his message.

Such candor on the part of a high Government official, especially in a time when candor seems to have gone out of style, cannot be too highly commended, and we hereby applaud it. But wait a moment; where was Mr. Martin's Fed all these years when these intolerable risks were being manufactured? Had Federal Reserve policy nothing to do with the case?

Of course it had. Mr. Martin himself concedes that the expansion of the money supply in many recent months has been excessive. His voice of dissent, however, has been a lonely one. Although chairman, he can't dictate the board's policy. Moreover, any realistic chairman must have some kind of accommodation with the White House which has been bent on wild Federal spending and deficiting, at the same time hoping to maintain an artificially easy money policy. Nor has Congress been effective in checking the Administration's omnivorous spending appetites.

So the buildup of the dangers, despite the repeated cautions of Mr. Martin and of some old-fashioned types like us, is understandable if hardly edifying. The peril being now bluntly stated, what of the remedies?

Mr. Martin favors the current bill in Congress calling for a reduction in Federal spending of $6 billion plus the Administration's long-proposed 10% tax surcharge. We would be the first to agree that, theoretically, something of the sort is indicated by the seriousness of the Government's financial condition. As Mr. Martin says, even so rich a nation must pay its bills. Yet questions persist.

For one, a $6 billion reduction is far too little out of the spending program originally blueprinted for fiscal 1969 at more than $186 billion. Given the criticality of the situation, drastic slashes, particularly in non-defense spending are needed. Second, who can really believe that this spending-prone Administration would actually follow through with even a $6 billion reduction?

Just as an example, there are such things as so-called supplemental appropriations, which the Administration sends to Congress and Congress, confronted with more or less of a fait accompli, can hardly refuse. This is one of the gimmicks that tend to make the budget, when the fiscal year is finaly done, come out so much bigger than the original forecast.

The same kind of credibility gap engulfs the proposed tax increase. How could it turn out to be anti-inflationary if the Administration simply uses the added revenue to augment its spending? And why should the beleaguered taxpayer be forced to pay still more for the Government's financial mismanagement?

Federal mismanagement is the crux of the matter; in Mr. Martin's phrase, the nation—or at any rate the Government—has been living in a fool's paradise. It is late to be waking up, and we hope his vigorous lecture will wake up officials in both the Administration and Congress. But let no one confuse the issue: It is there in Washington, not in the private economic affairs of the ordinary citizen, that the cause and the cure of the terrible trouble lie.

Zambia: The African Terrorist State

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 22, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, day by day it becomes more apparent to the American people that what is billed by the Communists as racism is really freedom of the individual.

The leading Red-controlled organ in the United States—the U.N.—continues its sinful propaganda against Rhodesia as being racist. Yet, the same destroyer of free men is silent on antifree enterprise by seizure of all industrial and commercial enterprises by the Red puppet chief Kaunda of Zambia.

In fact, the U.N. just recently tried to launch an unsuccessful aggression against South West Africa from Zambia, but Chief Kaunda did not trust the U.N. team with one of his airplanes. He was afraid it would get lost to the South Africans.

This is the Zambia the Vice President praises—this is the Kaunda Mr. HUMPHREY lauded as the great African leader.

This is the Zambia of war lord Kaunda who is scheduled to receive 15 million in U.S. tax dollars to build a highway.

Kaunda has established a rather high protective tariff to protect his people and I call on the President of the United States and all lesser lights not to let one copper penny of U.S. money go to Zambia until he releases all seized industries and pays indemnity to the owners and operators. Until then, I call for U.S.-free world economic sanctions against Zambia.

Mr. Speaker, our State Department and leadership cannot make this many honest mistakes unintentionally.

I include the AP report of April 19, the U.N. report of April 21, and other clippings at this point:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 19, 1968]

ZAMBIA SEIZES 25 BUSINESSES

LUSAKA, ZAMBIA.—President Kenneth Kaunda announced today that the Zambian government is taking over 25 major industrial and commercial enterprises, ranging from retail chain stores to big transport corporations.

