be alerted to these facts and realities if we are to continue to be the best fed nation at the lowest per income-dollar cost in the world."

WOULD CONSUMER PRICES, EXPORT MARKETS, BE THREATENED?

"There seems to be some fear that an attempt to strengthen farm income would result in undesirable prices of food at the grocery store, or that we would lose some of our foreign markets," noted Langren. "But neither fear is valid."

Langen used the sugar industry as an example of better farm prices without much effect on consumers. "Since 1960, the price to the sugarbeet farmer has gone up 23 percent, his gross income has almost doubled, and his net profit per acre has increased by 20 percent while production doubled. But the price of a pound of sugar on the grocery shelf increased by only about half a penny.

"Wheat prices, on the contrary, fell about 40 percent since 1962, down to just $1.24 these days. But the low price failed to increase our foreign markets for wheat. In fact, our low prices had the reverse effect, forcing foreign nations to increase import fees to protect their own farmers.

"If wheat had increased by the same 23 per cent in price that sugar beets experienced, a bushel of wheat today would be $2.50," said Langen. "What a boon that would have been for rural America! It wouldn't have hurt our exports, and the effect on the consumer would have been very little since the wheat in a loaf of bread constitutes only about 10 per cent of the cost."

AGRICULTURE HAS EARNED CONSIDERATION

Congressman Langen said that U.S. Agriculture and Rural America have earned our attention and consideration. "Our farmers have forged the best production story of any industry in this nation, increasing crop production per man hour by some 148 per cent in the past 20 years and livestock production by 149 percent. Every American has been the beneficiary of quality foods, ample supplies, better packaged foods, and at a cost of a little over 17½ cents out of every income dollar, the lowest percentage in the world. With 82½ cents left to the consumer to spend on other items, the farmer thus becomes the real impetus behind the expansion of our other great industries."

THE CONGRESS AND THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

"It is still too early to tell what suggestions or proposals will come from the new Administration," observed Langen. "There are encouraging signs, however, that more attention will be paid to farm prices, and all of us interested in Agriculture must pursue that pressing concern.

"The Congress, where farm laws and policies are formulated, remains much the same in composition as the preceding Congress," said Langen, "so the basic decisions on the direction agriculture will take in the future must come from people like you, at meetings like this. Your concerns and your decisions must be conveyed to the White House, the Congress and the American public. We who believe that American Agriculture should receive a fair return for the contribution it makes to the nation must have the unanimous support of every agricultural interest, whether farms, agri-business, farm organizations, small towns, or what have you.

"We either stand together, or witness each segment of America's largest industry fall in turn," concluded Mr. Langen. "If we expect Congress to face the challenge, we must first face it ourselves, as a united industry."

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS VOLUNTEER THEIR SERVICES

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in this day of revolt and rebellion on the campuses across the country, it is refreshing and reassuring to read confirmation of a fact that we sometimes lose sight of: the overwhelming majority of today's college students are productive, contributing citizens. The letter below pays well-deserved tribute to the students at Kent State University in my district for their countless hours of volunteer activity in conjunction with community service programs in Kent, Ohio.

The letter follows:

[From the Record-Courier, Feb. 10, 1969]

RETIRING WELFARE DIRECTOR CITES KENT STATE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' SERVICE

DEAR SIR: Before I leave my office as executive director of The Kent Welfare and Visiting Nurse Association, I wish to publicly express my appreciation and praise to the students of Kent State University who have devoted hours of service to our agency through the years.

They have come as individuals, in groups, from sororities, fraternities, residence halls, and other organized groups on campus, requesting service projects.

We found them to be enthusiastic, with a keen interest, not only in underprivileged children, but with the aged, the blind, families on low income and shut-ins. They have worked well under supervision and have given countless hours of joy to the very young, the very old and those in between.

They have furnished transportation for children to and from parties which they held for children of all ages at Christmas time, for Valentine's Day, and at Easter.

They have taken children on nature hikes, picnics, to ball games and to movies. Even held a story hour at the Public Library. They have tutored children and in many instances have collected clothing and even purchased new clothing. They have shown a great interest in the deaf children.

They have entertained children and sometimes families in their sorority and fraternity houses.

They have visited the blind, read to them, taken them for walks and, in many instances, these visits have been the blind persons' only contact with the outside world.

They have visited the shut-ins, taken them magazines, plants, cookies and scented soap. They have done household chores for them, such as mowing the lawn, shoveling snow, washing windows, turning rugs, putting up curtain rods, and small repair jobs around the house, even to spring housecleaning.

They have adopted families, remembering them on birthdays, often baby-sitting while another group took the mother out for an evening's entertainment. They have collected canned food on many occasions, hundreds of cans, helped in sorting, packing and delivering food baskets.

It is from this source that much of our volunteer help has come, from these young men and women, who are concerned with those less fortunate, who take time out of their busy schedules to give to others. I am sure their lives are enriched from these experiences and the recipients of their good deeds are indeed grateful.

It has been heartwarming to work with these young, thoughtful, students who have such a keen concern for others and who use their time and effort in such a meaningful way. They have helped to make our organization more humane and far reaching. They have given a personal touch that we could not accomplish because of time and limited staff.

So I salute the students of Kent State University who do care about others and who do something about it.

My hope is that you will continue to work with my successor in the same way.

MRS. ELIZABETH FOUST,
Executive Director, The Kent Welfare and Visiting Nurse Association, Inc.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, February 20, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.—Psalm 33: 12.

Our fathers' God, to Thee, author of liberty, to Thee we pray; long may our land be bright with freedom's holy light; protect us by Thy might, great God, our King.

In this temple of freedom we give Thee thanks for the spirit and the service of our first President whom we affectionately call the Father of Our Country. We remember his courage in times of crisis, his fidelity during periods of adversity, and his faith which made him bend his knees on frozen ground that he might find strength and confidence to continue the struggle for independence.

Grant that the remembrance of this great life may strengthen us and our people to live and to labor for the freedom of all mankind. Thus may we ever be one nation, under Thee, with liberty and justice for all.

We pray in the spirit of the Lord of Life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 1969, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER) to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. WAMPLER read the Farewell Address as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home: your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite movement, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appelation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater

strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations: they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of fraction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false

alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern: some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free

people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 263) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 263

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress.

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Friedel, Maryland; Mr. Dent, Pennsylvania; Mr. Lipscomb, California.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Friedel, Maryland; Mr. Thompson, New Jersey; Mr. Podell, New York; Mr. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Mr. Harvey, Michigan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 264) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 264

Resolved, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration, to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 44 United States Code 3305, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PETTIS).

DESIGNATION OF MINORITY EMPLOYEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 265) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 265

Resolved, That, pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, John J. Williams is hereby designated a minority employee (to fill an existing vacancy) until otherwise ordered by the House, and shall receive gross compensation of $21,792.12 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the legislative program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills, and we are not prepared at this time to announce the program for the balance of next week. We will announce any further program next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have finished the legislative business for the week, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if I am correct in understanding that no program whatever is being announced for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. None is ready at this time. All the committees are working. We have been in touch with all the committees, but none of them have bills which are ready to be brought up.

Mr. GROSS. Monday is not a suspension day?

Mr. ALBERT. Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills.

Mr. GROSS. And there is no program at all for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Not as of now.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

WINNING SPEECH—VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest, the theme of which was "Freedom's Challenge."

I am proud to present to the Members of the House of Representatives the winning speech from the fine State of Mississippi, which was delivered by Mr. Gary E. Evans, of Iuka, Miss., and reads as follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

How wonderful it is to be able to rise in the morning with no fear of anyone's forcing himself into my house to take me to prison for some unknown reason, to be able to walk out my door and breathe the fresh air with no fear of molestation, to be able to express my opinions openly, and as I please, to be able to walk down the street unafraid of anyone, to have the right to purchase property as I wish, and the most wonderful of all—to pray and worship God freely. I am also greatly thankful as I realize that we in this great land have all of these freedoms, and that they are protected and insured to us by the Constitution of the United States.

We of the United States enjoy so many privileges that many people of other countries long for but never receive. Do we respect and protect these privileges as we should, or do we degrade them and take them for granted?

We in the United States should, each day, thank God for the freedoms which we have. As citizens of the United States, we have great responsibilities upon our shoulders to protect these freedoms for generations to come, for our children and our grandchildren, and also to make ourselves more worthy of them. Just as our founding fathers sacrificed so that we might have these freedoms, we should also be willing to sacrifice to protect them.

To make ourselves more worthy of these freedoms, we must always show respect for the great American flag which tody is being downtrodden by so many. One of the best ways to become more worthy is to help all of us in the United States keep unmovable faith in God as our founding fathers did. Also we can uphold, in all circumstances, the freedoms and principles upon which our country is based. By simply reminding those around us, who degrade the freedoms which we have, of just how fortunate we are to even live in a country with such privileges, we will be helping to make this land a better place in which to dwell.

As students today, we can help others become more aware of our freedoms. We can work with the leaders of our community, student government councils, faculties, and administrators to help everyone realize that these privileges are ours to protect and increase or to destroy.

To establish an Honor Society in every school would give students a feeling of greater responsibility and thus prevent much of the cheating in the schools today as well as give the students a feeling of accomplishment. Throughout the country young people need to accept more responsibility. We, the young people, need to know and realize that we are not the leaders of tomorrow but are a great part of the leadership of today. We also need to realize that we have a part in our society, and that, unless we function as we should, an important part of our country's accomplishments will be left unfulfilled. Really, this idea would be to help us young people realize more fully the freedoms that are ours to enjoy, rather than just to place responsibilities upon us. But, at the same time it would make better citizens of us in our future lives.

Yes, we Americans do have many freedoms for which to be thankful, but there are also challenges to be met along with the freedoms. Are we going to accept these challenges? I am, and I'm going to do everything in my power to secure and protect the privileges which we have in our great country. Let's all strive diligently to meet "Freedom's Challenge!"

PROPOSAL FOR A MINIMUM TAX

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this timely occasion to introduce legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by providing for a minimum income tax. It would seem only appropriate that I submit this legislation for the consideration of the Congress at the time when the Ways and Means Committee is undertaking a series of hearings on the general subject of tax reform, including discussion on minimum tax proposals.

It is shocking and immoral to find that 21 people with incomes over $1 million did not pay any income tax in the 1967 returns. Additionally, 134 more, with adjusted incomes above $200,000, paid no income tax.

In these times, moneys are so sorely needed for the rehabilitation of our cities in housing and transportation; for the welfare of our citizens, especially in the inner city, in recreation and employment and education; for food to feed the hungry in the depressed urban and rural pockets of our country.

In the recent past we have witnessed—and strongly protested—the diversion of great quantities of our resources away from such badly needed domestic programs, and the crisis of the cities and the poor and the underprivileged has grown until we can no longer afford to ignore their existence.

Certainly the need to redefine our priorities has been demonstrated by the American people. But the revenues to implement the necessary programs must be found. Simply to increase the already heavy tax burden is not the means. Such proposals as the "temporary" surtax have a way of becoming permanent, and the tax dilemma, especially for the middle- and low-income brackets, becomes a particularly critical burden.

It is the low- and middle-income salaried individual who cannot deduct "business expenses" who suffers under our tax system. It is time that the wealthy and the well-heeled businessman pays his fair share.

Mr. Speaker, the answer lies in sharing the burden so that those who can afford it will pay an equitable share of taxes. These particularly well-heeled elements of our society have found nontaxable but certain profitmaking means of deploying their wealth under the existing provisions of our tax structure.

The proposal I offer today would establish a graduated scale of tax rates on the entire gross income of every individual. The tax table would be as follows:

If the defined income is:	The minimum tax is:
Not over $10,000	0
Over $10,000 but not over $20,000	5% of the excess over $10,000
Over $20,000 but not over $30,000	$500 plus 10% of the excess over $20,000
Over $30,000 but not over $40,000	$1,500 plus 15% of the excess over $30,000
Over $40,000	$3,000 plus 20% of the excess over $40,000

In my view this kind of a graduated system would be the most fair. It would help shift the presently unbalanced payment schedule and provide some relief for the overtaxation of the low- and middle-income tax bracket.

An editorial in the Washington Post of February 12, "Time Has Come for Tax Reform," in stressing tax assistance for the low and middle income, cites the importance of tapping the elusive big incomes which now go untaxed:

> The Treasury experts found that "many persons with incomes of $1 million or more actually pay the same effective rate of tax as do persons with incomes only one-fiftieth as large."

The Treasury Department in its exhaustive study on tax reform, has proposed a minimum tax to correct this deficiency in the law.

Tax reform is something we have all talked long and hard about, and the hour has long passed that action should be taken. Perhaps now we will do something about it.

FEDERALLY CHARTERED BANKS IMMUNE FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court decision last June held that federally chartered banks were found to be immune from State and local taxes.

Yesterday the highest court in the State of New York, the court of appeals, also held that all federally chartered banks in the State of New York were immune from sales taxes, and nondiscriminatory use taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are well aware that this has cost some $30 million to $40 million in States revenue from the national banks throughout the United States.

I have introduced legislation which will remove the immunity of federally chartered institutions from State sales taxes.

I shall shortly furnish the Members of the House with a report setting forth the results of the survey I have taken together with my findings as a result of the informal public hearings. I think it is important that I alert my colleagues to the urgency of this problem particularly at a time when there has been a sharp acceleration of State expenditures and we find that our States have already reached tax capacity.

This discriminatory practice of affording immunity to national banks must be stopped. I hope I can have the support of my colleagues.

THE TFX—AN ATROCITY PERPETRATED UPON AMERICA'S TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of February 14 informs us that another TFX has crashed somewhere in Nevada. This was a scheduled 3-hour flight of about 750 miles. The $6 million aircraft carried two decorated flyers, both veterans of Vietnam.

Eleven of these so-called bombers have crashed in this country and Asia since the dual-service craft was put into operation in 1967.

I have long wished to express myself in regard to this flying deathtrap that an embarrassed Pentagon and a criminally liable corporation have foisted upon an unsuspecting taxpaying public. This plane is such a complete disaster as to now reach the exalted status of a national scandal.

Years have gone by. Billions have been spent. The Soviets have already put two generations of better aircraft into the air from their drawing boards. We are still making excuses for this airborne coffin, loaded down with gadgets designed to "revolutionize" warfare.

Incredible that the Congress and public have remained quiet for so long. Here we see more vividly with each passing day or crash that it is an utter disaster. Yet each time the Pentagon, the five-sided fairy-tale factory across the Potomac, coos sweetly into our ear that every day in every way the F-111A is getting better and better. It will cure cancer next, I suppose. It will do everything except perform its claimed and assigned combat duties and missions.

According to the Pentagon the TFX is about to replace any and all weapons systems devised for air combat since the days of the Renaissance geniuses. It will perhaps walk on water next. But it will not do what it was designed to do.

Mr. Speaker, the TFX is a fraud, a disaster and a grisly monument to all that is evil in the military-industrial complex. Brave men have died flying it, struck down because an American manufacturer cannot turn out an effective piece of hardware. Struck down after the foe in Vietnam failed, because the Pentagon refuses to admit that this plane is a shocking failure and that its own judgment was faulty.

Whenever anyone dares to criticize this gargantuan cropper, reams of press releases pour forth from the criminally liable corporation and the Pentagon. I have but one response to them. After years and billions of dollars and dozens of lives, this plane is a piece of trash, unworthy of being deployed for combat missions in Vietnam; unworthy of being used in any overseas area of American military responsibility and even incapable of making 750-mile, 3-hour training flights with America's top pilots aboard.

If the criminally liable corporation and the Pentagon can prove me wrong as of this writing, I will retract this statement on the floor of the House. I expect that this will happen when someone unties the Belt of Orion. Or when corporations such as the criminally liable one can produce a working piece of hardware in return for the money almost stolen from the public. Or when elephants roost on rosebushes or the Pentagon admits mistakes. Or when the M-16 is as good as the Russian assault rifle being used in Vietnam. Or when cows give beer.

The TFX, Mr. Speaker, is a disaster. A colossal abuse of taxpayer dollars and Government effort. A blood-tinged stain upon our country.

ARAB TERRORISTS ATTACK UNARMED ISRAELI AIRLINER

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, again Arab terrorists have attacked an unarmed Israel airliner at an international airport in an neutral country. El Al was simply utilizing its right to pursue a mission of peaceful international trade and travel, utilizing airways. It is that free right to use any international mode of movement that has been challenged through use of terror. All international carriers of any kind are in potential jeopardy through the setting of such precedents. Peaceful pursuit of any goal via international land, sea, and air travel could be compromised.

What if tomorrow Biafra decided to attack Nigerian aircraft at London Airport? Suppose Pakistan sends raiders to shoot up an Indian passenger plane in Istanbul? Or perhaps it will be native guerrillas from Portugal's colonies attacking a Portuguese airliner in Rome? Will the Catholic Irish of the south move against a plane flying out of Ulster? Perhaps next it will be emigres from the Soviet Union using machineguns on an Aeroflot craft. Nothing is too farfetched once precedents have been set.

Yet the world watches calmly while the rights of one small nation to use international air routes are abrogated with impunity by assassins and religious bigots who seek to persecute the Jewish people to death and extinction. The Arabs are inheritors of Hitler's goals.

Already U Thant, has made a few perfunctory blubbering protestations of indignation. They were uttered in one breath, while with the other he swiftly stated his hope that the Israelis would refrain from retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, my contempt for those who will press for Israeli forbearance far exceeds my disdain of the fedayeen. All over the world there will appear statement after statement deploring, condemning, and bewailing. Reams of newsprint will be expended bemoaning the Swiss incident. Airwaves will pulsate with breast beatings about the horror of it all. The perfunctory shredding of garments in Foggy Bottom will be as futile and hypocritical as U Thant's bleatings. It is all useless.

Mr. Speaker, the entire principle of free utilization of the world's airways and sealanes is at stake here. What is being done to Israel will be done to others in the future, utilizing these barbaric acts of senseless bloodshed against peaceful civilian travelers as precedents.

A few weeks ago, Iraq barbarically murdered 14 of her citizens. Nine were Jews. They were executed because of their faith in a manner the Inquisition would have found admirable. The world raged. Israel withheld its hand. What does the world propose that Israel do now? Hand a laurel garland to the terrorists?

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. is an international joke. No one will defend Israel but her own strong hand. She has the right to act in accordance with her international interests. When she strikes to prevent further acts of this kind, I for one do not intend to condemn her, beat my breast in moral outrage or call for improbable solutions to matter-of-fact situations.

SELECTION OF PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce next week a bill on the democratic selection of presidential nominees. The bill is addressed to the same proposition as that dealt with in the Hughes Commission report which was placed in the RECORD on October 15, 1968, page 31544, by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER). I invite comment from my colleagues, and after considering such, I should like to prepare a bill which some of them might wish to join. The bill will be introduced on Thursday of next week. Please notify me if you feel you may be interested in cosponsoring it. The tentative draft is as follows:

A bill to suspend the equal time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for certain candidates for nomination to the office of President, to provide for television debates for such candidates, and to afford the States a uniform means of selecting and instructing delegates to the presidential conventions of the major political parties to the end that the people will be more directly and equitably represented in the selection of party candidates, that the political processes of the Nation will be more orderly, meaningful, and informative, and that the inordinately high cost of seeking presidential nomination will be reduced

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 "Television Debate and Presidential Nominee Selection Act of 1969."

TITLE I—SUSPENSION OF SECTION 315 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

SEC. 101. That part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 which requires any licensee of a broadcast station who permits any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, is suspended with respect to the use of a broadcasting station by a candidate for a political party's nomination for President or by a candidate for the office of President in a television program conducted under the provisions of this Act. Nothing in this section shall be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under the Communications Act of 1934 to operate in the public interest.

TITLE II—TELEVISION COVERAGE ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—(a) Congress finds that there is presently too little effective political communication between presidential candidates and voters in the nature of debate and presentation of issues. Therefore, to promote the public welfare and to improve the democratic processes of nomination and election to the Presidency, it is essential to recognize the airwaves as part of the public domain, and to reserve television time for dialog on public issues between presidential candidates.

(b) In the construction and implementation of this title, Congress directs that regard be had to its overall objectives, the fair and equitable administration of the programs provided for, without favor to any candidate, and with the sole purpose of informing the public as fully as possible on the qualities and positions of each candidate.

SEC. 202. POLITICAL PARTIES ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE.—In order to qualify for participation in nationwide televised debates pursuant to this title, a political party must be a qualified political party under the laws of three-fourths of the States having presidential primary or convention statutes approved by the Attorney General of the United States pursuant to the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 203. COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC DEBATE.—(a) There is hereby created a Committee on Public Debate to consist of a Chairman and four other members to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each member shall serve for a term of five years except that (1) the four members first appointed (other than the Chairman) shall serve for terms of one, two, three and four years, respectively, and (2) any member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has qualified. It is the desire of Congress that the President appoint to this Committee citizens of distinction and proven expertness in judging the effectiveness and fairness of modes of public information with respect to candidates for nomination for the Presidency, as for instance, distinguished persons from the academic, scientific, or journalistic fields.

(b) It shall be the continuing duty of the Committee to—

(1) study possible modes of operating the machinery provided in this title, and possible alternatives thereto, and to report from time to time to the President and to Congress on the results of such study;

(2) cooperate with the Federal Communications Commission with respect to the duties mandated to that agency by this title; and

(3) evaluate the particular mode of implementing this title chosen and followed by the Commission, suggesting improvements to that agency while the work is in progress, and reporting to Congress finally on the efficacy and fairness of the operation of this title with respect to the presidential nominating process.

(c) The first meeting of the Committee shall be called on sufficient notice by its Chairman, promptly after the enactment of this Act, and meetings shall be held thereafter, on call by the Committee at its last meeting or by the Chairman, at such times and at such intervals as may be required in order that the Committee may perform effectively the duties given it in the preceding subsection.

SEC. 204. PERSONNEL.—The Committee is authorized to provide for a staff for the Committee, and to promulgate duties and establish salaries for the members of such staff.

SEC. 205. DEBATES AMONG CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION.—(a) The Commission shall administer this section and section 206 of this title.

(b) The duties of the Commission, with respect to the operation of this title, shall be as follows:

(1) The Commission shall determine, no later than the 31st day of May of each presidential election year, the political parties which have met the requirements of section 202 and shall commence the process of determining who are the leading presidential candidates of each such political party. Such leading candidates shall be selected as follows:

(A) The Commission shall select not more than four nor less than two reliable opinion polling agencies sampling national public opinion.

(B) The Commission shall then select or obtain polls conducted by each of the polling agencies chosen representing an accurate measure of the preference of the voters of a party for the candidate for the nomination

of such party for President expressed as a percentage of all persons of the party polled, other than those who are undecided.

(c) The Commission shall then take the average of the polls in order to determine the average percentage of preference for each candidate for the nomination of each party and shall eliminate any candidate having an average percentage of preference of less than two percent within his respective party.

(D)(i) After the Commission has determined the candidates, it shall forthwith notify each such candidate to that effect by the most expeditious means of communication and shall advise such candidate that, unless he requests that his name not be used, his name will be included in the television debates under this section.

(ii) If such candidate requests that his name not be used for the purpose of inclusion in the television debates among the candidates for the nomination of a political party under this section, the Commission shall not certify his name for participation in any television debate under this section among the candidates for the nomination of such party. The Commission shall then notify the political party of the person who has so declined. No candidate shall have his name removed from the ballot of any State by virtue of his refusing to participate in any television debate.

(2) Prior to May 31 of each such presidential election year, the Commission shall invite each of the three major television networks to submit the names of four distinguished and nationally recognized journalists. Of these twelve, the Commission shall select three names, using methods customary in arbitration proceedings, permitting the striking of names by candidates, or employing any other fair and equitable means of selection. The Commission shall keep the Committee fully and currently informed on its selection process.

(3) The Commission shall in every way assist and cooperate with the Committee.

(4) (A) For each political party with two or more presidential candidates certified by the Commission there shall be television programs occupying not less than four hours of prime time without cost to the candidates, the parties, or any agency of government. The Commission shall select television stations to carry such programs. Such shall be done on equitable and fair basis so as to provide coverage throughout each State which is eligible to receive Federal assistance under title III of this Act. Such time shall be used on one or more programs in June of each presidential election year.

(B) Should a political party have only one presidential candidate who qualifies for television time under this title, such candidate shall be entitled to only one program of one hour duration.

SEC. 206. ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.—In the event that additional time is afforded voluntarily by television stations, the Commission may provide for programs comparable to programs conducted under section 205. In the event that, after the Presidential primary election or convention in a State which has received Federal assistance under title III, there remains any amount not committed to the costs of the elections or conventions in such State's nominating fund established under section 302(b)(1) at the direction of the appropriate authority of the State, the Commission may use such amounts to purchase television time, equally apportioned between the parties which have met the requirements of section 202, for programs which shall follow the same general format as those conducted under section 205, but in which the candidates selected at the national conventions of such political parties may appear and participate in the debate. The television time shall be separately purchased in the States from whence the excess funds come. Broadcasters shall make television time available, and such time shall be purchased only at the rate at which such time is sold to the most favored purchaser.

TITLE III—STATE ELECTION AND CONVENTION PROCEDURES

SEC. 301. PURPOSE.—Congress finds there is little uniformity in the States in selecting delegates to the national conventions of the political parties and that the political processes of the Nation will be more orderly and meaningful if more uniformity is established. Congress also finds that the present conglomeration of delegate selection procedures causes a maximum exposure of candidates to political foment of a demonstration or carnival nature and that this political activity continues over a period of many months, exposing the candidates to a maximum of physical exhaustion and danger and to inordinate expense for a minimum return in informing the electorate of issues and positions of the candidates on them. It is necessary and proper that the States be afforded opportunity to activate a common national method of selecting and instructing delegates from a State to the conventions of the political parties.

SEC. 302. STATE LAW STANDARDS.—The law of a State, to be in compliance with this title so as to afford such State the grants and benefits provided for in this Act, shall contain the following provisions:

(a) General provisions.

(1) Delegates from a State to a national convention of a political party must be selected by a convention system or by an election system. One system of selection shall be used to select all the delegates of a political party but the State need not require all political parties in the State to use the same system of selection.

(2) There shall be reasonable safeguards to assure that the election or convention be properly advertised and that the machinery and facilities for such process are such as to afford fair and equal opportunity to all the qualified voters of a State desiring to participate in the parties' affairs to do so.

(3) The election or convention in which delegates to the national convention are selected shall be held not earlier than the first nor later than the twelfth day of July of that presidential year in which the national convention is held.

(b) If a convention system be used:

(1) Any State convention shall be composed entirely of delegates selected from political subdivisions of the State which in the aggregate comprise the entire State.

(2) Votes at the State convention shall be allocated among the political subdivisions directly in proportion to the votes cast in such subdivision for the electors of the party in the last Presidential election, rounded out to the closest whole number. If the party did not appear on the ballot in the last Presidential election, votes at the State convention shall be allocated among the political subdivisions directly in proportion to their population according to the last decennial census, rounded out to the closest whole number.

(3) The delegates shall be free to nominate persons for the party's nomination for President. They shall then hold one ballot at which the delegates, or the delegations from the subdivisions, shall cast their votes. Such method of voting shall be in accordance with a system which affords proportionate representation, by fair and proportionate representative process, to the voters of the State adhering to each political party qualifying.

(4) When the votes for the party's nomination for President are tallied, it shall be determined what percentage of the total vote was cast for each nominee, and the delegates to the national convention from the party conventions of that State who are supporters of each nominee shall be in proportion to the votes cast for that nominee, to the closest single delegate. There shall be no additional delegates sent from the State to the national convention, such as "at large" delegates. The group of delegates to the national convention, selected as the proportionate representation of each nominee, shall be selected by a caucus of those delegates at the State convention who voted for that nominee.