Among these is a logging company owned by the Anglo-American Corp., the giant copper mining group.

Kaunda told a cheering crowd at Kabwe he was "asking' the companies to sell 51 percent of their stock to the government. He made clear he does not anticipate anyone's refusing.

The move staggered the country's businessmen. Kaunda said it is part of a general plan to eliminate "exploitation by foreign capitalists."

OTHER CURBS

Kaunda also announced restrictions on loans to local businesses owned by expatriates, a ban on expatriate businesses outside 10 major towns and a ruling that government contracts for less than $140,000 are to be awarded only to Zambian enterprises.

However, he said "foreign investors and foreign businessmen," in contrast to resident expatriate businessmen, are welcome in Zambia.

"It is my intention," he declared, "to enact legislation safeguarding approved foreign investments. This act will guarantee that dividends and interest payments on foreign capital may be remitted abroad, and that repatriation of capital brought in from abroad will be allowed."

COMPENSATION PLEDGED

Kaunda also pledged that compensation for government takeovers would be "fair."

He objected to local businesses owned by resident expatriates because he said they brought no capital into the country and took

capital out when the expatriates returned to their homelands.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., April 21, 1968]

DIPLOMATIC DEADLOCK OVER RHODESIA

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The problem of racism in Rhodesia continues to bedevil chancelleries in much of the world. It torments the Commonwealth, stirs black Africa, and mocks hope for development of world order.

Well over two years ago, a small band of white Rhodesians, some five percent of the country's population, set out to defy the conscience and the organized economic power of the rest of the world. They have very largely succeeded.

UN diplomats are currently wrestling once again with ways to deal more effectively with the challenge. It is widely agreed that economic sanctions, now selective, should be made total, and that they should continue to be legally compulsory.

But suppose this is done—on paper. What then?

DISCREDIT U.N. FURTHER

South Africa and Portugal, which control key ports of entry and exit for Rhodesian supplies, have made perfectly clear they will continue to disregard UN directives. Zambia, which also has substantial Rhodesian trade, cannot obey these directives for long, and survive.

The result is that Rhodesia almost certainly will continue to fend off decisive damage. And the net effect of the crackdown will be to discredit still further the United Nations and the instrument on which it had hoped to rely in seeking peaceful change.

What to do?

Blockade the Portugese colonial port of Lourenco Marques, Mozambique, through which a large part of the supplies flow?

There would be precedent for such action. Mozambique's other principal port, Beira, has been patrolled by British gunboats for two years to keep out oil tankers which had been feeding a Rhodesian pipeline.

But to shut both of Mozambique's ports completely, or subject them to an imposed rationing program, would be virtually an act of war against Portugal, Britain's oldest ally. The least it would be likely to do would be to drive Portugal out of NATO.

Send aircraft carriers to bomb the rail lines which carry supplies between Mozambique and Rhodesia? Again a drastic step which would not help retain a Portugese ally.

Close the South African loophole through which Rhodesia gets oil and other supplies? Far easier said than done.

South Africa has aircraft and naval vessels with which to challenge anything but a massive blockade. And in any event, neither Washington nor London would remotely consider a full-scale showdown with Pretoria at this stage.

Dry up Rhodesia's ultimate markets and sources of supply? This has been tried for two and one-half years, without notable success.

Send a British expeditionary force into Rhodesia? British opinion is deeply divided on the issue, and the Wilson government seems firmly opposed.

RHODESIA'S POSITION

Meanwhile hope of a mutually acceptable negotiated solution has all but vanished.

A Constitutional Commission in Rhodesia made clear once again this month that the only "compromise" the white minority will consider is one in which it is guaranteed permanent control.

The blacks could have a somewhat more influential political role, the Commission suggested, if they would give up any idea of ever ruling the country. But this a 95 percent majority is scarcely likely to do, and the rest of the world will not ask it to.