(5) If any convention of a subdivision, such as the precinct or county convention, elects to send to the next higher convention within the State a delegation which is instructed with respect to the candidates for the Presidency, a like procedure of proportionate representation shall be followed. The group of delegates to the next higher convention selected at any convention in a subdivision of the State, such as a precinct or a county, shall be selected by a caucus of those delegates in that subdivision's convention who voted for that nominee.

(6) In the event that only one nominee is presented at the convention of a State, county, precinct or political subdivision (as in the case of a favorite son nominee) notice may be given by any member of the convention of opposition to such single nominee. In that event, his name shall be presented for votes for or against such nominee and the delegation from the convention shall be constituted in proportion to the yea and nay votes in the same manner as if the yea votes had been cast for one candidate and the nay votes for another.

(c) If an election system be used:

(1) There shall be fair and comprehensive provisions for elections, including qualifications of nominees, the method of placing names on the ballot, and other election details.

(2) When the votes for a party's nomination for President are tallied, it shall be determined what percentage of the total vote was cast for each nominee, and the delegates to the national convention for each of the nominees shall be in proportion to the votes cast for that nominee to the closest single delegate.

(3) The group of delegates to the national convention selected as the proportionate representation of each nominee shall be selected by that nominee or by his designee, which may be his political organization in the State in question, as he shall designate.

(d) Instruction of delegates. Those delegates selected as delegates of a candidate may be bound to support such candidate through the first ballot of the convention and shall not otherwise be bound in any way with respect to support of candidates for presidential or vice presidential nomination. Such instruction shall be imposed only by the body, group or person selecting such delegates as provided in (b) and (c) of this section, and such instruction, if given, must be given in the caucus or in the letter of instruction in which they are named. Such instruction as may be given shall not survive the life of the candidate, and a candidate may personally release such delegates from their instruction by written release delivered to the chairman of the delegation. In the case of such release or in case of death of a candidate, those delegates selected as delegates of such candidate shall not be bound by any instruction with respect to support of candidates for presidential or vice presidential nomination. The rule stated here applies to all convention levels at which there are delegates from a lower convention and applies to delegates to the national convention of a party whether selected under (b) or (c) of this section.

(e) Effect of noncompliance. The failure of State legislation to comply with the uniform standards set out in section 302, or the failure of State legislation to be so certified by the Attorney General, shall not affect the general validity of the State's process for participating in the party presidential nom-

ination procedure but shall render the State ineligible to receive grants or other benefits under this Act.

(e) Financial Assistance to States.

(1) Each State which—

(A) has in effect on January 1 of the calendar year in which the President is elected a primary election statute which the Attorney General has determined is in compliance with this section, and

(B) has established a nominating fund, as provided in this section,

shall receive in such calendar year, as a grant-in-aid from the Federal Government for such nominating fund, twenty cents for each vote cast in such year for a candidate for a party's nomination for President in the primary election held pursuant to the certified State statute to aid in defraying the expenses of such election, to be distributed to or used on behalf of each political party using such primary.

(2) Each State which—

(A) has in effect on January 1 of the calendar year in which the President is elected a convention statute which the Attorney General has determined is in compliance with this section, and

(B) has established a nominating fund, as provided in this section,

shall receive during such calendar year, as a grant-in-aid from the Federal Government, for such nominating fund one dollar per hundred population of the State to be distributed to or used on behalf of each political party using such convention system.

(3) Any State electing to participate in a system of delegate selection provided for in this Act may submit to the Department of Justice proposed legislation complying with the standards set out in this section; and the Attorney General of the United States may give approval to the form of statute, which shall constitute assurance to the State that, if such legislation is enacted, the State will be in compliance with the uniform standards set out in this section. In that event, no further action, other than notification to the Justice Department by the Governor of the passage of the Act, shall be necessary. Upon receiving such notification, the Attorney General shall certify to the Commission that the State's statute meets the requirements set out herein.

(4) In the event that no such prior notice is given to the Justice Department, or the proposed legislation submitted to the Justice Department is amended before enactment by the State, the Governor of the State shall, after the passage of such legislation, certify to the Justice Department that such legislation has been passed. The Attorney General of the United States shall then consider such legislation. If such legislation is in compliance with uniform standards for such legislation set out in this section, he shall so certify to the complying State and to the Commission.

(5) Whenever the Attorney General determines, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that a State statute approved under subsection (a) or (b) has been so amended that it no longer complies with the requirements set out in section 302, he shall inform such State and the Commission that such State's statute is no longer a State statute which is approved under this section. After the Attorney General notifies such State, no further payments may be made under this Act to such State, or to political parties in such State.

(6) A State shall establish a nominating fund to aid in offsetting the expenses of the primary election or convention process. Such fund may be used by the State in such manner as it may provide by law to further the holding of party nominating conventions or elections and amounts remaining in such after such conventions or elections shall be available for the purposes of section 206. A party's procedure leading to the selection of presidential and vice presidential candidates may be combined with the party's procedures for selecting other party candidates, and expenditures may be made from the fund established under this subsection to pay the cost of such combined procedure. The State may either become the depository of all funds, from whatever derivation, and provide for payment of costs of elections or conventions, or it may provide means by which funds shall go from the State or Federal sources (or both) to the party to conduct such elections or conventions. Thus, if a State generally qualifies to receive grants-in-aid, but because of policy or statutory or constitutional limitation of the State may not receive and distribute such funds to a political party from the State's own treasury of funds, such funds may be distributed directly by the Federal Government to the appropriate political party as the State may direct. No moneys from this fund shall be used for other than the defraying of the costs of an election, a convention, or the costs of the television programs referred to in title II, section 206 of this Act.

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.—

(a) The term "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, or any other territory or possession allowed to vote in national political conventions.

(b) "Qualified political party" means a party which has qualified for its candidates or electors to be placed on the ballots throughout the State for president and vice president for the current election year; provided, however: If it has qualified in past years and is not yet required to be qualified in a given election year at the time of the applicability of this Act to the action involved, it is a "qualified political party" if its duly authorized agent expresses the intention of the party to qualify giving notice of intent in such manner as the State law may provide. But at any time that it has passed a deadline for qualification in a presidential year, is not yet qualified and may not qualify under the law of the State, it shall not then and thereafter be a "qualified political party."

(c) "Commission" means the Federal Commissions Commission.

(d) "Committee" means the Committee on Public Debate.

(e) "Population," wherever used, means population according to the last decennial census.

(f) "Attorney General" means the Attorney General of the United States.

(g) "Justice Department" means the Department of Justice of the United States.

SEC. 402. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act (other than sections 203 and 204) shall take effect on January 1 of the year following the year in which it is enacted. Sections 203 and 204 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

ABM SYSTEM RIDICULOUS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a thin antiballistic-missile defense system around the United States would be as obsolete as the Great Wall of China. It will be as ineffective as the maginot line. This proposal would be a rerun of the gallant Polish cavalry charging Hitler's panzer divisions. It will be as ridiculous as guerrillas in South Vietnam shooting arrows at low-flying jet bombers.

Mr. Speaker, I remember one day in high school the principal turned out the entire student body to see a picturesque troop of U.S. Army cavalry passing by. I wondered even then how these splendid men would fare in battle with armored tanks and bombers. Since becoming a Member of the Congress, I recall going on a national TV and radio broadcast to debate a retired general who advocated a reactivation of the horse cavalry. I keep on the wall of my office a picture of Billy Mitchell as a constant reminder that we cannot provide security for this Nation and the cause of freedom on military concepts of the past. To do so today will be playing into the hands of our enemies and will be fatal. If we had listened in the early 1930's to those who advocated airpower, tanks, and modernized weaponry, including aircraft carriers, we might have avoided World War II and preserved the peace of the world. No, Mr. Speaker, we must not fall into the error of taking an instrument of war or defense today and base our security on that instrumentality tomorrow. Alexander the Great conquered the world because he developed something new—the Greek phalanx. Rome conquered the world and maintained its power for centuries by developing something new—the Roman legion. Napoleon dazzled Europe with something new—the mass use of artillery in battle. In defense planning we cannot look backward. We must look forward. This money must be used for offensive instrumentalities of defense. No nation will move against America if they are sure of destruction in their own homeland. Tomorrow the only true defense will be an overwhelming offensive power. With our advances in space, we could remain capable of destroying any aggressor on his home ground.

Mr. Speaker, even laymen are aware there is no defense today against a missile in air or a bomb from space with many hydrogen warheads that can separate in flight and change direction to numerous targets. I urge our new and great Secretary of Defense and the Congress to abandon this thin anti-missile defense as utterly inadequate and ridiculous. I urge the Secretary and the Congress to look to the year 2000 and develop an offensive potential which will promote peace throughout the world and preserve the security of the American people.

THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969." It gives me great pleasure to say that I am joined in cosponsoring this bill by eight distinguished colleagues from both sides of the aisle: the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLOSKEY). The improvement of intergovernmental relations is

not and should not be a matter for party politics.

This measure is designed to build on the firm foundation established by the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of last year—Public Law 90–577—and is geared to strengthening further the management of Federal assistance programs. By focusing on the accounting, auditing, and fiscal reporting of grant funds, by facilitating consolidation of functionally related aid programs, by establishing expeditious procedures for processing projects drawing on more than one such program, and by strengthening congressional as well as executive branch grant-in-aid oversight, this measure faces squarely the key administrative deficiencies at the national level that must be corrected if federalism today is to meet and overcome the divisive challenges confronting it and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, which I had the privilege of sponsoring, constitutes the first major step in bringing some order to the confused state of contemporary Federal-State-local relations. By revamping procedures affecting the distribution of Federal grant funds to the States, by authorizing Federal departments and agencies to provide specialized and technical services to other jurisdictions on a reimbursable basis, by mandating a coordinated intergovernmental policy for the administration of development assistance grants, by establishing uniform policies and procedures with respect to the acquisition and disposal of urban land, and by beginning to strengthen congressional oversight over certain grant programs, some of the impediments to the effective operation of our federal system have been removed. How beneficial this legislation will be in the long run depends, of course, on the character of the implementing rules and regulations now being developed by the Bureau of the Budget and on the willingness of Federal departments and agencies to comply with the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Meanwhile, we must move forward on the legislative front. Many serious problems still face us in the area of Federal-State-local relations. No breakthrough has been achieved in improving the fiscal management of Federal assistance programs. No effort has been mounted on a broad, meaningful basis to reduce to a more manageable number the more than 420 categorical grants through the consolidation of functionally related programs into bloc grants. No meaningful procedures have been developed to facilitate the combining of closely related Federal assistance programs by State and local governments. And much too modest steps have been taken so far to provide Congress with the manpower to strengthen its programs oversight responsibilities, or to improve departmental and Executive Office of the President oversight with regard to these programs.

The lack of adequate action in these areas clearly signifies that further reform of the grant-in-aid system should be made a top priority item for this Congress. In large measure, these assistance programs represent a national response to the severe public service and the fiscal pressures that State and local governments have felt since the end of World War II, and especially during the past decade. Federal aid to State and local governments experienced a nearly fourfold increase between 1957 and 1967, with an average annual rise of over 14 percent. Federal grants now involve well over 420 separate authorizations, as estimated $25 billion for fiscal year 1970, and approximately 18 percent of estimated State and local revenue. At least 280 of these programs have been enacted since 1963.

However meritorious the purposes of Federal grant programs may be, this tremendous expansion of Federal aid has brought major problems as well. The extraordinary number and variety of these programs have created conditions of overlapping, duplication, and fragmentation at all levels. The excessive emphasis on narrow program categories has tended to obscure the need to deal with problems from the broad perspective of each level of government as a whole. Differing financial reporting, accounting, and auditing requirements among the various programs have generated as much conflict as cooperation among the personnel involved in these functions. Furthermore, efforts to develop an overview with respect to the operation of these programs—either within the committees of Congress or within the top management sector of the executive branch—have been largely sporadic and largely unsuccessful.

The legislation I introduce today comes to grips with these administrative defects, which undermine the collaborative basis of our federal system. It does so by concentrating on strengthening the financial management of Federal assistance programs, by authorizing a new way to speed grant consolidations, by establishing new procedures to facilitate the packaging of various aid programs, and by strengthening the monitoring of the operation of these programs by Congress, the departments, and the President.

Each of these provisions has been recommended by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on which I am privileged to serve. The goals of the measure as a whole are supported by the major associations of public officials, including the National Governors' Conference, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, and U.S. Conference of Mayors. The financial management, Federal assistance consolidations, and joint funding simplification titles, in many instances, reflect changes urged in testimony at hearings Act enacted last year.

Mr. Speaker, if we face a management crisis in federalism, and I am convinced on the Intergovernmental Cooperation that we do, then this legislation is needed. I earnestly hope that early hearings can be scheduled on this measure and that final House action on it can be accomplished this session.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a section-by-section analysis of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969):

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1969

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

This title contains definitions of two terms used frequently in other titles of the bill.

TITLE II—ACCOUNTING, AUDITING, AND REPORTING OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

Title II amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (P.L. 90–577) by adding a new Title VII which deals with the accounting, auditing, and reporting of Federal assistance funds. Section 701 sets forth the purposes of this new title: to encourage the simplification and standardization of the diverse financial reporting requirements of Federal assistance programs, to promote among Federal grant agencies accounting and auditing policies that rely on those State and local fiscal control systems which meet certain professional standards, and to empower the Comptroller General of the United States to establish rules and regulations for use of certain State and local audits in meeting GAO's responsibilities regarding Federal assistance programs.

More uniform financial reporting

Section 702 authorizes the President, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to establish rules and regulations that will simplify and, where possible, make more uniform the financial reporting requirements associated with Federal assistance programs. The purpose here is to bring greater order to a situation where widely varying forms, differing time schedules, and divergent data requests have undermined the basic objectives of meaningful fiscal reporting on Federal assistance programs.

Federal agencies reliance on the financial management control systems of States and their political subdivisions

Section 703 declares it to be the purpose of this section that Federal agencies administering assistance programs to State and local governments shall, to the greatest extent feasible, rely on the internal or independent accounting and auditing of these programs performed by recipient jurisdictions. Under this section, heads of agencies are assigned the responsibility of determining the adequacy of the internal financial management control systems utilized by recipient jurisdictions. In meeting this responsibility, such heads will, among other things, ascertain whether accounting records are maintained and reports prepared according to generally accepted accounting principles, whether audits are carried out in a way that meets generally accepted auditing standards, and whether the auditing function is performed in a timely fashion by a qualified professional staff that is sufficiently independent—in an administrative and political sense—from program operations, so that a comprehensive and objective audit can be performed. Where such control systems are found acceptable, agency heads, in the absence of substantial reasons to the contrary, are required to accept the audits performed under such systems as a substitute for those which otherwise would be performed by their own agency personnel. The periodic sample testing technique is cited as the chief means of verifying the continuing reliability of accepted control systems.

In order to strengthen the cooperative relationships among fiscal management personnel, each Federal agency administering assistance programs is required (under Section 703(e)) to maintain continuous liaison with counterpart State and local fiscal control administrators and the interchange of audit standards and objectives and interlevel collaboration in the development of audit schedules are specifically cited as means of furthering this liaison. To reduce the proliferation of accounting and auditing systems within and between Federal agencies, Federal agency heads are required, to

the extent feasible and permitted by law, to coordinate and make more uniform the auditing requirements of assistance programs coming under their jurisdiction (Section 703 (f)) and to establish cross-servicing arrangements with other agencies for audit purposes (Section 703(g)). The Bureau of the Budget, or such other agency as may be designated by the President, is authorized to prescribe government-wide rules and regulations for the effective implementation of this section.

Acceptance by the General Accounting Office of audits of States and their political subdivisions

Section 704 of this new title authorizes the Comptroller General to prescribe rules and regulations that would permit the General Accounting Office to accept for its grant audit purposes the auditing performed by recipient State and local governments, provided that such auditing is performed under internal financial management control systems whose procedures meet generally accepted auditing standards and whose personnel are professional and in a position to render a comprehensive and objective audit. As in the case of the previous section, periodic sample testing is relied upon as the chief device for verifying the continued reliability of accepted systems. This section also calls for an annual report to the Congress by the Comptroller General on the operations of this section.

TITLE III—CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

This title further amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-577) by adding another title to it dealing with a new approach to achieving consolidations of Federal assistance programs.

Section 801 declares the title's basic purposes and states that the President from time to time shall examine the various Federal assistance programs and determine what consolidations are necessary and desirable in order to upgrade the management and coordination of individual programs falling within the same functional area, and to promote more efficient planning and use by recipient jurisdictions of such programs.

Section 801(b) establishes a Congressional policy with respect to Federal assistance program consolidations and declares that the better management purposes of this title can best be accomplished by its enactment.

Preparation and transmittal of plan

Under Section 802, the President, after finding that a consolidation of two or more functionally-related aid programs is necessary and desirable to achieve the purpose(s) of this title, is authorized to prepare a consolidation plan and to transmit it to Congress along with a declaration indicating his finding that the plan will further the purposes of this title.

Each consolidation plan transmitted must place responsibility in a single Federal agency for the administration of the consolidated program; specify the new, single matching formula and, where the individual programs being combined have apportionment formulas, such a formula for rendering Federal assistance under the consolidated program; include other conditions and requirements for rendering such assistance, including planning and eligibility requirements, which are suggested by counterpart provisions of Federal assistance statutes affected by the consolidation plan; spell out the differences between the formulas, conditions, and requirements of a consolidation plan and those in such counterpart provisions; provide for the transfer or other disposition of records, property, and personnel of the individual assistance programs involved; arrange for the transfer of those unexpended balances of appropriations and of other funds available for the individual assistance programs affected insofar as the President considers it necessary in light of the functions authorized by the consolidated program (except that unexpended balances thus transferred may be used only for purposes authorized in the original appropriation); and make provision for terminating the affairs of an agency or administrative unit whose programs have been transferred pursuant to the proposed consolidation. With reference to the President's discretion in determining a consolidation plan's formulas, requirements, and conditions, its scope is limited by two factors: first, no such provision can be included that is not present in at least one of the individual aid programs being consolidated, and second, whenever two or more differing matching (or apportionment) ratios are present in such programs the new figure must fall within the bounds set by these ratios.

Finally, this section stipulates that each Federal assistance consolidation plan shall provide for only one consolidation of individual assistance programs and that the President when transmitting such a plan, shall have it delivered to both Houses of Congress on the same date and to each when in session.

Congressional consideration

Sections 803 and 804 of this title set forth the manner in which Congress shall consider Federal assistance consolidation plans. In all major respects the procedure here parallels the provisions that formerly applied under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. One major difference between the two appears in Section 803 which stipulates that a Federal assistance consolidation plan shall only become effective at the end of the first period of ninety calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after transmittal date (rather than sixty calendar days), unless between the day of transmittal and the end of the ninety day period either House passes a resolution not favoring the plan.

Expiration date

Section 805 limits the authority of the President under Section 802 to three years after the date of enactment. This provision is geared to giving both Congress and the Executive Branch an opportunity to review the operation of this title after a reasonable period of time.

TITLE IV—JOINT FUNDING SIMPLIFICATION

Section 401 further amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 by adding a new Title IX dealing with joint funding simplification. Section 901 states that the purpose of the title is to enable States and localities to use Federal aid programs more effectively and efficiently, to adapt these programs more readily to their individual needs by facilitating the broader use of joint projects involving more than one aid program, and to acquire experience that would lead to additional legislative proposals regarding consolidation, coordination, and simplification of Federal assistance programs. The statement of purpose also indicates the basic organizational focus of the title (which differs from that of predecessor legislation introduced in the 90th Congress) wherein primary emphasis is given to developing widespread use of joint projects and joint funding arrangements within individual departments and placing counterpart efforts at the interdepartmental level on an experimental and limited demonstration basis.

Intradepartmental joint projects

Section 902 deals wholly with procedures involving intradepartmental joint projects and joint funding arrangements. Under it, the head of each Federal department and agency administering more than one Federal aid program is authorized to approve combined applications for joint projects requiring funding from two or more such programs falling under his jurisdiction. To develop the necessary departmental or agency capability for achieving the purposes of this title, Section 902(b) requires departmental heads, among other things, to identify related aid programs within his agency that are likely candidates for joint projects; to develop and promulgate guidelines, joint project examples, common application forms, and other materials that will facilitate development of an interdepartmental joint project program; to review the various administrative requirements of departmental assistance programs in order to identify those that might impede the expeditious processing of joint project applications and where appropriate make the necessary modifications; to establish common technical or administrative rules for related departmental assistance programs; to create common or joint application processing and project supervision procedures—including establishing a single unit for handling these functions; and to develop common auditing, accounting, and fiscal reporting procedures to facilitate establishment of fiscal and program accountability with respect to joint projects approved by him.

In order to provide the means of cutting the red tape arising from the varying procedural requirements associated with individual assistance program, the head of each Federal department and agency administering two or more such programs is authorized under section 902(c) to adopt, subject to such regulations as may be promulgated by the President pursuant to Section 902(f), uniform provisions regarding inconsistent or conflicting agency requirements involving financial administration, the timing of Federal payments, whether assistance must be extended in the form of a grant or a contract, merit personnel systems (but only to the extent that a proposed joint project would cause these requirements to be applied to programs not otherwise subject to them), the accountability for or the disposition of property or structures acquired or constructed with Federal assistance, and other relevant administrative and technical items defined in regulations issued pursuant to subsection (f).

To develop the intradepartmental financial arrangements necessary for expediting joint projects, each head of a department and agency administering two or more Federal assistance programs is permitted under Section 902(d) to set up a single board or panel for the review of combined applications to his department; to prescribe rules and regulations for establishing joint management funds with respect to joint projects approved by him, so that the total amount approved for any project may be accounted for as if the funds had been derived from a single aid program or authorization; to establish uniform rules and regulations governing the fiscal reporting of projects financed through joint management funds; to have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to relevant records and other data of recipient States and local governments relating to moneys received from joint management funds authorized by him; and to establish a single non-Federal share for any joint project authorized by him and covered in a joint management fund.

Section 902(e) permits such heads of departments and agencies, subject to such regulations as may be established pursuant to subsection (f), to enter into agreements with States to extend the benefits of joint projects and joint management funds to cover combined applications involving not only assistance from programs administered by his department but also from those administered by one or more State agencies. In most instances, such arrangements will be restricted primarily to those program areas where Federal assistance is normally channeled through the States.

Under Section 902(f), the President is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to provide for the more effective administration of funds drawn from more than one Federal assistance program or authorization in support of interdepartmental projects authorized by this section. While fewer administrative problems

can be expected to arise in establishing meaningful departmental joint project programs than in the case of interdepartmental projects, energetic and consistent departmental efforts may not always be forthcoming—hence, the need for this section.

Section 902(g) declares that this section shall become effective 120 days following the date of enactment. This extra time is provided to permit departments to develop the necessary internal machinery and procedures for the effective management of a joint project program.

Interdepartmental demonstration joint projects

Section 903 extends selectively the benefits of joint projects and joint management funding on a government-wide basis. This is done in recognition of the administrative difficulties involved in this commendable but complex undertaking. Section 903(a) authorizes the President to approve on a demonstration basis combined applications for joint projects requiring funding from two or more Federal assistance programs administered by more than one Federal department or agency.

Section 903(b) gives to the President with respect to interdepartmental projects authorities comparable to those assigned to heads of departments and agencies under Section 902(b), (c), (d), and (e). This is done in order to facilitate the development of the necessary capability in the Executive Office of the President for processing and administering interdepartmental joint projects and joint management funds.

Section 903(c) authorizes the President to establish rules and regulations requiring the delegation by heads of Federal departments and agencies to other departments and agencies of project or program approval authority insofar as it involves programs or classes of programs included in an interdepartmental joint project(s). Without this authority, it is doubtful whether the goals of this section can be achieved. Such rules and regulations may also call for the delegation to other Federal departments and agencies of powers relating to the supervision of Federal assistance programs. These rules and regulations are conditioned by the proviso that they must be appropriate to assure that the powers and functions delegated are utilized in full conformity with applicable statutory provisions or policies.

Section 903(d) is geared to permitting establishment of joint management funds on an interdepartmental basis. Accordingly, the President is authorized to make rules and regulations, not inconsistent with other applicable law, governing the setting up of joint management funds involving moneys derived from two or more Federal assistanec programs administered by more than one Federal department or agency. These rules and regulations will assure that the necessary accounting, auditing, and other fiscal information will be made available to the departments involved, the Congress, and the Executive Office of the President. They also shall stipulate that any department or agency administering a joint fund shall be accountable for the total amount provided for the purposes of each account established in the fund and shall practice accounting and auditing policies consistent with new Title VII. Such rules and regulations may include procedures for determining on a periodic basis whether amounts in the account are in excess of those required, for returning that excess to participating agencies according to an equitable distribution formula, and for making returns to applicable appropriations, subject to fiscal year limitations.

Section 903(e) requires the President to submit annually to Congress a report evaluating the progress in accomplishing the purposes of this title. This report will be submitted in every January beginning with the first January following the end of the first fiscal year after the effective date of this section.

Section 903(f) underscores the demonstration nature of this entire section. Consequently, individual interdepartmental joint projects initiated under its authority must not exceed 100 in any one fiscal year nor exceed 250 during the three year life of this section.

The final subsection stipulates that this section will become effective 120 days following the date of enactment and will expire three years after it has become effective. Such expiration, however, shall not affect the administration of interdepartmental joint projects previously approved.

Auxiliary provisions

Section 904(a) is designed to help provide technical assistance to State and local governments involved in developing combined applications for joint projects. Under it, appropriations available to any Federal aid program for technical assistance or personnel training may be made available for the provision of such assistance in connection with joint projects involving that program and any other Federal aid program. In addition, the personnel of any Federal agency (pursuant to Section 904(b)) may be detailed from time to time, where necessary, to other agencies to assist in processing combined applications or in administering approved joint projects.

The authority of the Comptroller General of the United States

Section 905 states that the Comptroller General of the United States shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of recipients of intradepartmental or interdepartmental joint projects relating to moneys received from joint management funds for the purpose of GAO audit and examination.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL AND EXECUTIVE OVERSIGHT OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Section 501 of this Act amends the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 by adding a new subsection at the end of Section 601. This amendment is designed to strengthen Congressional review procedures for grants-in-aid enacted on or after January 3, 1971 and having termination provisions of three or more years. During the year preceding the date on which the program authority is to expire, the relevant substantive Committees of Congress, either separately or jointly, will conduct studies of the program and advise their respective Houses of their findings with special reference to the factors cited in Section 601(a) (1), (2), (3), and (4). The Committee report will be filed with the respective Houses not later than 120 days before the program is slated to expire.

Section 502 amends Title VI of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 by adding two new sections following Section 603 and appropriately renumbering Section 604. The first of these new sections authorizes establishment of the position of review specialist on each standing committee of the Senate and House responsible for the review, study, and oversight of two or more assistance programs. This additional professional staff member will be selected and appointed by the Chairman of the standing committee with prior approval of the ranking minority member. He would serve on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of professional competence. His basic assignment would be to assist the Committee in its performance of functions assigned by this title and he would be under the joint direction of the Chairman and the ranking minority member.

The second new section (Section 605) is geared to strengthening Executive Branch oversight with respect to Federal assistance programs. Under it, heads of Federal departments and agencies administering more than one program would submit annually a report to Congress and the President on the operations of these programs, beginning with the first fiscal year following the date of enactment. These departmental reports among other things would cover the progress and effectiveness of administrative efforts to carry out the programs' statutory goals; the consultative procedures utilized under each program to afford recipient governments a chance to review and comment on proposed administrative regulations and basic program changes; the various intradepartmental and interdepartmental arrangements for achieving proper headquarters-field program coordination; efforts to simplify and make more uniform application forms and procedues as well as fiscal reporting and auditing requirements; the feasibility of consolidating functionally related assistance programs; the practicability of delegating more administrative authority—including project or program approval power—to departmental field offices; whether the purpose, management, administrative procedures and requirements in such programs should be changed; and the degree to which such programs are meeting the growing and changing needs they were initially designed to support.

This new section (Section 605) concludes with the requirement that the President shall submit a summary report on these various departmental studies not later than January 31 of each year following the first fiscal year after the date of enactment. This report would be a synthesis of the materials presented in the various departmental studies and would stress the broad problems confronting grants-in-aid as effective government-wide devices for intergovernmental cooperation. Presidential proposals for reform might well be a concluding feature of this report.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I submit, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969." This measure serves as a followup to predecessor legislation enacted last year—Public Law 90-577—and constitutes a second major step toward strengthening the collaborative relationships among the Federal, State, and local governments. In essence, it is a good-management bill, in that all of its titles seek to overcome antiquated and ineffective techniques of public administration—techniques which must be revamped if American federalism is to adapt to the rapidly changing needs of our times.

Intergovernmental relations have experienced a major transformation since the end of World War II. Three key factors have triggered this dramatic change: the emergence of a greater role for State and local government, an accelerating tendency to rely upon categorical grants-in-aid, and the dramatic emergence of a more urban America.

Rapid urbanization and the rapid expansion of our population have generated tremendous demands from our citizenry for more and better public services during the past two decades. Most of this demand has fallen on State and local governments. Witness the fact that over the past decade expenditures by these jurisdictions rose at an average annual rate of 8.8 percent compared to 6.3 percent for direct nondefense spending by the Federal Government and that these expenditures now represent two-thirds of all civil governmental outlays.

Given these heavy pressures on the fiscal and administrative resources of State and local governments, the National Government was called upon to

mount its own response and as a result Federal grant-in-aid programs grew steadily both in volume and diversity in recent years. More than 420 categorical grants are currently in operation, involving approximately $25 billion for fiscal year 1970 and these grant funds account for approximately 18 percent of all State and local revenues. In 1948 by way of contrast, Federal aid amounted to only $1.8 billion and provided only a little over 10 percent of the State and local revenue.

The emergence of a greater role for all governments—especially State and local governments—and the rapid growth of Federal categorical grants are closely linked to the rapid pace of urbanization that the Nation has experienced since 1945. Fifty years ago, less than half of our population was urban. Twenty years ago, 58 percent fell in this category. Today, more than three-quarters of our people live in urban communities. And by the year 2000 when our population will have surpassed the 315 million mark, approximately 19 out of every 20 Americans will be urban dwellers. With this surging pace of urbanization, there has come an increase in the number of jurisdictions in urban areas and in the number and kinds of urban development programs. During the next fiscal year, approximately $16.6 billion of the estimated $25 billion total in Federal aid funds will be spent in metropolitan areas, according to Bureau of the Budget calculations. This figure is nearly twice that spent in 1964 and more than four times that disbursed in 1961.

These developments combine to bring us to a point where the need for intergovernmental administrative reform is mandatory. The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, given proper implementation by the Bureau of the Budget and the Federal departments and agencies affected, began the process of bringing greater order to the management muddle that faces our federal system. The measure I introduce today is geared to accelerating the pace of reform.

There is, after all, a need to simplify and systematize financial reporting requirements of Federal assistance programs. There is a need on the part of Federal agencies as well as of the General Accounting Office to recognize that the financial management systems of State and local governments are not necessarily inferior to those utilized at the Federal level. There is a desperate need for agencies administering grants-in-aid to coordinate and make more uniform the auditing requirements of such programs. There is an even greater urgency with respect to the need to reduce the overall number of categorical grants by combining overlapping and functionally related programs into fewer and larger bloc grants. There is an obvious need for new procedures that will facilitate the packaging of aid programs by recipient jurisdictions—procedures that will be used widely and effectively on a departmental basis and operate interdepartmentally on an experimental basis. There is a need on the part of Congress to acquire the professional manpower to assist the substantive committees in their oversight responsibilities with respect to grant programs. Finally, there is a pressing need on the part of Federal department heads, the Congress, and the President to acquire a more comprehensive and systematic view of the operations of Federal assistance programs.

The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 establishes ways and means of meeting these needs. Its provisions implement major recommendations advanced by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I am proud to serve as a member, advanced in their massive, two-volume study of "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System." Most of its provisions have been specifically sanctioned by major organizations representing public officials throughout the Nation—the National Governors' Conference, National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, and U.S. Conference of Mayors. Two of its titles received extensive examination during hearings conducted last year by the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee and they now include perfecting amendments advanced during the course of these proceedings.

American federalism is at the crossroads. One road leads to continued chaos in contemporary intergovernmental relations. The other points to strengthening the position of political executives at all levels, the top management sector assisting them, and curbing the power of narrow program specialists at all levels. The bill, I introduce, follows this second high and tough road to intergovernmental reform.

Unnecessary complexity, inconsistent requirements, excessively lengthy and duplicating procedures, time-consuming delays, the multiplicity of programs, widely dispersed authority, unclear responsibility and similar bureaucratic inefficiencies have greatly handicapped State and local officials, diminished the value of Federal assistance, frustrated the expectations of beneficiaries, added to the taxpayers' burdens, and weakened the confidence of the American people in their government's ability to help. This bill will go far toward correcting these conditions.

If Congress is to sustain and reassert its traditional role as "umpire of the federal system," action on this legislation should come at an early date. No less than the future of American federalism depends upon how and whether we respond to the crucial questions to which this legislation addresses itself.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, in conjunction with several of my colleagues, a bill entitled "The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969." The 90th Congress pioneered in efforts to reassert Congress' role as reconciler of conflicts within our federal system. Enactment of Public Law 90-577—the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968—constituted a first step toward reducing friction in our complex system of intergovernmental relations. The legislation, proposed today provides the basis for taking another giant stride forward. The response of this Congress must be no less positive than that of its predecessor.

As a member of the Government Operations Committee, I cosponsored and fought for enactment of last year's Intergovernmental Cooperation Act but there is need for additional legislation in this area along the lines that I am proposing today. Need for this additional legislation was highlighted in the 10th Annual Report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. In summarizing developments on the grant-in-aid front during the year 1968, the ACIR declared:

> The year saw a continued "hardening of the categories" in the immense and intricate Federal grant-in-aid system. Many believed that the passage of a Partnership for Health Act in 1966 might begin a trend toward consolidation and combination of categorical grant programs. But progress on this front was painfully slow. The Partnership for Health grant itself was eroded by Congressional categorization of health programs for migrant workers, alcoholics and drug addicts. In mid-year the Secretary of HEW, responding to powerful national education groups, ordered administration of the Elementary-Secondary Education programs to be withdrawn from regional offices back to Washington. The complex of interests—middle management program administrators at all levels, Congressional subcommittees, and pressure groups—that coalesce around the individual grants carried the day far more times than the top policymakers. Thus, more often than not, efforts to achieve a simplified, more flexible federalism were thwarted.

The perennial problem of proliferation, fragmentation, and duplication in the grant-in-aid system continues. The record with respect to consolidating functionally related grant-in-aid programs is less encouraging than it should be. There are continuing efforts to erode the few successful consolidations that have been achieved in recent years. Too often those who call for simplified procedures and more grant consolidations that have been achieved in recent years. Too often those who call for simplified procedures and more grant consolidations are at the same time trying to preserve the status quo in one particular program or another. All of this makes it clear that there is a real need for additional legislation to simplify and make more effective the grant-in-aid system.

In seeking to revamp the grant-in-aid system, I want to stress at the outset that reform is sought because the grant device is well worth saving. It is after all a technique for intergovernmental collaboration that has been with us for more than three-quarters of a century. In general, it has proven to be a realistic, reliable way of sharing Federal funds, while helping to achieve National purposes. In the long run and despite certain recent trends, it has demonstrated its compatibility with our decentralized, open-access, political system. If properly structured, it permits a fairly precise congressional review of appropriation requests and facilitates the job of administrative oversight. When sensitively administered, it assures a significant degree of flexibility and local adaptability. Reform, then, not abolition or a rigid adherence to the status quo, must be our goal.

While continuing to study and explore

other alternatives to assist States and localities, such as tax sharing, we must squarely confront the difficulties facing us in the grant-in-aid area. This system, still stands as the basic mechanism for Federal intergovernmental transfers of funds. It is still the major conditioner of the fiscal and administrative features of our contemporary federal system. Notwithstanding its critics, it is a system that is likely to be around for some time. The road to reform, however, is a rough one. The complexity of the system and the multiple clusterings of forces that swirl around and within each of the individual programs makes this largely a pick and shovel job. Bulldozers, unfortunately, are not available for this tough task of rebuilding.

The measure, I introduce today, deals directly with practical problems facing us now in grant administration. Four management problem areas are considered—fiscal administration, grant consolidation, simplified application procedures, and congressional and executive oversight. The deficiencies in these areas have been fully documented in reports by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and by subcommittees of the Government Operations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

In the field of financial management, the bill seeks to bring greater order to a situation where widely varying forms, differing time schedules, and divergent data requests have undermined the basic objectives of meaningful fiscal reporting of Federal assistance programs. To reduce some of the double paperwork, the drain on manpower, and some of the conflict among fiscal personnel, the measure requires Federal agencies administering assistance programs to rely—to the greatest extent possible—on the internal or independent accounting and auditing of these programs performed by recipient State and local governments. In a like fashion, it authorizes the Comptroller General of the United States to prescribe rules and regulations that will permit the GAO to accept for its grant audit purposes auditing performed by recipient jurisdictions, provided that it meets certain standards. To curb the proliferation of accounting and auditing systems within departments administering Federal aid programs, agency heads and the Bureau of the Budget are encouraged to coordinate and make more uniform the auditing requirements of these programs.

To reduce the chaos created by the overlapping and heavily fragmented pattern of more than 420 grant-in-aid authorizations, this measure incorporates a new approach to achieving grant consolidation. Under it, the President is authorized to submit consolidation plans to Congress under procedures similar to those formerly used with administrative reorganization plans. Each plan would involve the merging of individual programs within the same or related functional areas and assign administrative responsibility to one Federal agency. It would specify single matching and, where relevant, apportionment formulas, set forth such other requirements as are suggested by the individual grants being consolidated, and describe the differences between these new provisions and those of the programs slated for merger. The plan would become effective at the end of 90 calendar days of continuous session of Congress from the day of transmittal, unless either House passed a resolution opposing it.

This remedy for grant fragmentation is a tough one in the eyes of some. But, in my opinion, strong medicine is needed for a disease that is rampant. To those who endorse bloc grants, I commend this new approach. To those who are seriously interested about developing programs that incorporate broader national objectives and offer a more rapid response to changing conditions, I recommend this title. To those who are weary of the conflicting, overlapping, and uncoordinated requirements and procedures in existing grant-in-aid programs, I call attention to the benefits of this technique. To those who are depressed with the slow pace of legislative consolidations, I stress the real breakthrough that can be made in this area with enactment of this title.

The proposed Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 also comes to grips with another basic difficulty in contemporary grant-in-aid management—the need to simplify and render more expeditious the process of applying for Federal assistance programs. Federal assistance in recent years has increasingly assumed an interdisciplinary character—as the problems of our urban society, to which more and more of these programs are directed, have become more interrelated and more interdependent. Yet this interdisciplinary approach faces severe, practical hurdles, in that the necessary funds come from several different programs and authorizations. Here again, another byproduct of excessive categorization is encountered.

Title IV of this measure would enable State and local governments to use Federal assistance programs under two or more programs in support of multipurpose projects. Under it, Federal agency heads would be authorized to establish uniform requirements respecting technical and administrative provisions of law so that jointly funded projects would not have to be subject to varying and conflicting rules of procedure.

Such heads could establish joint management funds in their agencies to finance multipurpose projects drawing upon appropriations from several different accounts, thus eliminating the separate funding nightmare that faces State and local officials seeking to package Federal assistance programs. Strong emphasis is given in this title to developing widespread use of joint projects and joint funding arrangements within individual departments and agencies. This is done in recognition of the obvious fact that these units face fewer problems of bureaucratic and program politics in launching a program of this kind than does the President or the Bureau of the Budget. Interdepartmental joint projects, on the other hand, are placed on a wholly experimental and a limited demonstration basis.

To strengthen further congressional oversight with respect to Federal assistance programs, the proposed legislation requires that the relevant standing committees review and report to their respective Houses on future grants-in-aid having a termination date of 3 or more years. To meet the staffing problem that many congressional committees face with respect to their grant oversight responsibilities, the post of review specialist is established on each standing committee charged with overseeing two or more such programs. This specialist would be selected and appointed by the chairman, with prior approval of the ranking minority member. He would serve on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of professional competence. His basic job would be to assist the committee in its performance of functions assigned by title VI of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, as amended.

To develop a clearer departmental, Executive Office of the President, and congressional view regarding the operation of grant-in-aid programs, the measure requires departments administering more than one grant-in-aid to submit annually a report to Congress on how its programs are being run. As a followup, the President is required to submit a summary report on these various departmental studies which highlights the materials thus presented and underscores the broad problems confronting grants-in-aid as effective Governmentwide means for intergovernmental cooperation. Presidential proposals for reform, in all likelihood, would be a concluding feature of this report.

In focusing on the fiscal, consolidation, application processing, and oversight dimensions of the grant management problem, this bill pushes boldly into the critical areas that must be probed if our federal system is to be adapted to the needs of the final third of the 20th century. We cannot avoid these areas—though they are controversial and crowded with powerful proponents of narrow program politics. We cannot ignore them and focus simply on easier, more dramatic remedies. We must stand and face these intricate challenges then, as this legislation does. In the final analysis the fate of our governmental system depends heavily on whether we have the capability and courage to bring the benefits of improved public management to these critical areas of intergovernmental administration.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the cosponsors of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969 be granted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

MEDICINES AND YOUR FAMILY'S HEALTH

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard so much in recent months about some of the failures and the foibles of

the American drug industry that I am afraid we may be losing a bit of our perspective with regard to this great industry.

I certainly would not condone any wrongdoing in this industry or any other. But I do feel that in our investigative zeal we have perhaps tended to obscure the pertinent fact that in the past several decades the American pharmaceutical industry has made nothing short of phenomenal strides in their ability to combat disease.

Many of us can still remember when pneumonia, tuberculosis, syphilis, polio, and many other dread diseases were a scourge and a threat to many families. Today these and many other diseases have either vanished or become almost routine because of the capacity of new wonder drugs.

Surely, in our discussion of this great industry, we ought not to lose sight of these significant achievements of the drug industry and we ought not unwittingly to lay obstacles in the path of the drug industry that might impair their ability to duplicate such feats in the decades ahead.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a very informative advertisement which appears in the February 1969 issue of Reader's Digest, sponsored by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. It outlines some of these accomplishments which we can all be proud of and many of us can also be deeply grateful for.

The advertisement follows:

MEDICINES AND YOUR FAMILY'S HEALTH

Why some medicines can be worthless—even dangerous—unless their quality can be depended upon.

THE DIFFERENCE IN DRUGS—WHAT DIFFERENCE TO YOU?

In the spring of 1962 eight small children in a major West Coast hospital were undergoing a standard treatment for tuberculosis. The drug they were taking was well-tested and had a proven clinical history behind it.

Suddenly it was noticed that the youngsters were beginning to show alarming disorders hitherto unencountered in this treatment.

Hospital authorities and public health officials immediately launched a thoroughgoing investigation. Their judgment: the drug product had been contaminated, probably during manufacture, with a synthetic sex hormone called diethylstilbestrol.

A common incident? No. But one with a significant lesson: a drug product can be worthless and even dangerous *unless its quality can be depended upon.*

This is the reason reputable drug makers, regardless of size, devote so much of their time and money to continuous, meticulous quality control. It's also the reason the Federal Food and Drug Administration seeks to assure that its rules of good manufacturing practices—developed with the cooperation of experienced drug firms—are followed. These firms know that their reputation depends on their products' total performance. Assuring that dependability to you, your physician, and your pharmacist involves detailed control and testing.

For example, to reduce the margin of error to the smallest possible degree, a quality producer of a certain antibiotic insists upon 374 tests, consuming 406 hours through 35 stages of manufacture.

What *kinds* of tests does the producer of reputable pharmaceuticals employ? Many which most people might think hardly necessary, but all of which help assure the quality of his product.

To begin with, the purity of the raw materials must be checked. And the purity of the finished product checked also, to assure that no accidental contamination occurred during the manufacturing process.

With certain drug products the size of the particles is exceedingly important and must be controlled. Since most drug substances are crystalline or powder in form, the size of their particles may be crucial to the rate of absorption, the speed with which the drug takes effect, and the duration of its action. It is not enough merely to *know* that certain particle sizes are important, the reputable manufacturer will analyze samples from each batch of his product to make certain the particle size meets exact specifications.

This is equally true when it comes to the quantity of active ingredients in each drug product. Because reliable pharmaceutical manufacturers seek to leave nothing to chance, they exercise elaborate continuous controls to determine that the products they sell always have the specified amounts of active ingredients. If a manufacturer cannot afford this kind of quality control he runs the risk of producing products where the drug content may vary widely from dose to dose.

Just as important to you and your doctor is the long-term stability of a drug product. For example, a new, ultrafine crystalline form of vitamin C was used in three preparations: an ordinary vitamin C tablet, a vitamin C injectable, and a capsule containing, in addition to the C vitamin, iron, liver, and other vitamins of the B-complex group. Because reputable manufacturers insist upon long-range stability tests as a normal procedure, it was discovered that, while the ultrafine vitamin C remained potent in the tablet and injectable, it rapidly deteriorated when mixed with the other products in the capsule. To assure stability many months after manufacture, the capsules were made *only* with coarser particles of vitamin C.

What do all these quality controls mean to the patient? Greater well-being. The knowledge that every safeguard is being used to assure him that the drug will work as it is supposed to. The confidence that a sustained release tablet, for instance, will release its active ingredients gradually as it should and not with one potentially dangerous jolt.

Quality control is the basis of your physician's confidence that the drug therapy he prescribes will be beneficial—and as safe as science can make it. It means he can trust the makers of reputable drug products to be as careful about your health as you would want them to be.

Is there any other way when it comes to your health?

HOW AMERICAN DRUGS HELPED THE KOREANS TO BETTER HEALTH

At twelve noon on April 5, 1955, a group of men were gathered in the main dining room of the White House. Fifty of them were presidents of American drug companies. Another gentleman was the distinguished physician, Dr. Howard A. Rusk. They had been called together by the White House to help improve the frightful health conditions in war-shattered South Korea.

At White House request, Dr. Rusk had gone to Korea to assess the health situation a number of times. His mission had been sponsored by the American-Korean Foundation under the chairmanship of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower. Dr. Rusk rose to report his impressions to the assembled group.

"After four years of fighting," he told them, "one third of the buildings have been destroyed, another third have been unroofed. There is only enough fuel for one hot meal a day. Water comes from polluted streams. Almost 13 percent of the people have tuberculosis, everyone has diseases of the skin and intestinal parasites. Polio, leprosy, diseases of all kinds are rampant, and there are virtually no modern medicines or equipment to fight them with. The average life expectancy is 31 years of age."

He described a hospital for war orphans in Seoul—two children in each bed, little or no heat, no advanced drugs or facilities and barely a subsistence diet.

The problems of reconstruction and rehabilitation were so great that they could only be met by the United Nations and the governments of the free world. "But to supplement this official assistance," Dr. Rusk concluded, "Korea must have the warm, personal support of 'people to people.' This we believe to be essential, for our military efforts will have been in vain unless Korea emerges from the war as a strong, independent democratic nation."

Before the meeting was over, each of the 50 drug company presidents pledged the full support of his organization. Within a matter of hours modern medical supplies were being assembled throughout the United States for shipment to Korea.

Along with the contributions of thousands of other Americans—individuals and business firms in many fields—the drug industry has been building a people-to-people bridge to our Asian ally. Year after year a wide range of pharmaceuticals, vitamins and food supplements has been helping the Koreans to better health.

For example, a few years ago, the Minister of Health in South Korea sent out an urgent call for polio vaccine. An all-out campaign of imunization, he believed, could eliminate the scourge from his country. The head of a drug company, one of the large manufacturers of polio vaccine, was told of this request by the American-Korean Foundation. The company immediately promised to provide enough vaccine to inoculate almost a million Korean children. Dr. Kim Taek Il, the Director of Korea's Public Health Bureau, said, "We are very grateful for the donation, which greatly helps our efforts to break the back of polio in this country."

One company alone has contributed a variety of drugs valued at more than a million dollars.

Another not only donated more than a quarter-million dollars' worth of influenza vaccine, but paid the cost of air shipping to Korea.

Still another recently sent 90,000 doses of measles vaccine valued at $78,000.

Back from a visit to Korea in 1967, Dr. Rusk had this to say: "In 1953, the average life expectancy in Korea was 31 years of age. Now it is 63—*more than double!* Tuberculosis, while still a major problem affecting five percent of the population, afflicted almost 13 percent in 1953. Substantial progress has also been made against the age-old enemy, leprosy. Polio is on the way out. While much of this has been made possible by the help of governments and agencies and the courage of the Korean people themselves, the American drug industry has been the largest single private contributor to Korean health rehabilitation."

OUR PRESIDENTS' HEALTH—BEFORE THE ERA OF MODERN MEDICINE

Most of us still think of Washington as the robust, rosy-cheeked President of Gilbert Stuart's famous portrait. But Washington spent the first 30 years of his life plagued by a number of diseases and illnesses that modern drugs, properly administered, do much to cure and, in some cases, even prevent.

Between the ages of 16 and 22, Washington suffered his first attack of malaria, a case of smallpox that left his face badly marked for life, and a serious attack of pleurisy, probably tubercular in origin.

Recovering from these illnesses, he came down two years later with a long siege of influenza. Two years after that, in 1757, he was forced to leave his command of colonial troops in the French and Indian War for

several months because of an intestinal infection so severe his physician warned the 25-year-old man his life was in danger.

Just four years later, records show, Washington himself believed he was dying, when he was again stricken with what he thought was malaria, but what, in reality, may have been typhoid fever.

In contrast to the 1st President's early ill-health, Andrew Jackson, the nation's fiery 7th President, survived his youth with attacks of only malaria and small-pox, commonplace diseases in the U.S. then, but no longer, as a result of modern techniques, drugs and vaccines. In 1806, when he was 39, Jackson was wounded in a duel by a 480 grain leaden slug that shattered several ribs and lodged in his chest. The wound never fully healed.

Without modern surgical techniques to extract the bullet, or modern antibiotics to stem the chronic infection it caused, Jackson spent the rest of his life suffering from recurrent attacks of fever, chills, coughing and hemorrhages from the lungs, the result, probably, of a lung abscess caused by the bullet he carried in his chest.

So poor was his health when he took office, many thought he would not survive one term. But Jackson, often weak and in pain, remained active and forceful through two.

President Harrison, inaugurated in 1841 at 68, on the other hand, seemed to be in relatively good physical condition, aside from an apparent tendency to hyperacidity.

Taking the oath of office on one of the coldest inauguration days in history, Harrison nevertheless made the longest inauguration speech on record—an hour and forty minutes. By the time he returned to the White House, he had caught cold. A hectic schedule in the drafty, poorly heated executive mansion further sapped his strength and lowered his resistance.

Two weeks after his inaugural, Harrison grew suddenly worse and doctors diagnosed his condition as pneumonia of the right lower lobe, complicated by congestion of the liver.

Nineteenth century physicians, with little effective treatment at their command, such as that provided by modern drugs, were helpless to change the course of the President's illness.

One month to the day after his inauguration, Harrison was dead, the first American president to die in office.

A later chief executive, James Knox Polk, was more successfully treated for his illness, though not without suffering. Small and frail as a child, he endured, until 1812, when he was 17, the pain and chronic inflammation of what doctors diagnosed as a bladder stone. Their recommendation: surgery.

Surgeons, by then, had made some dramatic advances, but the first use of ether anesthesia in surgery was still 34 years in the future. For young Polk anesthesia was some opium and a slug of brandy. The operation, though short, was agony for the half-conscious patient. The safe pain-killing drugs known today were not available to ease his recovery.

But when Polk returned home some months later, he carried with him—in his hand—a bladder stone the size of a hazelnut.

Even a much more recent President might have been spared the affliction of a disease almost conquered in our country. The paralytic polio that attacked Franklin Roosevelt no longer brings down thousands of youngsters each year, because of modern vaccines.

Today, millions of Americans enjoy the benefits of medical care unknown to the most prominent men of the past. But it is not only the discovery and development of new drugs, and their use by the medical profession, that has helped bring this about. Their availability has also played a significant role. They are there when you need them, almost anyplace you are.

YOUR DOLLAR AND YOUR HEALTH

Although in most places dollars are buying less today, at the prescription counter of your local pharmacy they have greater value than ever before.

During 1968, the government's Consumer Index for all prices reached a new high. Compared to a decade ago the purchasing power of the dollar dropped to a new low of 82 cents.

Yet in buying prescription drugs, your dollar has a value of almost $1.15.

How come?

A number of factors tend to make your money worth more at the prescription counter. For one thing, price and product competition. Thus, such widely used agents as antibiotics and oral contraceptives have fallen in price over the years. Technological advances and marketing efficiency have also helped.

Modern drugs produced by quality-conscious manufacturers often shorten or prevent illness, cut the length of hospital stays, reduce visits to doctors' offices. Some newer drugs, either because they are more effective, or because they cure or ameliorate hitherto untreatable ailments, can lower the actual cost of illness. Others save money since they may be taken less often or for shorter periods, even though the prescription charge at your pharmacy sometimes may be higher than for the less effective drugs they replace.

Individual prescriptions, as every purchaser knows, vary considerably in price. Their research, production, and distribution costs vary. Yet the average prescription costs you, the consumer, only about $3.50 Four out of five cost less than $5.

Today, only a half cent of the dollar and only 9.5 cents of the medical care dollar go into prescription pharmaceuticals, actually less than 10 years ago.

The price you pay is not only for the drugs on your pharmacy's shelves today. Part of it goes into drug company research for new and better drugs that will ease pain and prevent and cure disease tomorrow.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN FREEDOM

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today in saluting the people of Lithuania and the people of Lithuanian descent here in America and throughout the world, who on February 16 commemorated the 51st anniversary of the independence of their proud country from Imperial Russia.

For 22 years thereafter Lithuania took her rightful place in the community of free nations of the world, until the iron heel of a new brand of Russian imperialism destroyed her precious independence in the first year of the Second World War.

Yet in Lithuania, as in so many other countries captured and subdued by the Communists, the fierce flame of freedom has never been extinguished by the conqueror. Lithuanians who live under the Soviet yoke still yearn for independence, still keep their rich cultural traditions alive, and still plan for the day when they shall again be free. More than a million loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent take prayerful note of the anniversary of their freedom every year, an observance that cannot be openly made, of course, in Lithuania, by the 3 million people residing there. But millions of Americans are still proud today to join with these Lithuanians in their hearts and with Lithuanian-Americans in their public observances of our common ideals and heritage of liberty in spite of conquest and oppression.