This is the kind of deadlock which drives men to violence.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 14, 1968]

NEW U.S. STEPS AGAINST RHODESIA ARE UNDER STUDY

The United States is "quite prepared to consider further measures" against Rhodesia, which already is subject to sanctions, Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Palmer III said yesterday.

Palmer, who last week completed his second year as assistant secretary for African affairs, noted in a interview that further sanctions are under consideration by U.N. members in New York. On the U.S. position, he emphasized that careful consideration must be given not only to the scope of any further measures but also to their probable effectiveness.

U. S. officials estimate it will be at least two weeks before a U.N. Security Council vote is taken on measures against Rhodesia, which unilaterally declared its independence from Britain on Nov. 11, 1965.

Palmer also expressed concern over an apparent "hardening of attitude" by South Africa, which he said was indicated by its attitude toward South West Africa, the terrorist trials and its noncooperation on sanctions against Rhodesia.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 19, 1968]

SIERRA LEONE COUP DETAILS REVEALED

FREETOWN, SIERRA LEONE.—First details of a coup by a group of army noncommissioned officers in this small West African state came this morning in a broadcast by someone who identified himself only as "Sergeant Major Rogers."

Sierra Leone had been cut off from the outside world since yesterday as reports from neighboring countries said the military regime of the National Reformation Council, headed by Brig. Andrew T. Juxon-Smith, had been ousted.

This morning's broadcast said Juxon-Smith had been arrested and a new 14-man council set up under the chairmanship of Warrant Officer Patrick Conteh. Sgt. Maj. Rogers said all diplomatic missions should carry on as normal and "have no fear."

Deputy Chairman William Leigh of the council and other senior army and police officers had also been arrested, Rogers said, accusing council members of having practiced "nepotism and corruption" since taking over 14 months ago.

"Our immediate aim is to return to civilian rule," he declared, adding that the Council has been dissolved.

The new regime, styled the "Anticorruption Revolutionary Movement," announced last night formation of a seven-man national interim council of four army and three police officers whose primary task would be to work out a peaceful return to civilian rule within the "shortest possible time."

The movement also announced the recall of Col. John Bangura, currently counselor in the Sierra Leone Embassy in Washington, and Lt. Col. Ambrose Genda, ambassador to Liberia, to serve as military commanders.

About 40 senior army and police officers have been arrested and a dusk-to-dawn curfew is in force, although conditions were reported almost back to normal today.

Despite official announcements that the coup was bloodless, at least two persons were reported killed and about six wounded.

SENATE—*Tuesday, April 23, 1968*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Bernie Smith, D.D., minister of the Fellowship Chapel, Hamilton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, hear our prayer. In a world that is divided and appalling, we are united and appealing unto Thee. Grant Thy favor to these who assume a vital role in the healing of a wounded world.

We thank Thee for our flag with the 50 stars of hope that shine in its firmament, and we know that every star proclaims our faith in Jehovah who guides the destiny of our people.

In an hour that recites the alphabet of death—teach us the language of life.

In an hour that invites compromise—teach us that life must be governed by principle and not by policy.

In an hour that is filled with the love of power—teach us the power of love.

In an hour when there are those who would offer men the glass crutch of bondage—teach us that we must give ourselves on the altar of service that men may learn the right and restraint of liberty.

In an hour when trouble spots like measles break out on every hand, and the dreadful cancer of division is eating at the vitals of an uncertain generation—teach us that time hastens without consent and must not leave us emptyhanded. Yea, help us to rebuild our spiritual arsenal and learn the value of the weapons of prayer and faith.

Take all that we are and all that we may yet become and use us in some measure that there will yet come a day when there is peace on earth and good will among men.

We ask not that our epitaph shall declare that we were great—but may it say that we have served.

Guide Thou the ship of state, O God. We fear not the angry waves when Thou art at the helm. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 22, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.