But homage alone, Mr. Speaker, is not enough. We in Congress who represent a variety of people united in many common aspirations, must also take action to match our words. Some years ago I joined with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) in introducing legislation to create in this House a standing Committee on Captive Nations. That bill did not pass; but I feel just as strongly as ever that such a committee would help to focus much more effectively our national efforts to encourage self-determination among all the many nations of the world who are now held under Communist subjugation. I believe we should act on such legislation in this session without further delay, and I have once again introduced my bill in this Congress.

In my hometown of Amsterdam, N.Y., live many families of Lithuanian descent. Each year they meet to observe Lithuanian Independence Day with a colorful and moving ceremony. Many times I have had the privilege of attending and participating in these ceremonies, and have always been most warmly received by those in charge. These rites exemplify for me the strong bonds which Americans of Lithuanian descent have with their relatives on the shores of the Baltic Sea, and with people everywhere who deeply love freedom.

These bonds must and will be kept strong, Mr. Speaker, despite the rigors of Soviet rule and the years of frustration for the people of Lithuania. Let us resolve, as our compatriots of Lithuanian descent have resolved to do on each anniversary of their freedom, to speed the day when men and women everywhere can control their own national destinies—not only in Lithuania, but in the Ukraine, in Latvia, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in South Vietnam, and in all other countries now under Communist rule or threatened with Communist aggression or subversion.

INCREASE PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income exemption of a taxpayer, including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness.

Under present law, a taxpayer may claim, in the amount of $600, an exemption for a spouse or other dependent. An additional exemption of $600 is allowed if the spouse or dependent is over 65 years of age, and a further exemption of $600 is allowed if the spouse or dependent is blind, regardless of age.

The bill that I am introducing today would increase these exemptions to $1,200 in each category.

At the present time, the $600 exemption is nothing more than token relief to the American taxpayer who must provide clothing, food and shelter to his family at a time when inflation is at a high level, and prices are continuing in an upward spiral.

Meaningful relief to the millions of Americans who must readily feel the effect of taxes should be of principal concern to the Congress, and I am hopeful that this legislation will receive early consideration. I might add that I am pleased that the distinguished chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), has begun hearings on tax reform legislation. I believe that any tax reform measures which may be recommended by the committee should include an increase in the personal exemption.

ABOLISH OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has recommended that the Office of Economic Opportunity be continued. And at the same spending level. This comes as a disappointment to those of us who believe that OEO is one of the biggest boondoggles in the history of the Federal Government.

Certainly there are some programs—such as Headstart, some of the self-help housing plans, some foster grandparent programs, day care, and a few others which might well be continued after being transferred to other agencies, but the Office of Economic Opportunity will remain as the symbol of waste, inefficiency and disorganization. It should be abolished.

There is mounting evidence, if any more is needed, on the unbelievable boondoggle known as the Office of Economic Opportunity.

OEO itself now admits that the 1968 summer youth programs completely misfired. Of programs in 48 cities, OEO—which is hardly an unbiased observer—could only find 16 "good programs." Of the Washington youth program, OEO found:

> There was no check on income eligibility; and attendance was significantly low. Jobs went to those who knew someone, rather than the poor. Some programs were not in target areas—at least one was found operating near Chevy Chase Circle.

Of the New York attempt, OEO cited it for "nepotism cronyism, and maintenance of effort problems." They called it a monstrosity.

Other OEO programs reflect similar or greater mismanagement. The New York Times recently devoted almost an entire page each day for a week and several pages on Sunday, to the gross theft and embezzlement of funds from OEO programs in New York City. Indictments in that case have just been handed down.

The press here in Washington report that a Federal grand jury is investigating serious charges by the General Accounting Office that a local program has failed to maintain payroll and personnel records, employment tax records, or property management reports. GAO found that in a sample of 104 enrollees in the program, there were 30 allegations of payroll padding and 30 of kickbacks. GAO estimates that 16 percent of the enrollees could not be located during the sample effort. Some addresses were nonexistent, others showed that none by the names listed had ever lived there.

Senator ROBERT BYRD, of West Virginia, has stated that Department of Labor officials who were responsible for this particular program had not completed its own evaluation of a draft report of its own auditors which was submitted over 6 months ago.

Practically every Member of Congress has noted similar examples of the failure to act by responsible officials engaged in the poverty program. After repeated efforts to have OEO recognize and stop illegal activities of an OEO program in Florida, I requested and received an investigation by the General Accounting Office, which at last brought about some needed reforms. Just this year I have been advised that OEO is going to discontinue another project operating in my district improperly—over 6 months after I brought specific illegal activity to the attention of OEO.

Throughout all of these OEO projects and others, one can only be amazed at the disregard for congressional intent, the wasting of millions of dollars of funds supposedly provided for the poor, and the failure on the part of the poverty agencies to correct wrongdoing even when the facts are presented to them.

As reported in the New York Times, the situation there was well known to officials. One embezzlement alone reportedly totaled $1,750,000. Yet the program continues today, and New York has been given another extension of time to get things worked out.

There are investigations, reports, audits, hearings, and assurances. And there is theft, gross mismanagement, and criminal waste of taxpayers' funds. And perhaps even murder.

Victor Riesel has reported on an antipoverty program in Boston, originally funded at $1.9 million but suspended by the Government on January 3. Mr. Riesel says the program was to train 500 auto mechanics. Twelve were trained in 5 months. In November, some of its trainees, its consultants, and some of its other officials apparently became involved in a power struggle over the money. Five gunmen, all affiliated with the project, shot down three men, all also associated with the project.

Trouble in the Boston case was reportedly known to officials long before the murders took place. Even after murder, funds were not cut off immediately.

There is special significance in the fact that in each of the cases mentioned here, and hundreds or thousands of others, outside action was finally required before the poverty program acted.

OEO is incapable of cleaning up its own house. It should be abolished, not continued at the same spending levels. The decision by the Nixon administration to continue down the same path is a blow to all those who were hopeful for a change in direction in this program. It is not very encouraging to those who feel we must return to fiscal responsibility, to sound administrative procedures, or to realistic approaches to the problems of the poor.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post this morning it was reported, and I have no way of judging the accuracy of the report, that House Democrats in closed caucus, decided after 1½ hours of debate that the answer to the pressure for congressional reform is the increased use of computers.

Increased use of computers is a good idea and I think there will be strong support on this side of the aisle, but it is not a new idea and I am afraid it is only a small part of the problem. I hope this caucus does not mark the end of the interest the majority party has expressed in congressional reorganization.

Obviously little can be accomplished without majority participation in the ultimate decision to modernize our processes. We all know that decision is coming, in one way or another, and that it is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to my colleagues that another 25 cosponsors for the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969 have today been added to those already sponsoring these modest but necessary steps toward congressional reform. Those of us now supporting this legislation hope that more Members from both sides of the aisle will join us.

COMPUTERS IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the preceding remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE). I noted the same article with regard to the recommendation made to increase the use of computers. It certainly would be only a very small step, although perhaps a very welcome one, to engage in such an activity. But if this is a cutoff of any further consideration of congressional reform, I think it would be too bad, and I trust that it is not.

Computers, I am sure we all recognize, can only find answers and put out solutions to the problems for which they are programed. I hope the interest expressed in computers means that a congressional reform bill, not merely limited to computers, is programed for early action at this session.

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

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the computers, if the Democrats do adopt them, will do a better job than they did over in the De-

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare when someone, in the last year or so, programed obviously incorrect information into the computers and the computers went berserk, authorizing the payment of more than $2 million in overpayments, payroll payments, and so forth and so forth. I hope they will do a better job for them, if they are going to computerize, in running the Democratic Party, or whatever it is you are talking about.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman.

Again he points out that computers can only put out answers for the programs that are put in.

TIME FOR COLLEGE OFFICIALS TO CLAMP DOWN

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last year after the disgraceful student riots at Columbia and Northwestern Universities, I took the floor of the House to point out that the time had come for college officials to clamp down hard on instigators of this type of anarchy. Fortunately, a few administrators have made it clear that this nonsense will not be tolerated, but by and large, the picture is not good as anyone can see from watching the evening news reports on television.

I have noticed that some of the columnists have finally come to the conclusion that this disruption of campus life has reached the limit and in that regard I place in the RECORD at this point a column by Drew Pearson in the February 18, 1969, edition of the Washington Post; a column by Mary McGrory from the Washington Star of February 17, 1969, and, finally, a copy of my remarks on the House floor on May 7, 1968.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1969]

IT'S TIME FOR CRACKDOWN AT COLLEGES

(By Drew Pearson)

CLARKSVILLE, TENN.—During the past twelve months, this writer has visited approximately 50 college campuses, ranging from the University of Warsaw in Communist Poland and the Sorbonne in Paris to the University of Montana, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Florida, Washington State, MIT, Stout State College in Wisconsin and Austin Peay State College here in Tennessee. It has been a cross-section of colleges, large and small, and at all of the American institutions I have addressed student assemblies and conducted student forums.

From this experience I believe I can accurately report that American students generally are alert, dedicated and far ahead of previous generations in their desire to tackle the problems of the world. They are not interested primarily in becoming engineers, businessmen, or insurance salesmen, as was my generation in college. The majority want to devote at least part of their lives to helping their fellow men. They are interested in the Peace Corps, Vista or going into government.

There was a day when the top graduates of the Harvard Law School were immediately gobbled up by the top Wall Street law firms. That day is over. These graduates and others from the best law schools are now more interested in spending some time in Government or other productive community work. If they do sign up with big New York law firms, many specify that they must have time off to handle indigent clients or other community work.

MINORITY RULE

In contrast, there is a minority in many colleges, led by Negroes, which seems determined to disrupt education altogether. It has done so by reversing the American system of majority rule for a system of minority rule.

It has done this, moreover by, using a technique outlawed by American law and tradition—violence.

Minority rule by force and violence has almost paralyzed San Francisco State College, killed one college president, Dr. Courtney Smith of Swarthmore, and disrupted some of the most liberal institutions in America such as Brandeis, a Jewish university, the University of Chicago under liberal President Edward Levi, and the University of Wisconsin, long proud of its liberal Lafollette tradition. All have tried hard for several years to enlist more qualified Negro students, yet this is one of the demands of the Negro minority.

In each of the above institutions there has been a small minority of students which has used violence to sabotage education for the majority. In Swarthmore forty black students locked themselves into the admission office and disrupted education for a thousand others. At Brandeis the ratio was about the same. At Chicago, 400 students tried to force their demands on the 9000-student University by occupying the administration building. At Columbia, a University where I once taught, about 400 students tied up an institution of 30,000 also by occupying the administration building where they rifled the private papers of President Grayson Kirk.

TOUGHNESS JUSTIFIED

My conclusions from having visited many campuses is that it is time for University authorities to realize that they must provide education for the majority, not submit to disruption by the minority. Otherwise, education in their strike-torn colleges will gradually erode. The easiest way to prevent disruption is to get back to previous disciplinary rules and expel violators immediately.

Today, in contrast with the past, striking students have been mollycoddled, given second and third chances and then allowed to remain in school. All of this puts a premium on violence.

This is unfair to the majority of the students who are trying to get an education; also unfair to the taxpayers who put up the money for education and to the alumni who help to finance private colleges.

In San Francisco State, only 350 teachers out of a total of 1100 belong to Local 1352 of the American Federation of Teachers. And of these 350, only 200 wanted to strike. Yet this minority threw the entire campus into turmoil and got the backing of the San Francisco AFL–CIO Labor Council. This is something AFL–CIO President George Meany would hardly sanction—if he knew the facts.

What minority faculty members have got to realize is that alumni can strike, too. So can majority students. Applicants at Columbia's last freshman class were down 21 per cent, in contrast to Harvard and Yale, which had no riots and whose freshmen applications are up 10 to 15 per cent. Students don't want to enroll at a university that may be riot-torn.

Any business firm that loses 21 per cent of its customers in one year is in danger of going out of business. Columbia can weather the slump. But it has been given a stiff reminder that the majority of students go to college to study, not to demonstrate.

More serious may be a Columbia alumni boycott in fund-giving. This is neither organized nor advertised, but it is a fact. If it spreads to other riot-torn campuses, it could be the most serious boycott of all.

STUDENT DEPRIVATION HANGUP

(By Mary McGrory)

The old fogies—which means anyone over 30—are now hopelessly baffled by current campus capers. Whatever happened to goldfish-swallowing and telephone-booth stuffing?

This year's rioter is yesteryear's panty-raider as far as mindlessness goes, granted. But where is the fun for the student who would rather learn than burn?

What tore it for the elders, of course, was the assault on the University of Wisconsin. Nobody with an IQ of 50 could work up a case against that noble tradition of excellence, freedom and dissent practically written into the curriculum.

At Madison, the militants have presented a list of demands that would make Rap Brown blush. The chancellor pointed out that if the "black-only" center, which is supposed to be the militants' main issue, actually ever happened, the university would be in violation of the antidiscriminatory section of the Education Act and thus lose the federal funds which help to keep it going.

Warren Knowles, the governor of the state, sees a pattern in campus turmoil across the country. He's luckier than most.

Who could sort out the new hullaballoo at Berkeley, where a number of students seem to be majoring in rebellion? The University of Chicago sit-in was rendered unintelligible when the fired teacher, presumably its spark, was rehired and refused to accept until "the university has changed."

If there is a common issue in all this, it is probably deprivation. Today's students are deprived. They are deprived of their birthright of struggle and suffering. Affluence and the pill have rendered the old hangups on money and sex obsolete. Their meek parents pay their bills and subsidize their affairs.

They found a conflict in the Vietnam war, which was largely fought by their brothers from the slums and the factories, and they helped to turn it around. Even the old folks could eventually see it was a witless enterprise. They are antiwar, but not antifight, but they have to import the enemy, the police and the National Guard.

Their fathers don't know what lack of trouble means. They were so busy during the Depression scratching for jobs to pay next semester's tuition they had no time to change the system.

The next generation was full of married veterans, hell-bent for degrees. They may have knocked the university in bull sessions; it never occurred to them to try to knock it over.

Cheated of economic pressure and moral strictures, the affluent scholars turned to the blacks for rescue. They have assumed their grievances for their own. They are slaves to changing racial fashions.

Five years ago, integration was in style, and young white students fought, bled, and, in some cases, died in the South for the cause.

Now the militants have changed their minds—separatism is imperative for racial identity. Lads at Wisconsin are storming the barricades for the right of Negroes not to associate with them.

Their lives are without suspense unless they create it for themselves. Their futures are assured. Jobs? Don't be funny. Seniors have to kick suppliant corporation executives off their doorsteps. Government recruiters hang around the Student Union like panhandlers at the Salvation Army.

What is to be done? Richard Scammon, former Census Bureau chief, has suggested prison for rioters—to dignify them. The thought may find a cordial, if secret, seconding among harassed university officials and buffaloed parents.

At least, jail would provide an authentic opportunity to suffer, and a feast for the in-

justice-collector. Wardens are for the most part not infected with the permissive philosophy; guards would not forgive with the readiness that causes the young to despise the endlessly pardoning authorities who populate their present world.

Who knows, they might find out they really like studying. Prison literature is rich in examples of those who improved themselves behind bars. The rioters do not want to be educated. They won't let others be educated. So they could educate themselves. They could studiy swahili to their hearts' content in their cells while their square classmates were trudging to class back on the campus.

ARE WE SLIPPING INTO A DARK AGE

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out that our Nation is suffering from a serious ailment—minorityitis. After the disgraceful and sorry display at Columbia University, the latest case is the shameful surrender of authority by Northwestern University which allowed a group representing one sixty-fifth of the student body to rewrite rules and regulations affecting the other sixty-four sixty-fifths. This is an age when majority rights are trampled. This is an age where violence is honored, where obedience and observance of law are shunted aside.

I believe it is time that the parents who are paying tuition, those donors who are paying for other costs, and those in charge of endowments, insist that the officials of our universities make clear that the schools are being run for purposes of education, not as field laboratories for revolution—domestic or imported.

College is not mandatory. Therefore, those who do not like a college or university, should be free to go wherever they believe their peculiar views may be more accepted. The idea of depriving the majority of students, who attend institutions of higher education for the purpose of preparing themselves for jobs requiring university-level knowledge, of the opportunity to learn, by tolerating disruption is an affront to commonsense.

When dissidents resort to violence the answer should be clear—a clampdown of authority and use of the law-enforcement agencies available. It is interesting to note that Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown, students, perhaps, of the Communist revolution, were among the demonstrators at Columbia University. It is interesting that many others who were arrested also were not students at all.

In all this ferment and fomenting of insurrection at our colleges and universities, one fact stands out—a very tiny minority is responsible. School authorities have been timid and unresponsive to their duties to maintain order and continuity on campus.

The Chicago Tribune of May 6 editorializes on the sad situation at Northwestern University. I believe the paper hits the problem on the nose, and recounts in sorry detail the flaccid surrender of school officials. It is high time that those who are paying for a decent education for their children to go to school to learn, let school officials know that they do not intend to support those who allow one-sixty-fifth of the student body to set the policies of that institution.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial from the Chicago Tribune and a column by William F. Buckley, appearing in the Washington Star on May 6, at this point in the RECORD:

"[From the Chicago Tribune, May 6, 1968]

"A SAD DAY FOR NORTHWESTERN

"Alumni and friends of Northwestern university must be profoundly dismayed by the university's response to the demands of black power insurgents who seized and held the old administration building for 36 hours. At the same time a handful of white student sympathizers took possession of the dean's office and were unmolested in their assertion of squatters' rights.

"The university administration's capitulation is as complete and humiliating as any event since Henry IV crawled on his knees in sackcloth to Canossa and there made penance and the act of submission to Gregory VII.

"This was an invasion, pure and simple, by blacks of the premises of a private institution—in no way different from the occupation of the home of a private citizen.

"A courageous university administration, with a fit sense of values, would have ended this insurrection within the first 15 minutes and driven out the interlopers. It would have said:

" 'This is a private university. You are here on sufferance. You will abide by the regulations which all other students are required to honor. Your color gives you no sanction and no license. If you don't like it here, you are at liberty to go elsewhere. Now, clear out, or the force necessary to throw you out will be mustered at once.'

"The students would then have received a remission of fees and would have been expelled and sent home.

"This would have been within the administration's proper sphere of action. The black power advocates had no more warrant for trespass and seizure than had the Rev. Martin Luther King when he seized a west side apartment building and proclaimed himself conservator for its owner.

"But the university officials lacked the courage of any convictions. They temporized and, in so doing, condoned the lawlessness with which they were challenged. They made common cause with the invaders in their stand that laws do not govern society and are made only to be flouted and ignored.

"The university has announced that no punishment under law or thru university disciplinary action will be sought for the offenders. If a student were caught stealing an examination paper or cribbing on an examination, he would be expelled or placed on probation, but, in Northwestern's new scale of values, no penalty is to attend students who appropriate the business office, where all university records are kept, or the office of the dean, from which all student affairs are directed.

"Forgotten in the disgraceful articles of unconditional surrender signed by university officials was the fact that friends and alumni who had given countless millions of dollars to Northwestern were not contributing to a Tuskegee or Howard university and had never conceived that their gifts were directed toward creating a racial enclave and calling it Northwestern university.

"In other days, the dean of a university was considered a man of stature and learning. At Northwestern we had the spectacle of the dean running back and forth between his own captive office and the captive business office where the black occupation garrison condescended periodically to hear his professions of penitence, while mattresses, blankets, and food were passed in thru the windows.

"The atmosphere was more like that of an outbreak in a penitentiary than of a university dedicated to intellectual freedom and the formation of individual character.

"All the university's spokesmen had to tell the rebels was that when they got out of the building they could state their supposed grievances to a committee.

"Instead, the administration puts its witness to an incredible document—an abject confession that Northwestern is, and has always been, the embodiment of the sins of 'white racism,' that invidious term coined gratuitously by the Kerner commission and eagerly accepted by every masachistic breast-beater in the white 'liberal' community.

"Not content with this fact of self-humiliation, the university then extended its own professed guilt to all other institutions of higher learning in America and to the whole of American society. The soft impeachment will have few takers among the white community.

"The university's frail apology that it really gave away very little beyond what justice demanded is absurd on its face. It has yielded to an infinitesimal minority—no more than 1/65th of the student body—and has made incredible concessions in order to buy peace. It is only buying more trouble and more insurrection in the time to come, for the course of blackmail and appeasement always proceeds progressively.

"Moreover, it has bent the knee to an element that does not ask equal consideration, but special treatment. The Negro militants were not seeking integration or fraternal equality, but their own form of apartheid. They demanded—and got—racial separatism in campus life, and the very nature of their demands showed their hatred of whites.

"Especially brazen was the demand of the rebels—granted without quibble by the administration—for special tuition supplements for blacks at the expense of poor white students, equally deserving of scholarship aid. The effect is to create a special class, based on color alone, and this represents discrimination in its ultimate form.

"Now that this revolt has succeeded, what may we expect next? Are all the members of the Northwestern football squad going to mount a protest strike until they are assured they will be given straight A grades? Every student, and every man who lives, labors under some degree of insufficiency of talent, or energy, or accomplishment. In the name of absolute justice, are we all to be leveled off so that no man possesses any superiorities by reason of endowment or attainment over any other? These are among the implications of Northwestern's surrender.

"The university administration has taken the easy way out. It has abandoned law and principle when it had the chance to demonstrate integrity and character. It has thought more of the value of property than of the verities which it was presumed to serve. The black insurgents had as their hostage the computer, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, which processes the university's financial records. They said it would be safe unless they were evicted. Their implied threat of sabotage paralyzed the administration.

"So, when this precious instrument came thru unscathed, the administration was lavish in its praise of the black power faction for its sense of 'order' and 'responsibility.' Property was not damaged, and clean-up squads policed the occupied premises. The wreck of the university's reputation is complete but the job was done cleanly. What a consolation!

"When universities all over the country are collapsing before the campus radicals, Northwestern had the opportunity to show that the values of common sense and probity are eternal in its life. It has grievously damaged its hope of public confidence for the future.

"All its alumni and friends must feel sick today. The university has made needless difficulties for itself in commanding continuing loyalty and support. It will learn the validity of the eternal question: 'What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'"

"[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 6, 1968]

"ARE WE SLIPPING INTO A DARK AGE?

"(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

"You have, I hope, mediated the meaning of the charges that have been leveled against the New York policemen who liberated Columbia University. Brutality. It apparently has not occurred to a living soul, to judge from published reports, that the caterwauling students who are charging

brutality because the police interrupted their week-long, whisky-fed stercoricolous occupation of other people's property could very easily have avoided brutality by simply obeying the policemen when they were finally dispatched to uphold the law.

"In the flat words of the newspaper account, 'The policemen had first read a statement urging the students to leave voluntarily, and the protesters had refused.' In other words, the police had even been instructed to permit the students to leave with impunity—to get off without arraignment on the charge of criminal trespass. But the students refused. So, under the vigilant eyes of radio, television, faculty, press, the Commissioner of Police, and the head of the local Mau Mau, they were dragged away.

"Oh, yes, there were also representatives there of Mayor Lindsay, whose comment the next morning will never perish from this earth. 'Mayor Scores Columbia Sit-Ins—But Backs the Right to Dissent.' That is as if, stumbling into Buchenwald with the liberating army, General Eisenhower had said, waving in the general direction of the corpses, 'I do deplore all of this, but I stoutly defend German dissent from the Versailles Treaty.'

"What is going on? One is increasingly reminded of the observation of Albert Jay Nock, that it would be fascinating to write an essay on how one can tell one is slipping into a dark age. His point is that if we knew collectively that that is what we were doing, we would simply arrest the process.

"One is tempted to observe that it is incredible that so many members of the faculty at Columbia sided with the demonstrators, and now are criticizing President Kirk for having called in the police after six days. But it is not incredible any longer; incredible though that may be.

"Everybody's doing it. Not quite everybody, but, for instance among the students all the leaders of the various student body groups appear to be unanimous in their condemnation of Mr. Kirk. The president of New York University, though declining to promise that under no circumstances would he ever call the police, professed himself as 'revolted' at the use of the police at Columbia, and stuffed a dollar bill into a jar being passed about to collect money to defend the students.

"A young rabbi recently appointed as chaplain to the Jewish students of Columbia was heard declaiming—get this: 'No amnesty for Kirk and the Board of Trustees!' They are not to be forgiven for restoring order to the campus by invoking those whose job it is to restore order when there is disorder. And then the rabbi attempted to assert his impartiality: 'I want to show you I'm going to be consistent,' he said, reminding his audience that he had sided with all of the demands of the rioters except their call for amnesty for themselves.

"In other words, the rabbi is being consistent by insisting that lawbreakers and law enforcers be dealt with exactly alike. Such anfractuosity is best left for advanced schools of sophistry to defend.

"A few days before the police moved in, Prof. Seymour Melman, who will be remembered as the prophet of overkill, suddenly found himself concluding that the opposite situation exists in Columbia. Columbia, he announced jubilantly, simply hasn't the power to discipline the refractory students: 'How can you dismiss several hundred students?'

"There—there is the revolutionary key. 'We won't be going around and around forever,' said the student head of the SDS, who organized the strike. He meant by that that additional forces are accumulating, and that in due course they will crowd in on Columbia and, in effect, dominate it.

"Mr. Kirk, poor Mr. Kirk whose office was smashed, the walls covered with graffiti, broken whisky bottles strewn about, poor Mr. Kirk says that calling in the police was the hardest thing he ever had to do. If that is the case, poor Mr. Kirk should be relieved of his misery, and sent out to pasture. Because Columbia needs someone who will do something a great deal harder. Suspend several hundred students for a year or more, and fire one hundred or so of the instigators. If Columbia can't do that and survive as a university, then it ought not to survive as a university, because the society it seeks to serve is mortally ill."

AWARD TO OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and honor for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues the presentation of an award to Oklahoma State University of Stillwater, Okla.

Last night, February 19, 1969, Dr. Robert B. Kamm, president of Oklahoma State University, was presented with the IIE-Reader's Digest Foundation Award for Distinguished Service.

Oklahoma State University was designated as the only educational institution in the United States to receive the 1969 award for distinguished service in the field of international and cultural relations.

Oklahoma State University has led the academic world in providing enlightened leadership, flexible instruction, valuable research techniques, and technical assistance over a 16-year period, in the field of international education, to a gradually widening circle of world neighbors.

Since 1952 in Ethiopia, 183 university staff members have invested 550 man-years, initiating under a U.S. Agency for International Development contract the establishing, staffing, and operating of a regional technical high school at Jimma—1952; designing, building, staffing, and operating a college of agriculture at Alemaya—1956; planning and staffing an agricultural research station at Bishoftu—Debre Zeit, 1953.

In a 16-year period the Jimma school graduated 600 students; the college of agriculture graduated 365 from Ethiopia, Malawi, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, and other African nations.

The university has sent 22 advisers and 11 short-term consultants to three colleges with a combined enrollment of over 1,400 students; 43 Pakistani students have studied on the Oklahoma State campus. In Latin America since 1967, the university has provided consultants and advisers to Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Brazil, and Argentina under cooperative programs with MASAU consortium and other agencies.

Oklahoma State University embarked last year upon a program of technical advise and assistance to the Ministry of Education in Thailand for the expansion and development of trade and industrial education, with annual exchanges of students and faculty projected.

Oklahoma State University's international activities have been directed toward creating independent and self-reliant world neighbors. Instead of leaving behind empty buildings and a superimposed educational curriculum in Ethiopia, this university in 16 short years helped Ethiopians to build an educational system that is staffed with native teaching personnel, whose early training in the Jimma school and the college of agriculture has been augmented with master's degrees and doctorates from the finest institutions in America.

Oklahoma State University has set an example for all of us to follow: international students have had a lasting impact upon all university personnel, enriching them with their cultural heritage and deepening the university personnel's understanding of all men's basic humanity.

ABSENTEEISM AND THE BACKLOG OF CIVIL CASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, an article in yesterday's Washington Daily News dramatized the dilemma of a backlog faced by more than 5,000 persons involved in civil jurisdiction cases in the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

The article indicated that some of this backlog could well be due to prolonged absenteeism on the part of at least one judge. Without passing judgment on the particular instance in question, it should be deemed unacceptable that there be such absenteeism during a time when such a heavy backlog plagues our court system.

President Nixon in his message to Congress on crime in the District of Columbia recommended an increase in the number of judges on the court of general sessions. There is no doubt that this expansion of the bench is gravely needed.

The administration also proposes legislation to increase the effectiveness by revamping the court system. To this end I am sure it will give support to the tenure and reward bill proposed by the Commission on the Administration of Justice. This is one of a package of bills which I am introducing to strengthen our city's crime-fighting machinery.

We must assure that all judges of the bench are able to make a full commitment to their critical duty of rendering prompt justice for all.

ARAB TERRORIST ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound shock, horror, and repugnance that the world learned of yet another Arab attack on an Israeli airliner, this time in Zurich, Switzerland.

I rise today to call upon the administration to take the initiative in the United Nations by calling for a condemnation resolution and whatever U.N. ac-

tion is necessary to make the perpetrators of these crimes feel the pressure of world opinion and end these tyrannical attacks. I have urged the Secretary of State today that this action must be taken immediately, so that there will be no misake toward whom this condemnation is directed.

This sneak attack is but the latest in a series of Arab terrorist activities which have been concentrated on unarmed civilians. They are obviously designed to hit innocent civilians in marketplaces, in theaters, on buses, in airplanes.

The perpetrators seem to prefer these cowardly types of hit-run attacks, and what makes these tactics all the more reprehensible is that they are condoned and actually supported by the Arab leaders and their governments. Each day brings us further news of an outright support of these activities, the latest being the embracing of the leader of the notorious El Fatah by King Hussein, of Jordan.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must act now. We must speak out in vigorous protest and we must enlist the world community to support a proposal at the International Civil Aviation Organization council meeting urging immediate action against all interference with international aviation.

Decent people everywhere must do more than deplore these acts. The United Nations, which lost no time in condemning Israel for retaliating to a similar attack, should be equally as swift in condemning this latest episode of uncivilized Arab action. Or, must we wait to see if Israel strikes back and then expect a one-sided censure of Israel? This seems to be the tragic routine of U.N. action, and what makes it all the more deplorable is our State Department's acquiescence via its U.N. votes. This is the sorry record of our previous positions at the U.N.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a new administration now. Let its spokesman speak out loudly in response to this dastardly act. Let the world community be heard so the Arabs realize the impact of world opinion and world repudiation.

ENDORSEMENT OF PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO DEVELOP ALL VOLUNTEER MILITARY FORCE

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the resolution and the list of those Members who have joined Messrs. HORTON, SHRIVER, STAFFORD, and me in introducing the resolution endorsing President Nixon's decision to develop an all-volunteer military force. We are indeed grateful for the support we have received in this effort and trust that many more of our colleagues will assist us in the coming weeks as the present draft system is again reviewed by the Armed Services Committee. We would hope that a revision of the draft toward the ultimate goal of establishing an all-volunteer Army will be accomplished by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, following the list of cosponsors, I also am inserting an article from the February 24, 1969, issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Volunteer Army—When?"

The material follows:

H. RES. 232

Whereas the need for improving our system of military manpower procurement has grown more and more urgent with each passing year; and

Whereas the present Selective Service System for compulsory military service has forced uncertainty, inequity, and in many cases dissent and doubt on large segments of American youth; and

Whereas many voices in the Congress have sought to encourage steps toward greater reliance on volunteers and recruitment in filling our defense manpower needs; and

Whereas among the uniformed services of the United States (United States Army, United States Marines, United States Navy, United States Air Force, United States Coast Guard, United States Merchant Marine) only the United States Army has relied to a major extent on compulsory service to fill its manpower requirements; and

Whereas the Army and the other services have demonstrated even under present personnel and pay policies that they can attract large numbers of qualified and dedicated volunteers; and

Whereas an all-volunteer military force is inherently compatible with the basic principles of democracy; and

Whereas an all-volunteer military force would be efficient, equitable, and effective in maintaining the national security; and

Whereas in a free society the obligations of service in the armed forces should be enforced through conscription only when necessary to ensure the security of this Nation; and

Whereas an all-volunteer armed forces may be possible within two to five years, if preliminary steps are taken now in pursuit of that objective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives endorses the President of the United States in his efforts, through the Department of Defense, to begin preparation for an all-volunteer military force through administrative changes in the structure of the armed services, and to place new emphasis on the attraction of greater numbers of qualified volunteers to the military.

SEC. 2. That at a time considered appropriate by the President, the House of Representatives will welcome for consideration legislation needed to implement the concept of an all-volunteer military force with a concurrent gradual reduction in the need for compulsory service.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Bell of California, Mr. Biester, Mr. Brock, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Brotzman, Mr. Brown of Michigan, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Bush, Mr. Button, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Clausen, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Collins, Mr. Conte, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Esch, Mr. Fish, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Gude, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Harvey, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Hosmer, Mrs. May, Mr. McCulloch, Mr. McDonald of Michigan, Mr. McKneally, Mr. Minshall, Mr. Mize, Mr. Morse, Mr. Morton, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Robison, Mr. Ruppe, Mr. Schwengel, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Taft, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Widnall, Mr. Winn, and Mr. Zwach.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 24, 1969]

VOLUNTEER ARMY—WHEN?

(NOTE.—Wheels are starting to turn on Mr. Nixon's promise to phase out the draft. The draft law will stay, on a standby basis. But only a flare-up in Vietnam or elsewhere can stop an early, all-out try for a "volunteer Army.")

It is now confirmed that President Nixon is determined to push for an end of the draft and try for an all-volunteer Army.

The President, who campaigned on a "need" to end all drafting at the conclusion of the Vietnam war, is making it clear to Congress and the Pentagon that he means it—and that he wants to get started right away.

As a first step, Mr. Nixon ordered Pentagon officials to draw up a workable plan for creating a volunteer Army. This statement was released by the White House on January 30:

"The Secretary of Defense was advised of the President's conviction that an all-volunteer armed force be established after the expenditures for Vietnam are substantially reduced, and was requested to plan a special commission to develop a detailed plan of action for ending the draft."

What the President has in mind was explained to "U.S. News & World Report" by a top-level Nixon aide. This is the plan:

Keep the draft on the books, continue to register and classify all youths of military age for call in emergency, but gradually cut back on the size of monthly draft calls until they can be suspended altogether.

Reduce the size of U.S. armed forces from 3.4 million men to possibly the 2.6-million level of early 1965, just before the big Vietnam build-up began. This would lessen manpower needs. The cutback will start as soon as possible—by mid-1969, it is hoped.

Raise military pay substantially. Increase other benefits, privileges and prestige factors of military life. Promote recruiting on a major scale.

These steps, the President is said to believe, could bring an end to actual drafting in a relatively short time, at a cost of a few billion dollars a year. No timetable for the shift to an all-volunteer armed force is included in the President's plan. But if the war in Vietnam does de-escalate as hoped, a trial of the all-volunteer approach could start late this year, or early 1970.

Mr. Nixon is aware that manpower officials in the Pentagon have studied this problem for years and have concluded that a total end to the draft would cost untold billions and require a much deeper cut than planned.

The President's theory, however, is said to be that an all-out effort to raise a wholly volunteer Army has never been made since before World War II, so the Pentagon experts do not really know whether it can be done or not.

The history of the 1947–48 effort to do away with the draft tends to support the President's theory. You get that story in the accompanying article, on the next page.

ENLISTMENT UNDER PRESSURE

What is known for sure, as a result of elaborate manpower studies by the Pentagon in the past two years, is this:

The hot breath of today's draft accounts for a large share of the manpower now in uniform. Many more youths are prodded into volunteering by the threat of the draft than are actually drafted into the service.

The most recent Pentagon study shows that 38 per cent of the enlistees in all services would not have volunteered without the pressure of the draft—including 43 per cent of all Army volunteers, 33 per cent of the Navy volunteers, 43 per cent of the Air Force and 30 per cent of all Marines. In the officer corps, the comparable figure is 41 per cent.

Draftees actually comprise only 20 to 25 per cent of the Army's strength. There are no draftees in the Air Force or Navy, only a few in the Marine Corps from time to time. So the basic problem in ending the draft is to find another way to keep volunteering high.

HOW MUCH MORE PAY?

An increase in military pay, the Pentagon studies conclude, may not be enough, by itself, to replace the spur of the draft. Yet better pay is at the top of the list of possible incentives. The big question is how large pay raises must be to lure the needed recruits and re-enlistments.

To maintain a force of 2.6 million men in 1965, the service required an "input" of about 800,000 men during that year, counting inductions, enlistments and re-enlistments.

What it would take to raise that number of volunteers each year without a draft, the manpower experts say, will depend on the state of the nation's economy—just how hard it is to get a good job in civilian life.

Depending on the unemployment rate, Pentagon estimates show that added military-payroll costs would range from 4 to 17 billion dollars a year.

In a year when unemployment reached 4 per cent—compared with the current 3.3 per cent—the most likely minimum cost is given as about 8 billions. Other studies carry more optimistic price tags of from 5 to 7 billions yearly.

But a vital point, military experts note, is that even outlays such as these would not guarantee an adequate supply of the better-educated manpower needed by a force of 2.6 million men in this era of sophisticated warfare.

In particular, they stress, it would be difficult to induce 3,000 or more physicians annually—nearly 50 per cent of those graduating from medical schools each year—to volunteer for military service through increased pay alone.

The same problem is likely to be met, the authorities add, in the case of computer programmers, intelligence analysts, missile repairmen and electronic technicians. Any volunteer plan that is adopted is thus expected to allow for continued drafting of physicians and certain other highly skilled people.

Harold Wool, a top manpower official in the Pentagon for nearly 20 years, gives his view as follows, in a just-published book, "The Military Specialist":

"Exclusive reliance upon wage incentives as a means of increasing the supply of highly qualified volunteers would prove very costly, and probably impracticable, in a high-employment economy."

No halfway system of incentives will work, either, in Mr. Wool's judgment. He puts it this way:

"A comprehensive voluntary recruitment effort must encompass the whole range of living and working conditions which shape the image of military service. . . . It is unlikely that any partial program that does not substantially alter the image of military service can hope to succeed."

Besides higher pay, Mr. Wool sees the need for "better use of individual skills and abilities; opportunities for upward mobility from enlisted to officer ranks; improved housing; and increased emphasis on measures to enhance the status of military personnel" in the American society.

AN ALL-BLACK FORCE?

Would all-out efforts to lure volunteers turn the armed forces into mercenaries, mostly black? This has been suggested by some authorities.

However, a Pentagon study indicates that an all-black military force is not a real possibility. There are not enough Negroes in the U.S., according to the study, to fill up the armed forces, even if every qualified Negro enlisted.

Of the 200,000 male Negroes who turn 18 each year, slightly more than half qualify for the armed forces under present standards. If all qualifying Negroes volunteered and stayed in service for six years, their numbers then would account for only about one quarter of an armed force of 2,6 million men.

On the other hand, if nearly all Negroes concentrated in the Army, and that branch were fixed at a size of 1 million men, Negroes would soon comprise more than half of all U.S. soldiers, under the assumptions stated above.

As a start in efforts to reduce reliance on the draft, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird announced February 4 he will seek "major revisions" in military pay to stimulate volunteers.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

Changes in the way the draft operates, even if on a standby basis, also are in the wind. Chairman L. Mendel Rivers (Dem.), of South Carolina, of the House Armed Services Committee, said February 10 that his Committee will hold hearings this spring and reopen the draft law to congressional review, to include possibly a lottery selection system.

With firm White House backing, and a growing mood for draft changes in Congress, a trial of the "volunteer Army" idea is considered certain. But its timing depends on events in Vietnam and the need for U.S. forces elsewhere.

THE LAST TIME THE UNITED STATES TRIED TO RELY ON VOLUNTEERS

The U.S. sought to get along without a military draft soon after World War II ended in 1945. The effort was limited, and it failed.

Late 1945 and all of 1946 was a time of chaotic demobilization for the armed forces. They dropped from 12 million men to 2 million by the end of 1946. The draft went on, but calls were low, with none at all called in several months.

On March 3, 1947, President Truman told Congress the armed forces were down near the level of 1,641,000 that was the goal for the year starting July 1, 1947.

"The only assured means of maintaining the Army and Navy at their required strengths . . . is through resort to Selective Service," the President said, but added:

"I have decided, however . . . with the earnest desire of placing our Army and Navy on an entirely volunteer basis at the earliest possible moment, that I should not recommend an extension of the Selective Service and Training Act at this time."

As a result the draft law, which expired on March 31, 1947, was not renewed. The Selective Service System was abolished, its records put in storage.

The armed forces launched a recruiting campaign. The Pentagon got special authority to hire civilians to replace enlisted men.

With no draft, however, volunteering lagged. The civilian economy was booming. Jobs were plentiful. Many people, including high officials, thought atomic weapons had made soldiers obsolete, with no future. And there was no pay raise for the military, despite much talk about changes to make service careers more attractive.

By January, 1948, the armed forces had dwindled to 1.4 million men—15 per cent below the authorized levels, which President Truman had described as "absolute requirements" for "reasonable assurance of security."

In March, 1948, Mr. Truman told Congress this:

"I believe that we have learned the importance of maintaining military strength as a means of preventing war. We have found that a sound military system is necessary in time of peace if we are to remain at peace. . . . We have paid a terrible price for unpreparedness."

The President recommended a system of universal military training, obligating youths to serve at age 18 for 12 months, followed by a period in the reserves. A renewed draft was urged for those already past 18.

Congress rejected universal service but renewed the draft. Volunteering picked up immediately. First draft calls for the period from November, 1948, through January, 1949, were cut back, and only 35,000 were inducted.

From mid-January, 1949, through June, 1950, no one was drafted. But the machinery kept going. Youths were registered, classified, deferred, "kept on the hook" through all of this year and a half of a "standby draft."

Then came the Korean War, which ended the draft lull and talk of an all-volunteer military system.

In 1951, Congress even adopted the name, though not the substance, of a universal military training law. It set up the draft system still in use today—and under increasing attack as outmoded after 18 years and the onset of new conditions.

REDUCED AIR FARES

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) in efforts to amend the Federal Aviation Act to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to continue youth fare reductions on commercial aircraft for students under 22 years of age and military personnel. In addition, this legislation authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Board to extend reduced fares to retired senior citizens.

The current policy of reduced youth fares and military fares are under attack in the Federal courts as discriminatory to the general traveler. This litigation is fostered by interstate bus operators who complain about the shift of passengers from bus to air transport. Some of the major air carriers also seek a termination of these reduced rates which have filled otherwise vacant seats on commercial aircraft.

The low-paid serviceman is entitled to ride commercial aircraft at reduced rates—otherwise a 4-day pass would be meaningless. The morale of the soldier is best fortified by a visit to his home.

Reduced air fares for students have served to divert millions of students from the highways to the airplane. They would never travel by bus. Higher air travel rates would force the student group to the private automobile. Student highway casualty rates would multiply. The 6 million student travelers in 1968 filled seats that would otherwise have been vacant.

The benefits of reduced air travel fares should be extended to the elderly on a standby, or seat-available basis. Most elderly citizens living on retirement income cannot afford to travel at regular rates.

Several years ago, the commercial air carriers imposed a penalty on travelers who canceled air travel plans without ample notice. Such penalties do not now exist and today the airlines suffer great expense because of passengers who either make multiple reservations or do not show at all.

The standby traveler who uses airline carrier space on a space-available basis fills a seat which would be otherwise vacant. He takes his chances on travel. He travels at times of low travel density. The reduced standby travel rate promotes more efficient use of the airlines which today operate half-vacant aircraft much of the time. The revenue passenger miles are less than one-half of the available seat-miles.

The elimination of reduced standby fares will only create more vacant seats in aircraft which at present have twice as many seats as there are passengers.

The reduced fare schedule for standby passengers is good for the airlines and good for the general public.

THE "PUEBLO"

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a good friend—an ordinary everyday citizen—who expresses discerningly and well his sentiments concerning the tragic and sordid case involving the *Pueblo* and her crew.

I am sure he bespeaks the sentiments of many, many Americans who find this whole affair incredible and who demand that never again will honorable citizens of the United States, military or civilian, be abandoned to a fate which in some respects is worse than death.

The letter follows:

As I read in the newspaper the proceedings of the Navy court of inquiry into the affair of the Pueblo, I feel a deep sense of resentment about the treatment of the officers and men of that ill-fated ship, not only at the hands of the North Koreans but at the hands of their own Government. A sense of shame sweeps over me as I become ever more deeply aware of how these poor souls were allowed to slip away into an environment of Communist torture and hopelessness by the same Government that once nurtured the face of John Paul Jones, and that is today acknowledged as the most powerful in the world.

Why do we persist in publicizing the Navy's exhaustive cross-examination of the Pueblo crew? All we are doing is exposing the weaknesses of our Government, the timidity of our leaders, the pathetic rationalizations of our patent inability to react to a real threat, our obvious unpreparedness, our failure to recognize that the chain of our world-wide defenses is no stronger than its weakest link. Certainly, the examinations taking place at Coronado, California, do not reflect on the men of the Pueblo except to show their status as sacrifices offered up to the Red enemy in favor of "not rocking the boat" or not creating a more serious crisis which might call for firm and truly American action.

Just what are we afraid of? And if we are so afraid of the possible consequences of fast and forceful action on our part, why is it that little nations like North Korea are not similarly afraid? Just how can we expect our military men to carry on in unselfish and dedicated performance of their duties when incidents like the Pueblo demonstrate no real intention to back them up and to move heaven and earth, if need be, in the process. These men of the Pueblo were not cloak and dagger types, operating covertly behind enemy lines. They were not of the sort who, if captured, must never be acknowledged. They were military men, uniformed personnel, performing their mission (even if one of intelligence) in an overt manner. They should have been able to obtain a response to their call for help from any U.S. military capability within range, immediately and without question. The plain truth of the matter is that they were abandoned by their own, shamefully abandoned, and this travesty is still being pursued through the medium of a public court of inquiry.

I wonder and so does many another American what this court of inquiry hopes to prove? So far it proves nothing except abject failure on the part of our civilian and military leadership to deal courageously with a bunch of bandits in North Korea. And in the process it demonstrates beyond belief the failure of our Government to plan in depth an efficient intelligence operation and to effectively protect the interests of the United States abroad.

Hail to the men of the Pueblo! I honor them for enduring their trial of fire—I sympathize with them for what they are going through now—I hope no other Americans will ever have to share their experience—I hope no other American will ever have to feel so alone, so left to his own devices by a country he was born and bred to trust and love and expect great things of.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HAYS, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. CAMP.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(b), Public Law 88–630, the Chair appoints as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. REUSS, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION TO STUDY MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(b), Public Law 90–301, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates and the Availability of Mortgage Credit at a Reasonable Cost to the Consumer the following Members on the part of the House: Mrs. SULLIVAN and Mr. BROCK.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits a special study regarding the administration of the Headstart program. This envelope was received in the Office of the Clerk at 3:55 p.m. on Wednesday, February 19, 1969.

Sincerely,

PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk.

SPECIAL STUDY OF HEADSTART PROGRAM, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–75)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 309 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the President to make a special study of whether responsibility for administering the Head Start program should be left with the Office of Economic Opportunity, or whether it should be delegated or transferred to another agency. Congress asked that a report of this study be submitted by March 1, 1969.

I am submitting the report herewith.

This report has been prepared in consultation with the heads of the Executive departments and agencies concerned.

The study concludes that Head Start should be delegated to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It leaves for later determination the question of whether the program should eventually be transferred. As I have indicated in a message to Congress today, I will present a set of recommendations before the end of the current fiscal year on a permanent status and organizational structure for the Office of Economic Opportunity. At that time, I will make a recommendation on whether Head Start should be transferred, or whether it should remain a delegated program.

Section 308 of the same Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the Commissioner of Education to make a special study of the means by which the existing Job Corps facilities and programs might, if determined feasible, be transferred to State or joint Federal-state operation. The Commissioner was directed to report his findings to Congress by March 1, 1969.

As my message today indicated, responsibility for administering the Job Corps will be delegated to the Department of Labor effective July 1. The question of State or joint Federal-state operation is a complex one which may well be affected by the over-all manpower-development proposals now being prepared by the Secretary of Labor. In light of these developments, and in order to comply with the intent of Congress, I have asked the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare, along with the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, and the Director of OEO, to work with the Acting Commissioner of Education in preparing a report responsive to the Congressional directive to be submitted at the earliest possible time. As directed by Congress, the Acting Commissioner will also consult with other Federal officials, with State officials and with concerned individuals.

In its request for these studies, I recognize the interest of Congress in a constant evaluation and review of the way in which new, experimental programs are being administered, and in the measurement of their results. I welcome that interest, I share it, and I will attempt to be responsive to it.

RICHARD M. NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1969.*

TRIBUTES TO MICHAEL MUNKÁCSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SYMINGTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, February 20, 1969, marks the 125th anniversary of the birth of Michael Munkácsy—1844–1900—Hungary's most prominent painter in the 19th century whose fame and material success were greatly enhanced by the sale of his works—numbering more than 60—to various private and public collections in the United States. At the end of the 1880's, Munkácsy was one of the most celebrated painters in this country. His tremendous success is to be attributed here mainly to his medal-winning oil paintings: "Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," 1870, "Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters," 1878, and his two huge canvases on Biblical subjects, "Christ Before Pilate," 1881, and "Christ on Calvary," 1884, all in possession of American collectors or institutions. His visit to the United States in November and December of 1886 established numerous new contacts between intellectuals and philanthropists in this country and Europe, and reinforced the interests in the freedom-seeking nations of Europe, advocated so eloquently by Louis Kossuth and his exiled associates while on a tour of this land of ours in 1851 and 1852.

Michael Munkácsy's career as an artist was one of the most spectacular ones in the 19th century. Having lost his parents in his early childhood, he earned his living as a carpenter's apprentice when his artistic talents were discovered and he was given an opportunity to receive an education as an art student in Budapest. During these early years the subjects of his interest were connected mostly with the memories of the war lost by Hungary against the invading armies of the Austrian Emperor and the Russian czar in 1849. Also, the social ills, caused mainly by the ensuing military occupation of the country which lasted for more than a decade, were treated vividly by the young artist. A prize received at an art exhibit opened the way for him to Düsseldorf, Germany, then one of the foremost centers of the arts in Europe.

While in Düsseldorf, Munkácsy became acquainted with John R. Tait, a young American artist, whose selfless friendship and high regard for Munkácsy's person and talent resulted in the first commission of real impact for Michael Munkácsy. In response to this commission from J. Wilstach of Philadelphia, the young Hungarian painter created a remarkable work, "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," which won a gold medal at the 1870 exhibit of the Salon in Paris, and made the name of Munkácsy famous all over Europe. From then on, Munkácsy's ascension to world fame, accelerated through the establishment of a splendid residence in Paris, which soon became one of the most important meeting places of the leading spirits of intellectual circles in the French capital, developed as one of the most breathtaking achievements in the drama of human artistic endeavor. His great composition, "Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters," 1878, won for him another gold medal at the Salon. After a triumphant tour of the painting throughout England and continental Europe, it was purchased for a large sum for the Lenor Library in New York, as a symbol of the high cultural tasks of that institution. The climax of Munkácsy's artistic career and popularity, however, came with his two great canvases on Biblical subjects, "Christ Before Pilate," 1881, and "Christ on Calvary," 1884, which were acquired by John Wanamaker of Philadelphia for the highest prices ever paid to an artist up to that time. These two huge paintings, while on tour in Europe, and later in the United States, attracted millions of people, and evoked the highest praises from art critics, clergymen, and from viewers of all walks of life.

After his departure from America, Munkácsy was awarded nobility by Emperor Francis Joseph I, as King of Hungary, and was recognized in his native country as one of the greatest sons of Hungary. On two occasions, he was awarded the Legion of Honor in France, and received other high decorations from various countries of Europe. But all expressions of recognition coming from the high and the mighty did not bring about any change in the straightforward outlook and basic honesty of Munkácsy. His warm interest in the problems of the lowly and the poor found its expression in paintings such as "Nocturnal Tramps," 1873, "Pawn Shop," 1874, or "The Strike," 1895, and are recognized by art historians as proofs of his involvement with the issues concerning the forgotten, the underprivileged masses of his time.

Munkácsy's influence upon our society derives not only from the two great Biblical works which, according to John Wanamaker's instructions, are exhibited every year during the Lenten and Easter season in the Grand Court of the Wanamaker store in Philadelphia and viewed by countless numbers of people, many of whom as it is well known travel there for the single purpose of seeing these wonderful works with their own eyes, but also from his numerous other works all over this country which, by themselves, provide an astonishing spectrum of the great qualities of this Hungarian painter both as an artist and as a man of true compassion for his fellow human beings.

I include the following contemporary opinions on Munkácsy's art and personality at this point:

Gotthold Neuda, Paris: "Munkácsy is not only an artist of great individuality; he is also the creator of a *genre;* he is original, not only by his style of painting, but much more so by the choice of his subjects and by the characteristic comprehension of his times, the spirit of which is reflected in his works." ("Milton", 1878)

"At the beginning of his career he chose national, Hungarian subjects, but gradually he widened the scope of his observation and addressed himself to a more universal muse. But whether he leads us into a Hungarian peasant house, a Westphalian tavern, or a Parisian pawnbrokers' office, everywhere his regards penetrate into the immediate and peculiar life of forms and figures, and discover their artistic element; everywhere he gives us well understood and real types, and his paintings, which impress themselves on his contemporaries by force of character and dramatic expression, will in future have the value of historical testimony of the popular life of our time." (1878)

"Therein lies, I believe, the principal excellence of Munkácsy, to which, however, his brilliant talent for colouring and his mastery over all expedients in the art of painting have most powerfully contributed; joined to these, as it were, democratic features of his art, he owes his popularity also to the strong, dramatic instinct, which animates his creations and to the breadth of sombre, suppressed passion, which gives them an overwhelming, tragic expression." ("Milton", 1878.)

"In his 'Milton Dictating Paradise Lost to His Daughters' Munkácsy shows himself a complete master of himself, powerful and original as heretofore, but at the same time free from that dark manner which some critics complain of in his former works, uniting the most brilliant *coloris* with a remarkable simplicity of means." (1878)

Albert Wolf, Le Figaro, Paris "Munkácsy, who lives and works in our midst, should be counted amongst the French; he is more Parisian than Hungarian." (1878)

Gazette du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg: "Munkácsy, by birth Hungarian, has almost become a Luxembourger, as much on account of his yearly prolonged residence amongst us, on his estates in the canton of Redange, as well as by the sympathy which he has always shown to the Grand-Duchy." (1878)

Emile Bergerat, Journal Officiel, Paris: "Of all the paintings exhibited at the Champ-de-Mars, this is the picture one is delighted most to come back. I believe that we have here before our eyes one of those perfectly executed works, to which even the most ill-humoured critic must accord the epithet 'chef-d'oeuvre.' There is but one universal voice as to this Milton being one of the best paintings that have been produced for the last twenty years." (1878)

W. Wyl, Paris correspondent of the Neu Züricher Zeitung: "Never, either in ancient or modern paintings, have I seen an important action of the mind represented in a more captivating manner, never a less ostentatious and simpler use of artistic means. Munkácsy is the painter of this masterwork, which would have delighted Velasquez, the painter of Philip IV., for it is painted with that chaste, natural modesty, which disdains all coquetry." (1878)

Introduction, "Christ Before Pilate, by M. Munkácsy" (Paris, Ch. Sedelmeyer, 1886): "The celebrated painting 'Christ Before Pilate' is uncontestedly the masterpiece of Michael von Munkácsy, the greatest painter of modern time, who is likewise one of the greatest masters of all times, and who has inscribed his name in golden letters in the book of honour of the noble art of painting, which art he has surrounded with a new and imperishable splendour.—Paris, London, Vienna, Berlin, Stockholm, Buda-Pest, Amsterdam, Manchester, Brussels, etc., have had already the opportunity of seeing this picture; two millions of lovers of the Art have admired it; the professional critics of both worlds have paid enthusiastic homage to the powerful creation. And yet the imposing triumphal procession of this great work through Europe is as yet but half accomplished; for Spain, Portugal, Italy, Russia, Roumania and Turkey still await, with unsatisfied longing, that unique sight, which different agents have zealously tried to procure them, even at the greatest sacrifices. The author of the splendid painting and its proprietor and artistic publisher, Mr. Sedelmeyer, have arrested its victorious march through Europe; because the invitations from America have daily become more numerous and more pressing, and because a tribute of due gratitude has to be paid to the United States, whose art-patrons were among the first to recognize and appreciate the genius of the artist."

"To we sure, Europe has followed the development of this chosen artist, first with

attention, then with admiration and lastly with enthusiasm; but America may boast of the loftier triumph of possessing the greater number of Munkácsy's paintings, including some of the most important. If Hungary is his native home, and France his artistic one, America is gradually becoming the lasting home of his works."

"Works by Munkácsy are in the collections of Messieurs Vanderbilt, Astor, Marquand, Aug. Belmont, Moris (sic!) K. Jesup, Judge Hilton, Ferd. Blumenthal, C. J. Osborn, O. D. Mann, Mrs. Rob. L. Stuart, Miss Wolfe, W. E. Walters, of Baltimore, J. Wilstach and H. C. Gibson of Philadelphia, (Mr.) Rice of Boston, and others."

The New York Herald, May 30, 1881 (from its Paris correspondent): "The Salon cuts but a poor figure, after all, beside half a dozen private exhibitions now open in various parts of Paris. Munkácsy's single picture of 'Christ Before Pilate' which for some weeks has been attracting thousands to the galleries of M. Sedelmeyer in the Rue Rochefoucauld, is in itself better worth one's study than all that hangs upon the walls of the Palais de l'Industrie. It rises above them all by a head and shoulders—indeed it would be ridiculous to compare it with them. In the one case we have to deal with a work of genius. In the other, at the best, there is only talent."

The American Register, Paris, May 14, 1881: "The great event in the artistic world after the recent opening of the Salon is the exhibition of Munkácsy's painting, 'Christ Before Pilate', which, as our Paris readers know, was finished too late to be received at the Salon, and which the Musée des Arts Décoratifs finally saw fit to decline exhibiting by itself. Since Monday *le tout Paris artistique* and the lovers of art of every nationality have flocked to Sedelmeyer's Gallery, 6, Rue de la Rochefoucauld, to look at and admire the artist's last and probably grandest creation. We would not fail to call the attention of our readers to this unique exhibition, all the more so as we are told that not only have several offers been made for the painting, but that in all likelihood the same may speedily become the property of one of our countrymen, a well-known patron of art."

The Times, London, January 24, 1884 (on "Christ on Calvary"): "This picture is certainly one of the most perfect which have been produced for many a year, combining all the majesty of classic schools with the modern and personal stamp that marks it of the nineteenth century. When one gazes on this picture and hears Munkácsy speak, one realises the feelings which the contemporaries of Rubens, Murillo or Veronese must have experienced when they conversed with those great masters who were destined to be handed down to the admiration of posterity."

New York Times, March 16, 1885: "The 'Calvary' of to-day, over which not only the world of art but the world of fashions, of thought, and of religion is at present wondering, is indeed a marvellous picture. Taking all things into consideration, it is a strange subject to offer in this century of unbelief, of scepticism, and of scoffing. Who has time now to think of the Man of Sorrows? What artist living in Christian England ever dares to offer such scenes to the critical public, and who could imagine such a subject coming from a Paris studio, where even the last rags and shreds of religion are cast scornfully to the winds?"

The Morning Post, London, May, 1884: "Byron wrote to his mother from Florence, on his return from the Pitti Palace, that he was 'drunk with beauty.' The like effect has been produced here by Munkácsy's noble picture of the Crucifixion. Every one is entranced, intoxicated with this most sublime conception, perhaps which has been ever transferred to canvas—of which, by the way, it covers nearly half of an acre. For many centuries past the Crucifixion has been treated *ad nauseam*. The greatest artists, ancient and modern, have represented the awful tragedy with the revolting realism of a murder scene at Madame Tussaud's or the Musée Grevin. Their Crucifixions are as horrible as the wax figures in the famous Fenayrou murder or the horrors of the dissecting room. The great Hungarian has divested the subject of all its hideous realisms, and has set it upon his canvas in all its sublime majesty. The contemplation of the most sacred and solemn event in history appals the gazing multitude, yet attracts them by the exquisite arrangement of the composition; the colouring, the draperies, all are beyond praise. The heart beats with pity, but it is not stirred into repulsion."

Methodist Times, March 12, 1885: "Mr. Munkácsy has given to the world one of the noblest pictures of our incarnate Lord which this century has produced."

The Irish Tribune, March 5, 1887: "Standing in front of this marvelous conception (now being exhibited in Newcastle-on-Tyne), as we did the other day, it was indeed difficult to realize that nineteen centuries have passed away, since the enactment of the most sublime tragedy of the world's history.

"This largest and latest of Munkácsy's works is perhaps the best described by saying that in artistic touch, power of expresssion, and minute faithfulness of detail, it is simply marvellous. A hallowed hush seems to enshrine it, and we can almost feel ourselves shrouded in that deep darkness which was 'over all the earth until the ninth hour'."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add I would not have had the opportunity to deliver this special order if it had not been for the preparation and research done by my good friend Dr. Elemer Bako of the Slavic and Central European Division of the Congressional Library.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, great artists are gifts of God to humanity, their importance and their message transcends the national, religious, and historical differences of nations. Today when technology seems to be so much in ascendancy as to relegate the humanistic works of the mind into the background and when art has become abstract and so individualistic that only a few who understand the key to its symbolism can decipher the message and enjoy the medium, it is well to recall the great artists of the past, especially those whose message is modern enough in form and structure to be understood by us.

Such an artist was Michael de Munkácsy, the most famous Hungarian artist-painter of all times. He was not favored by fate in his childhood. His father, a subordinate official in the Austrian customs service, was, despite his German origin, a loyal Hungarian who joined Kossuth's army in 1848–49 to fight for Hungarian independence. In the reverses which followed upon the ensuing Russian occupation in 1849, his father was thrown in jail, fell sick, and died there. The 4-year-old Michael, whose mother died soon after his birth, was adopted by an aunt who was killed by robbers as were Michael's other relatives. He was asleep during the ravage and awakened in the morning to find himself near to the corpse of his aunt. An uncle became his foster-father, but being poor, he apprenticed Michael to a carpenter at Bekescsaba. Michael soon made it to journeyman, and acquired the friendship of some high school students who taught him to write and read. Soon he was reading the German poet Schiller and tried to write poetry himself. As a carpenter he had to do painting and decorations on his chest of drawers. Soon he found that he had the talent for painting.

He persuaded his uncle, who was now in better financial condition, to let him study with a portrait painter. He soon went to Budapest where he succeeded in selling several of his paintings for increasing prices, but unable to enter the Vienna Academy. Despite his failure and the ensuing eye sickness that almost blinded him for a while, he left Budapest again and worked at Munich. Finally fortune favored him. His painting, "The Deluge," won first prize in Budapest and two others also won substantial prizes. One of his contemporary biographers describes him at Düsseldorf as follows:

He had been attracted thither by the influence of Knaus, but he soon found himself more a master than a pupil. With the hard, dry, conventional Düsseldorf school he had little sympathy. He startled the whole raft of mediocrities there, as the advent of a larger fish might startle the minnows in the pool.

In Düsseldorf, he made his first American contacts, with the painter John R. Tait, the wealthy businessman from Philadelphia, J. Wilstach. The latter commissioned his first major painting: "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," which Munkácsy sent in 1870 to the Paris Salon competition. The painting was considered the picture of the year by the French jury and was awarded a medal. Upon receiving the news Munkácsy returned to Hungary for a visit and then left for Paris. His next work was entitled "War Time," an episode from Hungarian life when the wounded are treated upon their return from the battlefield. Two years later Munkácsy won a second and third medal from the Paris Salon and married the young widow of a rich landed proprietor from the Duchy of Luxembourg—Baron de Marches—and established a home in Paris where princes, world famous painters, artists and businessmen were welcomed and feted. In 1878 at the World Exposition in Paris he won the highest prize with his "Blind Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters." This painting now hangs in the public library in New York, and received the Legion of Honor from the French Republic.

His greatest paintings were "Christ Before Pilate" and "Christ on Calvary." Completed in 1881 and 1884, respectively, they toured Europe for years before audiences cumulatively exceeding 2 million people. In 1886, Munkácsy's two masterpieces came to America where they toured the Eastern States. Soon thereupon Munkácsy himself visited New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C., received by Joseph Pulitzer, John Wanamaker who thereafter purchased both paintings, and several other major families of the day on the east coast, painting portraits of several of the Wanamakers and Mrs. Pulitzer. The critics' notices were ravenous, the Mail and Express wrote on November 20, 1886, as follows:

The most phenomenal career in the art of recent times is that of Michael Munkácsy, who in the space of ten years leaped from indigence and obscurity into opulence and fame, and whose genius, in the painter's thirty-seventh year, culminated in the production of the chef-d'oeuvre of the century.

Great artists exist among his contemporaries . . . but not one of them exemplifies to the same extent, or gives an equal sense of reality to the idea—rather felt than comprehended by those who entertain it—of inspiration.

Munkácsy was not a painter of the elite. Most of his subjects, except the Biblical ones, deal with small people, even with workers and strikers. However, he always kept his belief in the noble side of man's character and in the divine in history. A modern realist, his Biblical paintings occasioned church services under them while on tour and as the Reverend William M. Taylor stated it in 1882:

It is not often that a painter becomes a preacher: but it will be long before I can forget the sermon that Munkácsy preached to me.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, great artists belong to all mankind in their quest for beauty and truth. This is of course true of the greatest artist-painter the Hungarian nation ever produced Michael de Munkácsy, 1844–1900.

Today marks his 125th birthday anniversary, and so we commemorate him as a great artist, a man of inspiration, realism and endless search for the beautiful and noble in men.

Munkácsy was as much at home in painting the most hallowed figure of human history, the Christ, as in depicting the life of simple Hungarian peasants and the poor.

Munkácsy himself experienced the vicissitudes of life in his early childhood and toward the end of his life, despite a meteoric rise to fame and opulence during the 1870's and 1880's when his paintings sold for as much as $150,000 and were seen by 2 million people in Europe alone.

Munkácsy visited America in 1886 and toured New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. He was received and feted by people like Joseph Pulitzer of the New York World and John Wanamaker.

Munkácsy, while an international painter in his message and style, remained a loyal Hungarian to his death. Except for his Biblical and portraiture work, most of his canvases deal with specifically Hungarian folk themes. One of his famous canvases, "The Coming of the Magyars to Hungary," decorates the hall of the Hungarian Parliament.

Many of Munkácsy's paintings are found in the United States. A former Governor of Michigan, Russell A. Alger, bought some of Munkácsy's paintings and several of them are still in Michigan. But the greatest number are in New York in private and public collections, including one at the public library and one at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. In Philadelphia there are several in the possession of the Wanamaker family. The "Christ Before Pilate" and "Christ on Calvary" are exhibited during Holy Week every year in the Grand Court of the Wanamaker store.

Let us then commemorate the anniversary of this great artist, Munkácsy, the humanist and the loyal Hungarian patriot whose works have become widely known not only in Europe but here in America and whose idea content was never far from the principles of freedom and democracy which the people of this Republic revere.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, our gifted Hungarian friends have contributed more than their share to the world of the arts. Their many talents glitter in theater, music, literature; in sculpture and painting.

Today marks the 125th birthday anniversary of one of Hungary's finest painters, Michael Munkácsy, whose works are as renowned in this Nation as in Europe. Who is not familiar with his great "Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters"? And who has not been stirred by what many consider to be his finest work, "Christ Before Pilate"?

The only Munkácsy original in the Greater Cleveland area hangs in St. Mary's Romanian Orthodox Church on Warren Road. It is his magnificent 41½ by 21¼ canvas, "Transylvanian Peasant."

Truly this inspired Hungarian dipped his brush in a palette of universal communication. His paintings transcend the barriers of language and time.

As one who knows and loves the Hungarian people, who admires their many-faceted culture, it is my distinct pleasure to join in paying tribute to Michael Munkácsy, who translated his devotion to the spirituality of all mankind on canvas, with brilliant and lasting success.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of the 125th anniversary of the birth of the most outstanding Hungarian painter, Michael Munkácsy—1844–1900—recalls the memories of times past when this great son of Hungary became one of the most honored figures in the opinion of art lovers not only in Europe but also, and perhaps even more, in this country.

Although many prominent Americans promoted him along with his splendid artistic career, the palm belongs to J. Wilstach and John Wanamaker, both of Philadelphia, who played the most important parts in helping Munkácsy along toward his ultimate triumph as an artist of world fame. The reception accorded him in the great city of New York, during his visit to this country in 1886, and the support and interest of great New Yorkers in Munkácsy's works and personality are regarded similarly as very important factors in shaping the ultimate success of this great painter of the 19th century. As a matter of fact, the purchase of Munkácsy's medal-winning painting, "Milton Dictating 'Paradise Lost' to His Daughters" in 1878, by Robert Lenox Kennedy for the Lenox Library, established the artist's name in the minds of the people of New York as something genuinely their own.

One must look back upon Munkácsy's emergence from the most humble circumstances as carpenter's apprentice in a country town in Hungary. He had to earn his living, having lost his parents in early childhood. As an art student, and a promising young painter, he proved his talents with the pencil and brush and was awarded a scholarship to develop his abilities in Budapest. One can only marvel how this urgently creative artist advanced from one great success to another before he finally won his first gold medal with "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," at the 1870 exhibition of the Salon in Paris.

It gives us a warm feeling that at this important turn in Munkácsy's career a commission was awarded to him by the prominent Philadelphian, J. Wilstach. This made it possible for Munkácsy to achieve that high grade of concentration and devotion without which no intellectual creation can be achieved. This support, awarded to a promising young artist, remains one of the most shining examples of the deeds of great American philanthropists and art lovers, who still today continue to function as the patrons of struggling artists and other intellectuals in various parts of the world.

Munkácsy's rise to world fame and unprecedented material success for a painter came when he completed his first great canvas on a Biblical subject, "Christ Before Pilate," in 1881. Although it could not be exhibited in the Salon, because the artist missed the deadline for the exhibit, the great work shown simultaneously with the Salon's exhibit in a private hall was immediately recognized by experts as "the work of a genius," rising above them all "that hang upon the walls of the Palais de l'Industrie by head and shoulders." This much-loved work was purchased by John Wanamaker, and was first exhibited in New York together with its companion piece, the magnificent "Christ on Calvary," 1884, which also became the property of Wanamaker.

On the occasion of this unexcelled event, New York Hungarians sponsored a dinner honoring Munkácsy. It was presided over by Joseph Pulitzer, another great son of Hungary, who also built a spectacular career far away from his native country. Surrounded by such prominent guests as Mayor-elect Hewitt, Cyrus Field, Henry Ward Beecher, Carl Schurz, Chauncey Depew, and others, Pulitzer greeted the Hungarian artist "because true Americans, having no aristocracy, are ready to worship the aristocracy of virtue and the royalty of genius."

He linked Munkácsy with Louis Kossuth and Franz Liszt, Hungary's other great sons living abroad and finished by saying:

Tonight we are all Hungarians—we are all Americans.

And Pulitzer's paper, the World, wrote of Munkácsy on November 18, 1886:

When the few great artists of our age and time shall have won, by lapse of centuries and art periods, and by the power of their work, the title of "old master," as we now understand the term, Michael De Munkácsy, the Hungarian painter, will hold a foremost place among the immortals of the 19th century, secured for him by his masterpiece, the "Christ Before Pilate."

Thus, in the light of these contemporary opinions, it is no wonder that the creator of such masterpieces of true humanitarian content and spirit remained the same honest person as he was when he first approached his great task as a young artist. In spite of the numerous high decorations, praises, and the unparalleled material rewards showered upon him for his subsequent works, his care for the poor and the needy never ceased—time and again he turned to such subjects and they appear in such works as the "Yawning Apprentice," 1868; "Nocturnal Tramps," 1873; "Pawn Shop," 1874; and "The Strike," 1895; a

surprising variety of works of art for a man who was elevated to nobility by Emperor Francis Joseph I.

It is our privilege and our duty to treasure the memory of Michael Munkácsy, whose life and works created so many ideas for later generations coming from the shores of the old world in order to enrich the realm of the new.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the 125th anniversary of the world-renowned Hungarian artist-painter of the 19th century, Michael de Munkácsy, born on February 20, 1844.

Munkácsy was not only a great master of his age, but a fighter for human freedom and human rights. This explains why the works he produced found as much response abroad as in Hungary, and why over 60 of his canvases are today in the United States in museums and private art collections.

Munkácsy's early childhood was overshadowed by the so-called Bach era of Habsburg oppression in Hungary following the tragic end of the Hungarian fight for freedom in 1848–49. Orphaned, the young Munkácsy suffered poverty and injustice and for a while had to earn his living as a carpenter's apprentice. Yet his talents soon won him scholarships and he moved to Budapest. A prize won by one of his canvases won him also a scholarship at the famous Düsseldorf Art School in Germany.

Among his earliest friends was the American artist, John R. Tait, of Baltimore, Md., through whom his patron, J. Wilstach of Philadelphia gave Munkácsy his first commission for a large painting. The work was entitled "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death," and won a medal at the Salon at Paris catapulting the young artist to European fame.

His American connections were reenforced by the interest developed in his works, particularly the magnificent "Christ Before Pilate," by the Philadelphia philanthropist, John Wanamaker and the famous editor of the New York World, himself of Hungarian origin, Joseph Pulitzer.

In 1886 Munkácsy visited the United States after a tour of his painting "Christ Before Pilate" on the eastern coast. In New York, Joseph Pulitzer greeted him with a Hungarian-language headline in the World and while in New York he also painted a portrait of Mrs. Pulitzer. James B. Townsend, writing in the November 18, 1886, issue of the World described his work as follows:

> The work is a grandly conceived one; is majestic in its simplicity and tells its dramatic story through no tricks of art, but simply by genius guiding the hand which created it. It satisfies and moves the spectator. "Behold and look if there is any sorrow like unto my sorrow," are the words that come irresistibly to his mind.

The New York Herald also commented on the same day:

> It is an impressive and dramatic scene, and one which grows on the beholder. The "Christ Before Pilate" is a work which will be ranked as one of the most remarkable of the century.

Today the New York Public Library possesses Munkácsy's "Milton" and several other paintings are in private collections all over the country.

Munkácsy's message was both real and ideal. The subjects were either simple people, or religious motives, but the message always expressed real conflicts, social and personal, and tried to ennoble the concept of man and his freedom. His message is timeless and is not limited to Hungarians or Americans. He is striving to express man's universal yearning both for freedom and a meaningful life.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in joining my distinguished colleague from New Jersey in commemorating the 125th anniversary of the Hungarian artist-painter, Michael de Munkácsy, we are paying homage not only to an artistic genius but to a great champion of human freedom and human rights of his generation.

Hungarian contribution to music is too well known to be emphasized, but usually we are less aware of the artistic genius of Munkácsy who is revered by his fellow countrymen as the greatest artist of Hungarian origin.

He is a representative of the critical realist school, yet the depth and expressiveness and form perfection of his canvases gave him the reputation of an "old master" in Tintoretto's style. His themes were often Biblical and point from the natural to the supernatural sphere, yet he never became an idealizer of life. Rather he tried to grasp the noble sentiments of man, even among those oppressed and underprivileged. His best-known painting in America became the canvas "Christ Before Pilate" and "Golgotha" both of which toured the United States on exhibitions and are annually shown by the Wanamaker family during Holy Week. Munkácsy visited the United States in 1886 and was warmly received not only by John Wanamaker but by Joseph Pulitzer and indeed by all art patrons of the eastern coast.

In the latter part of his life, he was elevated to nobility by Emperor Francis Joseph and decorated twice with the Legion d'Honneur in France and received the most coveted artistic prizes of Europe.

However, in his heart he remained the warmhearted, compassionate man he always had been, and while painting public personages he did not forget to immortalize in his paintings the lonely, the poor, and the underprivileged. His socially reformist paintings included "The Strike," 1895; "Pawn Shop," 1874; and even the early "Yawning Apprentice" to mention only a few.

As his childhood was embittered by the memories of the Austrian oppression in Hungary following the defeat of the Hungarian War of Independence, in his themes man's quest for freedom always occupied an important place. Thus, he is indeed modern as well as classical and we are happy to have more than 60 of his paintings in the United States in public and private collections.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the greatest Hungarian artist of all ages, Michael de Munkácsy, upon the 125th anniversary of his birth today.

Munkácsy was a representative of critical realism, but his realistic style did not prevent him from dealing with themes that were religious and idealistic. Some of his most famous paintings were connected with Christian religion, like the two major canvases on "Christ Before Pilate" and the "Golgotha," and the equally famous "Ecce Homo." His paintings also exude a great interest and compassion for those deprived of freedom, and he can be truly called one of the great champions of human rights and freedoms of his age.

Munkácsy's childhood was overshadowed by Austrian oppression in Hungary following the defeat of the Hungarian struggle for independence in 1848–49, and the theme of the proud, unbroken, yet fettered man before his oppressor is also a trademark of his work, including the "Christ Before Pilate."

Munkácsy had many connections with the United States. One of his earliest friends was the American artist, John R. Tait, of Baltimore, Md. Among his strongest backers were Mr. J. Wilstach and Mr. John Wanamaker, both of Philadelphia.

Munkácsy visited the United States in 1886, when he was received warmly in New York by Joseph Pulitzer and the social world, as well as in Philadelphia and Washington, D.C.

More than 60 of his paintings are in American public and private collections, many of which are in New York, including his "Milton" at the public library.

His American contemporaries saw in him another old master of the size of Tintoretto. Not less than nine New York papers commented extensively and favorably on the exhibition of his "Christ Before Pilate" and all compared him to the immortals of his century.

It is, therefore, most fitting to remember both the genius of arts and the champion of the oppressed peoples, fighting for their national and personal freedom, at this anniversary of Munkácsy's birth.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

NFL FOOTBALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it may be difficult for many Members of Congress to sympathize with the plight of an athlete who this year is expected to make an income of at least $100,000.

But the plight of O. J. Simpson, gang-tackled as he is by the callous monopoly of professional football, is the plight of more than 1,000 young athletes who are stripped of their freedom each year. Simpson's situation is only more dramatic.

Unless Congress takes steps to correct these flagrant abuses, Simpson will join the eager young recruits and the tested veterans in the lock-step of slavery. He will be a well-paid slave—one of the

richest in pro football—but he will be just as much of a slave as the lowest-paid journeyman.

Let us analyze the case of O. J. Simpson to illustrate how each and every pro player is victimized by the current system:

Simpson, in case anyone needs to be told, is the most publicized star of our era—perhaps in the history of college football. A running back blessed with a remarkable combination of size, speed, strength and stamina, he made the University of California at Los Angeles one of the greatest powers in the country. He is possibly the most sought-after player by the pros in history—not only because of his outstanding ability but because of his box-office magic.

But Simpson cannot sell his services as a free man. He does not have the bargaining power of the lowliest laborer in our country. He is told he must play in a certain city. He must play in a designated league. He must come to an agreement on salary with one owner. And if he does not like the terms offered, he has only one alternative. He can quit football. Simpson is now in precisely that situation. He has been drafted by the Buffalo Bills under league practices and is that team's property. His recent retention of legal counsel and threatened court action against the league demonstrate that he is the unwilling property of the Bills.

Such unconscionable restraints stem from two practices: the effective evasion of football's own "option clause," and the common draft of the merged National and American Football Leagues.

In theory, the "option clause" seems justified. It is purportedly necessary to create stability among league members and to curtail wholesale yearly raids on personnel by richer owners. This clause in the standard contract provides in essence that, when a player signs a contract initially, or renews it, he also gives the club an option on his services for the following year under the same terms. However, the player may decline to grant this option and thereby suffer a 10-percent cut in his current contract. In this case, the player can then sign with any team for the following season as a "free agent."

This, in my view, is not an unreasonable restraint. Indeed, the late Bert Bell, former NFL commissioner, argued most persuasively that this "escape hatch" for players effectively removed them from bondage, and thus antitrust prosecution was forestalled. Indeed, it was a factor in persuading Congress to exempt the NFL–AFL merger from antitrust jurisdiction. However, experience in recent years has demonstrated that principle and practice are two different things.

As I told the House last October, there is persuasive evidence that the team owners and commissioner have devised means to deprive players of this "escape hatch," thereby rendering the option clause in violation of antitrust laws. I shall discuss this point in more detail shortly.

Up until a few years ago, there were two separate leagues, each holding its own draft of college players annually. Under this setup, a player had at least a minimal freedom of choice and bargaining rights. He could decide which city and which team offered him the greater advantages, and he could weigh these considerations against the respective salary offers. But with the merging of the leagues, all freedom ended abruptly. Now he goes where he is sent. And if he does not like the city or the team or the coach or the salary, that is just too bad. He is stuck. He is stuck until his legs lose their spring or his arm loses its zip, or the coach decided to trade him. In any case, he has no control over what happens to him.

He has no control because it appears Commissioner Pete Rozelle and other league officials have taken steps to make a mockery of the "free agent" status of athletes who have elected to "play out their option." Last fall, I brought to the attention of the Congress the case of Dave Parks as one of several abuses. It merits review here.

Parks played out his option with San Francisco and signed with New Orleans. It had been the custom up until that time for the new club subsequently signing a player to compensate the old with a player of equal ability and/or cash. This represented a gentlemen's agreement, which in itself was suspect as evading the intent of the option clause. But the NFL went a step further. When the two clubs could not agree on the compensation to be paid for Parks, Rozelle ruled that New Orleans had to give up its first draft choice of 1968—Kevin Hardy, of Notre Dame—plus its first draft choice for 1969.

Let me repeat that this severe penalty meant only one thing, in my opinion. It was a clear warning to players that playing out an option could well result in unemployment; it was an obvious threat to owners that dealing with a free agent would be too expensive. It eliminated the escape hatch of the option clause as effectively as if the provision were physically removed from the contract.

Let me say again that an athlete achieving free-agent status—at a financial sacrifice—can well find himself a drug on the market. Another team will fear to sign him, unless he is a superstar who might be worth the gamble of the probable reprisal.

But even though I have paid particular attention to the case of O. J. Simpson, it is not the superstar I am concerned about. It is the journeyman, the average player with family responsibilities, the athlete with only a year or two left to play in the big time.

In view of this concern, over 3 months ago I requested the Justice Department to investigate the matter with a view to antitrust prosecution. However, in recent communications with the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, I have been informed that no investigation will be undertaken.

The sole explanation offered by Justice Department officials for this refusal is that they "believe the option clause and common draft practices of the NFL to be 'reasonable' restraints under the Sherman Act."

This, in my judgment, ignores both legal precedent established under the Sherman Act and the intent of Congress in permitting a merger of the NFL and AFL. I am convinced that, in its option clause and player draft practices, pro football has deliberately and callously gone beyond the bounds established by the legislation exempting the merger of the NFL and AFL from antitrust jurisdiction. This legislation, a rider to a nongermane bill, merely exempted "a joint agreement by two or more professional leagues," and during House debate proponents made clear that this language only granted exemption to the actual steps necessary to effect a merger of the NFL–AFL. It most certainly did not give pro football a license to flout or evade antitrust laws in its day-to-day operations.

I am further convinced that the Congress must reexamine its decision to permit a blanket merger of the two leagues.

I have therefore requested the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee to authorize a full investigation of the merged NFL. In my judgment, this course of action is the only way to insure that pro football will survive as one of our most popular sports.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a grave crisis. The haphazard, unplanned establishment, and expansion of our national cemeteries has resulted in an ever-increasing shortage of burial sites for those who have earned the privilege of interment in these cemeteries.

This crisis, which has already resulted in an order limiting burials in historic Arlington National Cemetery, comes as no surprise to those of us who have kept abreast of veterans' needs in the United States.

We have had many warnings during the past several years about the need for a workable, long-term plan to establish adequate gravesites for veterans. Yet each time, the warnings have been ignored.

We cannot continue to do this any longer. Unless the Congress takes action promptly, the crisis which has already all but closed down Arlington National Cemetery will spread to other national cemeteries. In fact, according to the American Legion, for all practical purposes we have already run out of available burial sites for veterans.

A prime example of this heightening crisis is Pinelawn National Cemetery on Long Island. When Pinelawn was established in 1937, it was estimated that this would provide gravesites for veterans until 1975.

In recent years, however, it has become apparent that this projection was far too optimistic, and current estimates indicate that the close-out date is almost upon us. Without expansion, Pinelawn is not likely to serve beyond 1970.

Thousands of acres of Government-owned land is available on Long Island for the expansion of Pinelawn. The time to plan such expansion is now, not on the eve of another crisis.

And there are many other national cemeteries throughout the Nation whose future should be outlined in a well-defined plan, also. Such a plan does not exist and will not exist if the legislation aimed at creating it is not acted upon.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to resolve the heightening national cemetery crisis by eliminating the present outdated system of divided and overlapping jurisdictions and by providing the means to expand existing sites and create additional ones.

This measure would transfer to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, jurisdiction over existing national cemeteries presently parceled out to three other agencies, in addition to the Veterans' administration: the National Park Service, the Department of Interior, and the Department of the Army. It would vest in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs the authority and responsibility for the operation, care and maintenance of these cemeteries.

Further, the bill would direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to plan a system of national cemeteries and to create additional ones so that the capacity and distribution of national cemetery sites shall at all times be sufficient to assure burial in the national cemetery for those who so desire.

To implement this, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would be authorized to acquire such lands as are needed: by gift, purchase, condemnation, transfer, or by any other means.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation is vital if we are to be able to continue to properly pay tribute to the men who fight for the honor and freedom of our country. We can no longer ignore the inevitable. The time for action is now.

I, therefore, urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this bill.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND THE HOLDING COMPANY BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the potential for conflicts of interest among the new officials of the U.S. Treasury Department.

Mr. Speaker, this concern goes particularly to legislation which might go before the Banking and Currency Committee and on which the Treasury Department must comment. The banker influence at the Treasury is hip deep and it is sure to cast a pall on all banking legislation that is sent forward by the Nixon administration.

As I have pointed out earlier, the top policymaking officials at Treasury come directly out of the banking industry. Here is the way the list reads:

Mr. David Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury, formerly chairman of the Continental Illinois National Bank of Chicago;

Mr. Charls Walker, Under Secretary of the Treasury, formerly executive vice president of the American Bankers Association; and

Mr. Paul Volcker, Under Secretary of the Treasury, formerly vice president of the Chase Manhattan National Bank.

What deeply concerns me is the effect of this banking background on the one-bank holding company legislation which must be considered early in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that these Treasury officials cannot divorce themselves from their backgrounds as they make recommendations on these holding companies. Today, I have written President Nixon about this important issue and I have urged that he withdraw these officials from direct participation in the holding company legislation.

Mr. Speaker, here is what I told the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The forthcoming hearings on the Bank Holding Company Act are of vital importance to every segment of our economy and this once again raises the serious problem of the banker influence at the U.S. Treasury Department.

As you are aware, it would be normal procedure for the Treasury Department to make recommendations on these amendments to the Holding Company Act and to comment on the various proposals. Likewise, normal procedure would involve consultation and approval of the Budget Bureau.

However, all Administration officials in a position to advise the Congress on this vital piece of legislation are only weeks away from their jobs in the banking industry which this legislation is designed to regulate and to restrict.

In fact, the Secretary of the Treasury—who would be expected to make the recommendations of the Administration—participated in the formation of a one-bank holding company while he served as Chairman of the Continental Illinois National Bank of Chicago. He must now draft legislation and make recommendations which will, in effect, decide whether the very holding company which he formed will remain intact. Mr. President, I am sure that the Secretary is a man of high integrity, but such a situation places him in an impossible position where he must rule on his own handiwork.

The same situation exists when the matter goes before Mr. Robert Mayo, your director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Mayo, of course, was a vice-president of the Continental Illinois National Bank and presumably participated alongside Mr. Kennedy in forming the one-bank holding company.

I understand that a great deal of the work on the Administration proposal is being performed by Charls Walker, the under-Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Walker, of course, is former executive vice-president of the American Bankers Association, the lobbying organization largely controlled by the big banks which are now so interested in the one-bank holding companies as a means of expanding their influence in the economy. Mr. Walker has had a close relationship with these banks and has faithfully lobbied for their position on Capitol Hill.

Before he was appointed by you, I am sure that Mr. Walker was in the process of preparing the legislative position of the ABA on the Holding Company Act and it is safe to assume that this position was not contrary to that of the large banks which have formed holding companies.

I am not certain of the role of the other under-Secretary, Paul Volcker, in the holding company talks in the Administration, but I assume that he will have a voice in the final decision. Mr. Volcker, as you know, was vice-president of Chase Manhattan National Bank of New York, which announced plans to form a one-bank holding company just 11 days before Mr. Volcker joined the Treasury.

The background of these policymakers perhaps explains the confusion and constant shifting which seems to be going on inside the Treasury Department on this vital issue. Trying to reconcile their past associations and life-time careers in banking with their current responsibilities, is, I am sure, a difficult, if not impossible task, particularly on an issue as volatile as this.

Originally, I had understood the Treasury Department would send legislation on Bank Holding Companies to Capitol Hill before the Lincoln Day recess. Then later, I noticed in the press that the time table had been changed and that the bill would be forthcoming immediately after the recess, February 17. Later this was changed to February 19 or possibly the 20th "at the latest." Now I understand that all of this scheduling has been changed to next week.

I can only assume that there is some rapid rewriting and re-evaluation going on inside the Treasury Department. I notice in the press that there have been a series of "background briefings" extending over several weeks by an anonymous official of the Department. It is my understanding that these briefings have been taking place not only in the Treasury Department building, but also in the editorial rooms of some of the nation's leading newspapers. Apparently, there is a great effort to justify the Administration's position before it has a position.

What his sifted out of these shifting positions has been discouraging and alarming. The briefings have inspired reports that the Treasury Department wants to give total exemption to all of the one-bank holding companies already formed. Much more serious have been reports that the Administration would weaken the present Bank Holding Company Act through a broader definition of non-banking activities and by splitting the regulation of the holding companies among all the banking agencies.

If these reports are true—and they have not been denied by that anonymous Treasury official—then what we have is a back door assault on the existing regulation, rather than a much-needed strengthening of the Holding Company Act.

All of this points to the extreme difficulty of drafting legislation in a Department dominated by people from the very industry that the legislation purports to regulate.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the extremely critical nature of this issue and its far-reaching impact on the entire economy, I respectfully urge you to withdraw the Treasury Department and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget from direct participation in this legislation.

This may seem unusual, but there is, indeed, ample precedent in our system of government for such action. For example, a judge is obligated to withdraw from consideration of a case in which he may have participated as an advocate before taking the bench. And certainly, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Walker, Mr. Volcker, and Mr. Mayo were advocates for the banks—and bank holding companies—before they took their current appointments.

I am sure that there are others in the Administration—not connected with banks—who could be drafted to work on this legislation and to bring forward your recommendations to the Congress. The Federal Reserve Board, of course, has direct responsibility for the regulation of the registered bank holding companies and I understand that this agency has already studied and

prepared extensive legislative recommendations on this issue.

The important thing, Mr. President, is that we have legislation that truly protects the public interest and in which the public can have confidence. This issue involves much more than the narrow banking interests and its resolution should not be left solely to the bankers. It is something that affects the entire business community and the general public.

You have the power to remove the cloud of suspicion that has arisen about the pending Administration proposals. I respectfully urge you to exercise it.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

ACQUISITION OF CONTROL OF RAIL, MOTOR, OR WATER CARRIERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills having to do with the acquisition of control of a rail, motor, or water carrier. Both bills would amend section 5(2)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which has to do with control, mergers, and consolidations. They are alternative approaches to the same problem.

One would simply change the present statute to make it unlawful for a person which is not a carrier to acquire control of a single carrier. There presently seems to be some doubt in the minds of the Interstate Commerce Commission how far their jurisdiction extends in these cases unless two or more carriers are involved.

The other would add additional criterion to those which the Commission now must consider in the acquisition of control of a carrier by a person not a carrier, namely that such person is engaged primarily in the business of transportation or in a business which is reasonably incidental, or economically necessary or appropriate to the operations of such a carrier or carriers. This is the test which presently applies under the Public Utility Holding Act of 1935. This bill by itself in nowise changes all other restrictions on intermodal control which the act now contains.

I have introduced these bills for the purposes of holding hearings to determine what is the best solution to a problem, which, I think, is of tremendous importance. This problem is whether a railroad or other carrier which is acquired by a person which is not a carrier can fulfill its obligations and responsibilities to the public in providing the kind of service that a common carrier is charged with providing the public.

There are numerous proposed acquisitions of railroads by holding companies, and railroads themselves have former holding companies in their efforts to diversify their current investment. This is true in other carrier fields. I am disturbed, in the absence of adequate information and knowledge about these acquisitions, as to how far they represent and will continue to represent a serious intent to discharge common carrier duties or how far they might chance to be simply erections of financial empires for other purposes. I have introduced these bills therefore as a vehicle for a considered approach to this matter where all aspects thoroughly might be aired.

OKLAHOMA STATE TECH SHARES HIGH HONOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleague in his salute to Oklahoma State University, which was honored last night for its significant contribution to international education.

Oklahoma State Tech, a vital part of Oklahoma State University, is located in the Second Congressional District at the beautiful city of Okmulgee, and shares in the high honor conferred on the university.

The Oklahoma State Tech facilities and faculty are without a peer in the field of technical education, and this great institution is visited regularly by educators from all over the world who are interested in its programs. Thousands of graduates with much needed technical skills are evidence of its excellence.

As an Oklahoman, I am delighted by the international recognition which was given last night.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PATMAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BINGHAM, for 1 hour, on February 26.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks granted to:

Mr. HALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN and to include a newspaper article.

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

Mr. ROTH in five instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. KEITH.

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

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in two instances.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN in six instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. PODELL in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. ST. ONGE in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in six instances.

Mr. BENNETT in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. MINISH in two instances.

Mr. COHELAN in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. OLSEN.

Mr. FARBSTEIN in two instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 24, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed changes in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 (H. Doc. No. 91–76); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

525. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the financial statements of the low-rent public housing program fund for fiscal year 1968, Department of Housing and Urban Development (H. Doc. No. 91–77); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

526. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

527. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July–November 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

528. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to resolve questions of safety

involving certain registered uses of lindane pesticide pellets, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

529. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 82d annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1968; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 7305. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7306. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by the recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7307. A bill making a supplemental appropriation for Headstart programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7308. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7309. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7310. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residences to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 7311. A bill to amend item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 7312. A bill to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the Confederated Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 314, amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 7313. A bill to incorporate Retired Enlisted Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7314. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. ADAMS):

H.R. 7315. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 7316. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $2,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize the taxation of certain cooperatives (other than marketing and purchasing agencies); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7319. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide medical and maternity care in service facilities for certain members of the uniformed services and their dependents after such members are separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7320. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a national cemetery system within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7321. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 7322. A bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize conditional pretrial release or pretrial detention of certain persons who have been charged with noncapital offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7323. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7324. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7325. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, for the purpose of controlling oil pollution from vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 7326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a minimum tax on individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 7327. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the North Loup division, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7328. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness from $600 to $1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7329. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to establish certain requirements with respect to air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7330. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 7331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 7332. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the assignment of surplus real property to executive agencies for disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 7333. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7334. A bill to designate the lake formed by the waters impounded by the Libby Dam, Mont., as "Lake Koocanusa"; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7335. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7336. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the amount of deductions attributable to the business of farming which may be used to offset nonfarm income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY (for himself, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. LIPSCOMB):

H.R. 7337. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7338. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 7339. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1907, to authorize the Department of Agriculture to conduct a regular program of inspection of reindeer meat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 7340. A bill to provide for the orderly expansion of trade in manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7341. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to repeal the provisions limiting the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the program of aid to families with dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7342. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7343. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7344. 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 exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 7345. A bill to repeal subsection (c) of section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to permit adjustment of the status of persons from the Western Hemisphere on the same basis as other aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7346. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7347. A bill to amend section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C.A. 1592), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the estate tax treatment of certain interests created by community property laws in employees' trusts and retirement annuity contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 7349. A bill making an appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7350. A bill to authorize the U.S. Customs Court to maintain an office at the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7351. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7352. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 7353. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 7354. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. CULVER):

H.R. 7355. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 7356. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7357. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit veterans to determine how certain drugs and medicines will be supplied to them; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 7358. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain benefit increases provided for by the Social Security Amendments of 1967 to be disregarded for the purposes of determining eligibility for pension or compensation under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 7359. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 7360. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Richard M. Nixon National Historic Site in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 7361. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7362. A bill to amend section 815 of the Internal Revenue Code with regard to certain distributions of the stock of wholly owned corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 7363. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the waiver, in certain cases, of claims of the United States arising out of erroneous payments of pay or allowances to a civilian officer or employee of military departments and the Coast Guard or a member or former member of the Armed Forces, including retired or Reserve and National Guard personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7364. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweek of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7365. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of minimum and maximum age limits governing new appointments of firefighters in the competitive service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN (for himself, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr ROTH, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 7366. A bill, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1969; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.R. 7367. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act in order to provide for the regulation of the amount of project reservoir storage capacity that may be allotted for water quality control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY (by request):

H.R. 7368. A bill to provide members of the Colville Confederated Tribes with full citizenship and to provide for vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share representing his equity in all reservation assets of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 7369. A bill to vacate and relinquish the reservation of rights-of-way for certain purposes made pursuant to section 321(d) of title 48, United States Code; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 7370. A bill to authorize flood control project on the Sabine River, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RUMSFELD (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. LLOYD, and Mr. LUKENS):

H.R. 7371. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD (for himself, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MIZE, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ZION, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.R. 7372. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7373. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that a person which is not a carrier may acquire control of a carrier only with the approval and authorization of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7374. A bill to amend section 5(2)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to acquisition of carriers, to add a requirement that any acquiring person not a carrier must be engaged primarily in the business of transportation or a related business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7375. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the U.S. mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 473. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 474. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period January through December 1969 as "International DeMolay Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 476. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 477. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 478. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution expressing the opposition of the Congress to the proposed consumption taxes of the European Economic Community on oilseed products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. WATSON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, and Mr. CONTE):

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to reduced air fares for children, youth, and members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to the furnishing of relief assistance to persons affected by the Nigerian civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Res. 266. Resolution to amend rules X, XII, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 267. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H. Res. 268. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 269. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct studies and investigations within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Res. 270. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 271. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 152; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 272. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of moneys to cover expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency incurred pursuant to House Resolution 152; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. AYRES):

H. Res. 273. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 200; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POLLOCK (for himself, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H. Res. 274. Resolution advocating U.S. recognition of Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 7376. A bill for the relief of Gregorio E. Mamerto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7377. A bill for the relief of Girolamo and Maria Aspano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7378. A bill for the relief of Domenica Carlucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7379. A bill for the relief of Baldassare Ciaravino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7380. A bill for the relief of Antonio Giaimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7381. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Naso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7382. A bill for the relief of Jorge Omar and Lidia Triporo Puricelli and minor children Jorge Favio and Walter Omar Puricelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7383. A bill for the relief of Giacomo LaLicata Saccaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 7384. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia A. Buensalido and her minor children, Raymond A. Buensalido and Jacqueline A. Buensalido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 7385. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Il Sun Ko (Baik); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 7386. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Araghi Heshmati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 7387. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title of certain land now owned by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 7388. A bill for the relief of Shukri Abed Zazou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 7389. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Asaro, Francesca Asaro, and Maria Antonina Asaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7390. A bill for the relief of Angelo Joseph Bouchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7391. A bill for the relief of Richard Couture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7392. A bill for the relief of Jean Louis Gaumond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 7393. A bill for the relief of Thomasina Aciarno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 7394. A bill for the relief of Loi Sing Yip, his wife, Szet Pik Shun Yip, and their minor son, Koon Ying Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7395. A bill for the relief of Seferino Duna Castrudes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7396. A bill for the relief of Albert Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7397. A bill for the relief of Fernando Leano del Fierro, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7398. A bill for the relief of Hain Guez, Danielle Cohen Guez, and Michele Guez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7399. A bill for the relief of Josefina del Fierro Hizon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7400. A bill for the relief of Jesus Calapatia Leano and Bayani Calapati Leano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7401. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Galec Mactangay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7402. A bill for the relief of Leonisa Pedro Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7403. A bill for the relief of Magtibay Perez Pedro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7404. A bill for the relief of Fernando Vega Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7405. A bill for the relief of Manual Paredes Santiangco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7406. A bill for the relief of Salvado Francisco Sugui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 7407. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands to Herbert E. Counihan, of Temple Hills, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 7408. A bill for the relief of Shlomo Zack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7409. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Aldover Nipaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 7410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chin Jaw Dung (also known as Mrs. Joan Faye Yee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7411. A bill for the relief of Nemecia Macatangay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7412. A bill for the relief of Antonietta Daniele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7413. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hong-Chien Lin, Tzu-Yung Lin, and Hong-Yih Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7414. A bill for the relief of Gianiale and Anna Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7415. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7416. A bill for the relief of Haseline Editha Maughn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7417. A bill for the relief of Rouhama Lebel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 7418. A bill for the relief of Freddy Albertus Zwaagstra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7419. A bill for the relief of Dr. Esteban G. Friera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 7420. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Vincenzo Culotta, Rosaria Culotta, and Fortunata Culotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 7421. A bill for the relief of Jiang Toy Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7422. A bill for the relief of Chung Won Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7423. A bill for the relief of Kowk King Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7424. A bill for the relief of Yee Cheung Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

61. The SPEAKER presented a petition of William Mathias, Joliet, Ill., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I bring to the attention of my House colleagues the outstanding oratorical effort of a fine young lady from Indiana's Eighth District. Miss Carolyn Soniat is the winning contestant in this year's Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This year's theme was "Freedom's Challenge" and Miss Soniat has beautifully put her own feelings on this patriotic subject into winning form. Her bright, young mind has formulated a blueprint that America might well follow:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Carolyn Soniat)

"I dare you: I dare you to look this world in the eye, to meet this world as it is, not as how you'd like it to be. I dare you to see: to see not only what is wrong, but what is right; to see more than dirt and crime; to see new life and beauty and goodness, and I dare you then to choose forever the beauty, and the truth, and the freedom."

So does Freedom challenge me—Freedom in all her guises. Freedom demands more from us each minute that we live. She forces us continually to re-examine—ourselves, our actions, our motives. To meet her dare, I must each day, make myself more myself. I must eliminate all that is not real, not honest. I must cut out and cast off all my petty prejudices, all my vices, anything which weakens me. Only then will I be prepared, fit, not just for the rigors of the battle, but also for the responsibility of victory.

It is on these victories that we must set our sights; the victory over illiteracy, for ignorance is near kin to slavery; the victory over hatred, for malice breeds narrowness and discontent; the victory over prejudice, for injustice is the path to self-destruction. Our victory must be over all our own weaknesses and imperfections which lead away from liberty.

Each of us must begin with himself. Each student must study and learn about his world and specifically about how he personally can contribute to its betterment. It is not enough to be a good student. Each must be the best he can be. We must recreate the passion our founding fathers had to free themselves from all oppression, from within themselves as well as from without. We must find and eliminate whatever force it is that breeds apathy.

It is not enough that America boasts freedom and equality and is satisfied with that. These are never achieved once and for all. There is no room for complacency where freedom and equality are involved. They must be won over and over again, each time in a truer and purer form. Our victory will lie in our struggle for this pure freedom, not just in America, but in people, people everywhere.

Although the words "commitment" and "involvement" are on the verge of being overworked, they do hint at the type of action that must be taken to keep a world spirit of freedom. Organizations like "Head-Start," the "Up With People Sing-Out," and so many community projects have this spirit. But citizens must participate. People of all ages should become active in their local government and politics. We must get away from our self-satisfaction, out of our lethargy. America has never been lazy. She must not become that now.

Our nation must strive with all its power to abandon secularism: and we must maintain and perfect our system of capitalism. America must not deny the principles epitomized in our motto "In God we trust." We must face the truth—that the nations of the world look to the United States of America for an example of right—and we must act on this truth and fulfill their expectations.

The Persian poet Omar Khayyam, an expert on the free life, wrote in verse 76 of his *Rubaiyat*:

"The Moving Finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on: not all your Piety not Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it."

We have one chance, and only that. America must show the universe for all time that man is noble enough to govern himself, and free enough to create a true civilization.

SAN DIEGO CELEBRATES

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, San Diego—California's first city and my hometown—is celebrating her 200th birthday this year, and the observances are attracting nationwide notice.

A fine article about San Diego, which was characterized in the headline as the "Turned-On City of 1969," was published in the Washington Post last Sunday. The article, by travel writer Horace Sutton, follows:

SAN DIEGO: TURNED-ON CITY OF 1969

(By Horace Sutton)

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.—This may be the most turned-on city of the U.S.A.

San Diegans have festooned their city with gold and white bulbs and are preparing to flick the switch every night through 1969. It isn't San Diego's scheme to rival the luminescent superiority of Los Angeles, but a dazzling way to broadcast the celebration of San Diego's 200th birthday. Gold and white are the home colors.

The miracle of the Mazdas celebrates the historical fact that in 1769 the Franciscan priest, Junipero Serra, established the first colony in California at San Diego. Serra's pioneering urban relocation plan with the word California as a new way of life is also being celebrated by Monterey. San Francisco reckons it did enough 20 years ago with the Gold Rush centennial, and Los Angeles is sprawling too fast to think about birthday parties.

San Diego's Kiwanis Club had little trouble putting over its Warm Lights of Welcome idea once they announced it would cost only $5.37 each to hang a string of gold and white lights four hours a night throughout the year. The downtown skyline, where a new tower rises almost weekly, glows like a carnival midway. Naval ships parked in San Diego are wreathed with bulbs, casting a golden glow across the water.

Visitors at San Diego in 1969 will stumble into a bicentennial event nearly every day and night. There will be fiestas, trade fairs, concerts, art exhibits, boat races, parades, golf tournaments, historical pageants, fireworks, water shows, and on through the spectrum of revelry. More than 30 nations will show their colors none brighter than Spain with its royal flamenco dancers, fashion show, art exhibit, costume display and royal Spanish ball, all in April. Each of the 50 states will have a week to do their thing.

By happy coincidence, the bicentennial will mark the arrival of a bridge and a baseball team. Some local folk won't be happy to see the 80-year-old ferry service replaced by a sweeping span joining San Diego and Coronado Island, scheduled for completion this summer. Coronadoans fear the increased traffic will sully their proud ground; others want to save the ferries as San Francisco saved the cable cars. The Padres baseball team, new entry in the National League, will open the season April 15 at San Diego Stadium, 50,000-seat part-home of the Charger football team.

That makes San Diego a big-league town in every sport including whale-watching. If there was any doubt the San Diego Rockets would make the grade in basketball, it vanished this season with the advent of Elvin (Big E) Hayes, the 6-foot-9½ Houston All-American who has become a bigger attraction than the giraffes at San Diego Zoo.

Ironically, the place where San Diego began may fade from the scene in 1969. Mission San Diego de Alcala, where Father Serra built a crude altar in 1769 and where bells rang in the 200th birthday last New Year's Eve, has fallen victim to freeway encroachment. As new roads were laid to serve the nearby stadium, the white stucco mission on the hill was all but swallowed by the concrete landscape. In fact, some maps neglect showing the mission altogether.

Close to a thousand visitors a week came to the mission a year and a half ago, but by late 1968 attendance had fallen off to a few a day. Father Booth, the mission pastor, has put out a brochure describing three routes to the mission—the easy way, the confusing way, the hard way. For the seasoned freeway driver, the easy way isn't hard to find: Interstate 8 to Mission Gorge Road, north to Twain Avenue, left on San Diego Mission Road.

From the bell tower to the cool concrete walls to the brick courtyard alive with bird song, the mission meets perfectly a visitor's expectations. One of the few hints of modernity is the public address apparatus hanging from the chapel ceiling—that and the hum from the highway down the hill.

Come April, the hum will be upstaged by the roar for the home team at neighboring San Diego Stadium. Maybe in the end big-league ball will be a blessing to the all-but-forgotten mission. A certain number of errant motorists and bored box-seat holders are bound to find their way to the mission, perhaps just in time to save it from oblivion. In return, the mission can relay to the nascent San Diego Padres a little bit of providence.

THE LOWLY COLLARD COMES INTO ITS OWN

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, collard greens are neither universally known nor ap-

preciated. This in unfortunate. Perhaps you have to be raised with collards to know how good they can taste. I am one of those fortunate individuals who understands that collards are a delicacy. My good friend, Judge E. W. Carswell, formerly Mayor of Chipley and a most capable writer on folklore in northwest Florida, has told in effective language the story of the sometimes lowly collard greens. I recommend it, and I will even help the uninitiated to obtain some west Florida collards if they desire to learn more about good eating.

Judge Carswell's articles which appeared in the Pensacola Journal of February 16, follows:

LOWLY COLLARD COMES INTO ITS OWN

(By E. W. Carswell)

CHIPLEY.—Thanks to the "soul food" craze sweeping the nation, the once lowly collard is coming into its own.

The collard, the uncrowned queen of greens here in the Gulf Coast southland for generations, has found favor among the sophisticated city folks up north.

Other Deep South delicacies now among the "soul food" favorites include black-eyed peas and hog jowls, barbecued ribs, sugar cane syrup, candied yams, fried okra, hamhocks, hog head cheese, crackling bread, pot-liquor, corn pone, hoecake and chitterlings.

The yams in these parts are called sweet potatoes, the hog head cheese is sometimes called souse, pot-liquor is spelled pot-likker, crackling bread is pronounced without the "g" and chitterlings, of course, are "chitlins."

Because of a scarcity of 'possum, that "soul bowl" composed of baked 'possum and sweet potato is yet to be introduced at the gourmet restaurants in the big towns. But give them time—and enough 'possums—and this delicacy may become a franchised item to compare in fame with Kentucky fried chicken.

The mullet fish, which the Florida Board of Conservation has been trying to glorify under the name Lisa, is the number one seafood "soul food" near the Florida Gulf Coast. Maybe the board of conservation is missing a bet by not promoting it as such.

But this is primarily about collards. This has been an excellent season for this supreme queen of edible greens. They're tastier after having been nipped by frost. That happened early last fall, with repeat performances at timely intervals in the meantime. That has kept them at their tantalizing, taste-tempting best throughout the winter.

Science has made it possible, of course, for the frosting to be done artificially by means of the deep freeze. But that is a poor substitute, at best, for the frosting applied by nature.

To be on the safe side, it is well to poke tomorrow's mess of collards into the freezer for a few hours for the frost effect. The greens will come out more tender if covered with water before freezing.

A flavorous delicacy, the collard is enriched by nature with an astonishing variety of vitamins and minerals. Scientists have confirmed that they are blessed far more than most other vegetables with nutritive content.

They are an excellent source of iron, for example, and of vitamins A and C. A couple of ounces of collards, in fact, contain a list of food values to compare with those outlined on the average vitamin and mineral food supplement label.

Those who know collards best agree that the richness of flavor, whether before or after frost, is actually captured in the cooking pot. Recipes and methods are many.

One of the oldest, simplest and most universally used recipes calls simply for tossing a piece of smoked ham, pork or bacon into the collards before boiling them in a little water in an iron pot.

That recipe, handed down for generations, is a favorite of Mrs. Mary C. Davis of Washington County's St. Joseph Community. She likes to chop the leaves before cooking, but many of her neighbors cook the leaves whole and cut them up afterward.

She also likes, particularly if the collard leaves are mature, to bring the mixture to a boil and then drain off and replace the water. She says this improves the flavor.

She usually adds a little cooking oil. Some housewives add a pod or two of pepper, but not Mrs. Davis. Her family likes the collards best without the pepper. But for those who do, she suggests green pepper if it is available. If not, red pepper will do.

Many persons add a zestful dash of pepper sauce. Others insist that collards are flavorful enough without the sauce. Since it is a matter of individual choice, a bottle of sauce is usually made available. Collards are usually served with corn pone or crackling bread.

For those who want their collards Southern fried, the leaves can be chopped up into a little bacon grease and water and fried.

A few collard-lovers enjoy day-old greens warmed over in a frying pan, according to Mrs. Davis. A few (mostly old-timers) also like to cover their collards with sugar cane syrup and then serve with crackling bread, baked sweet potatoes or corn pone. She doubts that this recipe has yet found its way to places like the Waldorf or the White House kitchen.

Collard-cooking success depends largely on how the greens are grown. Collard seed should be sown in a small seedbed in January and no later than February. Transplant to the collard patch in late March or early April.

If you can start your plants earlier than January of the year in which they're to be grown, your plants are likely to run-up or go to seed during the summer. When that happens, the plant becomes tough, fibrous and bitter tasting.

By waiting until January or February to plant, your collards will have the benefit of a full summer's growth—without going to seed—before being flavored by the autumn frosts. Many commercial growers, unfortunately for the flavor of the plant, fail to follow this practice in an effort to shorten the growing season.

Collard pot-likker, the liquid in which the greens are cooked, is unsurpassed for rich vegetable flavor. In the pot-likker is captured that indescribable elixir of the collard pot, a blend of the essence of hickory-smoked ham or bacon and the royal nectar of the supreme queen of greens.

Just crumble a little corn pone or crackling bread into a bowl of collard pot-likker for a brothy, distinctly flavorful culinary combination. With such a "soul bowl," the other gourmet foods—including even chitlins and fried okra—will just have to wait.

ADVANCE FEED-GRAIN AND WHEAT PAYMENTS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be associated with the remarks of my colleagues from Washington (Mrs. MAY), from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE), from Texas (Mr. PRICE), from North Dakota (Mr. KLEPPE), and from my own State of Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN and Mr. NELSEN).

I strongly endorse the announcement by President Nixon and Secretary Hardin that participants in the feed-grain and wheat programs will again receive advance payments of up to 50 percent for voluntary acreage diversion.

I know that many farmers and their suppliers, not only in my constituency but throughout the Nation, depend on these advance payments to meet some of their heavy springtime expenses.

I am pleased that the Johnson budget has been corrected in this instance.

CRIME RATES AND POLICE PROTECTION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the sharp increase in the incidence of crime in the 13th Congressional District in Brooklyn, N.Y., underscores the inadequacy of police protection not only in my congressional district but in the entire city of New York. New burdens thrust upon the police department by tensions of the urban crisis, by demonstrations, and by strikes that the blue line of police designed to protect our people from normal criminal activity is stretched to the breaking point.

Crime statistics for the 13th Congressional District during the month of October 1968, show the following:

First. During this month a total of 2,160 major crimes in the categories used by the FBI Crime Index were reported in this district. This represents an increase of 13.3 percent over reported crimes during the month of September. Robberies increased from 49 in September to 80 in October for an increase of 63 percent; burglaries increased from 568 in September to 681 in October for an increase of 20 percent; and motor vehicle thefts increased from 481 in September to 538 in October for an increase of 12 percent.

Second. In simplest statistical form, in September 1968, the people of this district were subjected to 63 major crimes every 24 hours. In October 1968 the crime rate leaped to 70 major crimes every 24 hours.

Third. During the first 10 months of 1968 a total of 19,278 major crimes were reported in the district. The monthly incidence of crime in the district was as follows:

January	1,775
February	1,630
March	1,797
April	1,901
May	1,960
June	2,115
July	2,050
August	1,985
September	1,905
October	2,160
Total	19,278

Fourth. During this 10-month period the people of this district were victimized by 6,327 burglaries; by 6,504 larcenies of $50 and over; and by 4,956 motor vehicle thefts. On a daily basis, this

amounts to 20 burglaries, 21 larcenies, and 16 automobile thefts.

Fifth. The Crime Index Trend for October and for the first 10 months of 1968 shows the following:

	October 1968	1st 10 months, 1968
Crimes against the person:		
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	0	16
Forcible rape	6	44
Robbery	80	633
Assault	69	798
Total crimes against the person	155	1,491
Crimes against property:		
Burglary	681	6,327
Larceny, $50 and over	786	6,504
Motor vehicle thefts	538	4,956
Total crimes against property	2,005	17,787

Sixth. The special police problems in the city of New York were fully set forth in an article written by Peter Kihss, a distinguished reporter for the New York Times, in the December 22, 1968, issue of that paper. After an interview with Chief Inspector Sanford D. Garelick, of the New York City Police Department, Mr. Kihss reported that school problems alone in the fall of 1968 often required the assignment of 3,000 policemen.

The thinness of the blue line against crime—

Mr. Kihss wrote—

is measured by the men actually available for duty. Chief Garelick said only about 4,000 were available on each of three daily shifts—and of these only 2,800 are deployed by the 78 precincts.

Seventh. It is clear that our urban centers have an urgent need for increased and better trained manpower. It is equally clear that the urban centers with their limited taxing powers will be unable to meet this need. The Nixon administration must take every possible step to provide substantial Federal funds for local law enforcement programs as an essential step to eliminate the fears that stalk our people on our streets, in their homes, and in our parks.

Eighth. The following tables show the criminal statistics for the 13th Congressional District for October and the first 10 months of 1968:

OCTOBER 1968 STATISTICS

Precinct	Murder nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	Larceny, $50 and over	Motor vehicle thefts	Total
60	0	1	21	29	134	88	49	322
61	0	1	17	12	175	305	192	702
66	0	0	10	7	124	131	89	361
67	0	2	17	12	111	138	62	342
70	0	2	15	9	137	124	146	433
Total	0	6	80	69	681	786	538	2,160

CUMULATIVE STATISTICS—JANUARY-OCTOBER 1968

60	5	14	179	383	1,278	987	564	3,410
61	5	8	126	127	1,624	2,357	1,896	6,143
66	4	3	79	100	1,047	825	762	2,820
67	0	7	127	97	974	1,007	629	2,841
70	2	12	122	91	1,404	1,328	1,105	4,064
Total	16	44	633	798	6,327	6,504	4,956	19,278

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 16, marked the 51st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For Lithuanians and for freedom-loving people all over the world it was a day of remembrance, not a day of joy, because Lithuania no longer exists as an independent state in the world's nations. She exists as a spirit, as a people with an ethnic and linguistic identity.

Independence for Lithuania has had all too brief an experience in this century. Her freedom was proclaimed in 1918 and it lasted only until 1940 when her borders were overrun by German and Russian Armies. The Soviets annexed this small Baltic country, along with her sister states of Latvia and Estonia. And with the end of World War II, they were absorbed into the Russian political structure.

The strong identity of the Lithuanian people, however, remains. The desire for freedom still burns bright. And as we salute these resolute people on the commemoration of their independence, we join them in their hope for a day when all men will be free to direct their own destinies, and we dedicate ourselves to the realization of these hopes.

BIBLE READING IN OUTER SPACE

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, as one might have expected, the voices of the atheists were raised in protest immediately upon the reading of the Bible by our astronauts while in outer space. Personally, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Col. Frank Borman, Capt. Frank Lovell, and Lt. Col. William Anders for their deep religious conviction and for their choice of reading material while in outer space.

I shall always defend and uphold the right of all Americans, including astronauts, to read from the Holy Scriptures wherever and whenever they please. To do less would be to sanction the imposition of a restriction on freedom of religion, which I do not believe straight-thinking people want to impose. I am not alone in my beliefs, and I am pleased to inform the House that a campaign is now underway to obtain 500,000 signatures commending our astronauts for reading from the Scriptures. I understand that the Reverend Fred Taylor, of Toledo, Ohio, and Mrs. Loretta Fry, of Detroit, Mich., are presently directing a campaign to obtain these signatures for presentation to Mr. Paul Haney, the Public Relations Director of NASA, in Houston, Tex., on March 7, 1969. To date, they are reported to have obtained 175,000 signatures, and I wish them Godspeed in obtaining the remainder of them.

PUSEY CAUTIONS STUDENTS ON ATTACKING ACADEMIC FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carried a story about the president of Harvard University, Nathan Pusey, which has great significance.

Dr. Pusey has wisely pointed out that while the dangers to academic freedom traditionally have come from outside the university community, on today's campuses academic freedom is endangered because of coercive methods used by some students within the university community. This note of caution desperately needs to be voiced by men like Dr. Pusey in academic institutions across this country. I include it as such for the information of the Members of Congress:

PUSEY WARNS OF STUDENT ATTACKS ON FREEDOM—HARVARD PRESIDENT DEPLORES USE OF "COERCIVE METHODS"—HE ISSUES STATEMENTS AFTER PROFESSORS PROTEST SIT-IN

(By Robert Reinhold)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., February 18.—Nathan M. Pusey, the president of Harvard University, warned today against assaults by students on academic freedom. He said that such assaults had accompanied disruptive campus protests.

"Growing numbers of students have chosen to exercise their frustrations in the academic arena in insufficient awareness of what a university properly is and sometimes at the expense of the rights of others," he said.

"Each time we thoughtlessly or emotionally allow ourselves to chip away at the painfully erected structure of academic freedom for which time and time again in our role as leaders we have had to man the barricades we not only do ourselves but also our country an irreparable disservice."

Dr. Pusey's statement came as a response to an open letter signed by more than 100 leading faculty members at Harvard.

SET-IN PROTESTED

The professors protested a recent incident at Harvard in which Negro students had staged a sit-in to force an instructor to scrap the syllabus of a course they felt was racist.

In thanking the professors for reiterating "the ancient privilege of the teacher to teach and the student to learn in an atmosphere of free inquiry," Dr. Pusey said that in the past the chief threats to academic freedom had come from outside the university.

"The irony and tragedy of the present," he went on, "is that now the threats to academic liberty and integrity often come from within.

"Harvard has the right to expect that the members of its faculties and the great majority of its students will have sufficient understanding, historical sense, reason and self-control to insist that coercive methods have no place in this university community."

The faculty letter, published in The Harvard Crimson, called on the Harvard administration to "take measures appropriate to insure the inviolability of instruction and examinations."

A PLEDGE TO FREEDOM

Dr. Pusey, in his reply, did not specify what measures he was prepared to take, except to say:

"I shall do everything in my power . . . to see that the freedom of this university continues unabated, proof against attacks, however well-intentioned or from whatever quarter they may come."

The Harvard faculty has been highly disturbed by the Negro students' coercive action, although most feel that the course in question, which was to have studied means of riot control in the cities, was inappropriate.

However, informed campus sources believe that the Harvard administration is prepared to take no action against the Negro students aside from the general statement of principle expressed in both the faculty letter and Dr. Pusey's report today.

The course, to have been given under the city planning department of the graduate School of Design, has not been canceled but the original syllabus scrapped and replaced by an unstructured seminar in urban studies.

SENTINEL ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE PROGRAM

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in the past month we have seen the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile program go from preliminary acceptance to controversy. In a free system, this is only right, but it seems that judgements affecting the national security of this Nation should be based on cool and rational perspective rather than on emotions.

We in the West, unlike a number of those from other parts of the Nation, are willing to accept the risks that the defense of our Nation entails. I would evidence this by a telegram I received this morning from a group from my district, the great State of Wyoming.

I include at this point the telegram from the Greater Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce and an editorial by the editor of the Wyoming State Tribune, James A. Flinchum in the RECORD:

CHEYENNE, WYO.
February 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN WOLD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We of the Cheyenne community convey our enthusiasm to have within our community and all Sentinel anti ballistic defenses.

We are the home of the first free world. First operational ICBM base and the Minuteman and welcome any further expansion to our area. Your affirmative action will be appreciated.

ROBERT G. SMITH,
Greater Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce.

WELCOME, SENTINEL

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's statement yesterday that the Defense Department is considering removal of Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile sites from the immediate environs of some eastern metropolitan areas to more remote locations at first glance suggested that some of our western states might be in line for additional ABM locations.

But a more careful examination of Laird's remarks, made on NBC's "Today" show, in reality indicated something else. Laird is thinking of new locations 20 to 30 miles from Boston where a proposed Sentinel installation has produced all sorts of vocal reverberations. Twenty to 30 miles wouldn't make much difference, we believe, in the event of a nuclear accident.

Whether some of the more liberal senators and congressmen such as Massachusetts' Sen. Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy and South Dakota's George McGovern, both Democrats, are really worried about the possibility of nuclear accident, or are opposed to further expansion of our missile and anti-missile systems, is difficult to determine. The latter may be much more probable since it must be recalled that nuclear weapons have been in considerable abundance within the past 10 years on missile warheads and to a much greater degree in B52 bombers over the past two decades.

As a matter of fact, H-bomb equipped bombers located on airfields in this country could have posed a much greater danger than missiles equipped with nuclear warheads.

The fact, of course, that no accident has occurred is no indication that none will; but there seems to be no other choice in this age of sophisticated and devastating weaponry. The H-bomb is something we have got to live with. Hopefully we shall not die by it, either accidentally or deliberately.

If the Nixon Administration finds the metropolitan areas of the country unwilling to allow these installations for their own defense, then possibly some of our remoter and less settled areas such as, well, Wyoming, might be acceptable. Chances are the citizens here wouldn't have any objections; quite the contrary, they probably would welcome further ABM installations than those already proposed.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS MUST BE CONSIDERED IMPORTANT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

M. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Willie Mae Rogers as assistant to the President on consumer affairs has been withdrawn. This is probably the wisest course of action in this instance.

Comments on the selection of Miss Rogers are still relevant in the context of the importance of consumer protection. If the selection of Miss Rogers is an indication that recent improvements in consumer education and protection are to be ignored, then the Congress must be prepared to work doubly hard on this issue.

The Saturday edition of the Boston Globe included an article by James Doyle of the Globe Washington Bureau. Mr. Doyle's article is relevant today because it questions the role that consumer affairs will play in the new administration. Jim Doyle sees the nomination of Miss Rogers as an indication that consumer affairs may be relegated to the background.

I hope this is not so. Legislation passed by the 89th and 90th Congresses in the area of consumer protection, although meaningful, is only a beginning.

I recommend Mr. Doyle's article to my colleagues, as follows:

NO CHEERS GREET NIXON CHOICE TO PROTECT CONSUMER

(By James Doyle)

WASHINGTON.—When Betty Furness sat down to play consumer protection tunes on the piano, Washington laughed. She turned out to be a strong performer possibly even stronger than President Johnson had in mind.

The new administration gave Miss Furness her walking papers, supplanting her with a woman who claims "every job I have ever had has been one in which, in a sense, I represented the consumer."

Nobody here is laughing.

Willie May Rogers, who collects a salary as the head of Good Housekeeping Magazine's Institute in New York, will be the presidential consultant on consumer affairs.

Both she and President Nixon's press secretary insist that this is an attempt to strengthen the government's efforts at protecting the millions of Americans who can get shortchanged on everything from soup to nuts, who get snookered by misleading claims and phony warranties, and who have no high-priced lobbyists in Washington to present their case to the government.

Remembering the lesson of Miss Furness, most of the consumer interests people have have remained quiet about Miss Rogers. They remember, blushingly, displaying their shock publicly when President Johnson chose a lady best known for opening refrigerator doors, with no experience in consumer affairs on the legislative mills.

Miss Furness, who came to the job with a blank slate, worked out well. Miss Rogers may do as well.

She claims to have spent her life toiling for the consumers, but that claim is disputed by some in the field. Mrs. Erna Angevine, who heads the Washington office of the Consumer Federation of America, notes, "to the best of my knowledge, I've never seen her at what we call consumer meetings."

Dr. Stewart M. Lee, chairman of the department of economics and business administration at Geneva College in Pennsylvania, is more distressed than Mrs. Angevine.

"When Betty Furness was appointed, I was appalled," Prof. Lee says. "She proved how wrong I was, and the rest of us were, in our judgment.

"But she also proved the need for a White House assistant on consumer affairs.

"I'm not impressed by having somebody move in now to see if the job is needed."

Prof. Lee remembers the case of California. "Gov. Pat Brown had a strong consumer council, and Governor Reagan appointed Mrs. Kay Valori, whose job, apparently, was to emasculate the council. And that's what she did."

Gov. Reagan managed this, according to Dr. Lee, despite legislation creating a consumers council. President Nixon would have much less trouble liquidating a job created only by the mandate of his predecessor.

"Lee's views are interesting because he is the co-author of a book called "Consumer Economics," which included in it three pages

that discuss the history of Good Housekeeping's Institute from 1912 to 1966. Miss Rogers has been director of the institute since 1953. As soon as Dr. Lee heard about her appointment, he dashed off letters of protest to President Nixon, his senators and his congressman.

Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York says "I am distressed about the appointment of Miss Rogers because of a possible conflict of interest with her association with a profit-making publication, because of that publication's questionable role in the consumer field."

It develops that long before the Nixon appointment, Rep. Rosenthal's House subcommittee on Consumer Affairs had been investigating Miss Rogers' institute for the adequacy of its product-testing methods.

Even if she were not continuing under salary in her magazine job, she would not be suitable by Rosenthal's standards. "Miss Rogers is put in the difficult position of having to snitch on her friends," he says.

This very question came up at the Wednesday news conference that Willie Mae Rogers held at the White House. The question won't arise, Miss Rogers said, because any product with the seal of Good Housekeeping wouldn't be found wanting. Rep. Rosenthal suggests he may have evidence to the contrary.

He told a news conference yesterday that Good Housekeeping continued to advertise a product after the Food and Drug Administration had moved against it, and that when the truth-in-packaging bill was being fought by grocery advertisers, Miss Rogers testified against it.

The White House assures questioners that at some future time a replacement for Betty Furness will be named and that meanwhile the old Furness staff will continue to operate within the executive branch. But some of its top members have already left.

The jury is still out on Miss Rogers and on Mr. Nixon's approach to the bread-and-butter issues that affect consumers. It may be that Miss Rogers' appointment will serve as the alarm bell to keep the industry foxes out of the chicken coop.

Robert Smith, assistant director of Consumer's Union, the most respected of the watchdog groups, said yesterday his organization will wait and see before judging Miss Rogers and the Nixon Administration.

But the C.U. monthly magazine noted in its current issue, "during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, it was evident that consumer affairs occupied a niche somewhere on the government's priority list.

"Whether or not President Richard Nixon considers consumer problems worth paying much attention to remains, at this writing, largely unrevealed."

CU could find little ground for optimism during his election campaign or in his early statements as President-elect.

"The nation will simply have to wait and see."

SP4C. SALVATORE MANCUSO, U.S. ARMY, KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that another one of my constituents, Sp4c. Salvatore Mancuso, U.S. Army, of Ossining, N.Y., died in Vietnam on February 5.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article:

[From the Ossining (N.Y.) Citizen Register, Feb. 6, 1969]

MANCUSO AREA'S 10TH VIETNAM WAR VICTIM—WAS OSSINING HIGH SCHOOL THREE-LETTER MAN IN 1966

A 20-year-old Ossining serviceman, Spec. 4 Salvatore Mancuso has been reported killed in Vietnam.

He was the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Mancuso of 231 Spring St., and the 10th from the area to lose his life in Vietnam. He would have been 21 on Monday.

The Mancusos yesterday received notice of their son's death and are awaiting further information from the Army. He was attached to Co. B Second Battalion, 12th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division.

Besides his parents, he is survived by his grandfather, Salvatore Mancuso of 66 Wolden Road. His father is the owner of Daddy Pete Inc., 207 Main St.

Salvatore was born in Ossining on Feb. 10, 1948. He attended local schools and was graduated in 1966 from Ossining High School where he received a varsity letter for wrestling, baseball and football.

High school principal George Allison described the youth as a good school citizen, loyal and cooperative. "He was respected by all the faculty and students," he said today.

He was a three-year man on the wrestling team. Salvatore's coach, Michael Nardone credited him as being a hard worker and reliable. "He could always be counted on to do his best," he said.

Following graduation he was employed as a teller with the County Trust Co. in Tarrytown from July of 1966 to June 1967. He was working with his father before beginning military duty.

Salvatore was drafted by the Army on Jan. 8, 1968, and received his basic training at Fort Jackson, S.C., and Fort Gordon, Ga. He was home on leave in June and shipped to Vietnam last June 23.

CAMPUS UNREST

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the news is continually dominated by unrest on college campuses. The reasons for the unrest and possible solutions are many and varied. One clear proposition has emerged—solutions in this area will be as difficult and challenging as in other areas. The college campus is caught up in the social problems of the Nation—indeed, of the world. The university campus cannot and indeed must not be isolated from the national environment. In fact, our young people have continually been urged to involve themselves in political and social change. The avenues of active participation in national progress must be widened for young people.

How is this to be done?

How is the college campus to be integrated with national and international goals? These are hard and tough questions—deserving of well-reasoned answers. The answers to these and other similar questions will shape the future for higher education in the United States.

The statement I am inserting in the RECORD today is an enlightened discussion of this problem. The author is Dr. Ivan Hinderaker, chancellor of the University of California at Riverside. I think that in the cloud of smoke raised by a small group of agitators or by undue political interference in campus affairs, the progress of the universities brought about by the endeavors of people such as Chancellor Hinderaker are often obscured.

The statement follows:

THE UNIVERSITY AND RACE RELATIONS

(By Chancellor Ivan Hinderaker)

Two months ago, in my "State of the Campus" message on November 6, I discussed four topics important to this campus: The first was academic freedom and responsibility; the second, the student role in decisionmaking; third, a new academic plan; and fourth, minority students at UCR.

Today, I will talk further about minority students at UCR. In doing so, I want to begin by relating our problems to the black and the Mexican-American movements in our society.

Of the many issues which the United States must decide, one stands out above all the others. It is the most critical question which we, as individuals, are going to be called upon to answer in this century, and, perhaps in the next as well.

Can people whose color is more or less white, and people who are more or less black, or brown, or red, or yellow—can we all, working together, create a society in which equal opportunity genuinely exists for all? That is not really a question. There is no other alternative.

The United States does not offer equal opportunity now. It never has. We have a long way to go.

There is racial discrimination in our society. We all know it. One would have to be unable to hear and unable to see, not to know.

That pattern dates back over 300 years. Its most brutal form was slavery, practiced first in the colonies, and then sanctified in the Constitution from 1789 until after the Civil War.

Only a little less brutal than slavery were the practices used by southern states to undermine the rights given to black people by the 13th, the 14th, and the 15th amendments to the Constitution. The Ku Klux Klan reinforced these practices with its own special brand of terror and intimidation.

What replaced slavery after the Civil War was not freedom. It was not equality of opportunity. It was a kind of "permanent purgatory," somewhat above the hell of slavery but somewhat below acceptance into American society. It was a kind of second, third, or low class citizenship—in job, in house, in school, in church, under the law, at the lunch counter, on the sidewalk, at the drinking fountain, in the restroom, at the voting booth.

Discrimination against black people has not been confined to the South. In different forms, and in some of the same old southern ways, it is found throughout the United States.

Racial discrimination has not been confined to black people. Those who are brown, and red, and yellow, as well, have been the victims of prejudice.

The plain fact is that we who are white have withheld from people who are not white something which should be everyone's sacred right. That is the right of every man, in this his one and only life on earth, to develop himself to the limit of his ability.

A non-white is less likely than a white man to be able to get and to advance in any job to which he might aspire, even if there is no question about his qualifications.

A non-white is less likely to be able to buy or rent any house or apartment he might want, even though he has the cash in his pocket.

A non-white is less likely to be able to achieve any educational opportunity of

which he might dream, even if he has the ability and the willingness to work.

A non-white is less likely to be welcome at the door of any church in which he might choose to worship, even though he, too, is a child of God.

Since the Declaration of Independence, we have been telling ourselves and the rest of the world that a new and truly equalitarian social order was emerging in America. We defined this social order as one in which the fortunes of individuals were determined by their ability and willingness to work, rather than by the privileges of caste, or class, or race.

We have given credit to this dynamic system for the rise of the United States as a world power. We have offered ourselves as a model of democracy for other countries of the world to emulate.

We have talked about the importance of individual freedom, about the value of providing an equal opportunity for all, about equal protection under the law, about the dignity, under God, of each human being. We have talked about these ideals for nearly 200 years. But, in the main, it has been whites talking to whites. It has been whites thinking in terms of whites. It has been whites forgetting there were others besides themselves.

When we spoke of race being no bar to opportunity or advancement, what we really meant was that people of Polish, or Irish, or Italian extraction were being allowed to compete on equal terms with Anglo-Saxons. That was about all that was really meant.

But black Americans and Americans of other races regarded themselves as Americans, too. They, too, were listening. They, too, got the message about this Nation's ideals. They, too, thought it was a good message. They wondered why these ideals did not apply to them.

As the answers to their questions became more clear, 300 years of pent-up anger came pouring out in the black rage and the brown rage of this decade of the 1960s.

That there should be fury from those in the minority should cause no surprise. The only wonder is that it took those in the majority so long to become aware of it.

Neither should there be surprise at the white backlash which followed. The habits of majority thinking have developed over generations. They are grounded deep in the emotions. They are hard to change.

And so, in a spiral with a terrible logic all of its own, the tensions continue to build. With each turn of the spiral, the explosions become more destructive and more frequent. If that spiral is not stopped, the result might well be a second civil war.

Is this an unreal threat? I don't think that it is. Neither the Nation, nor we in California, nor we in this area, nor we at UC Riverside, can behave as though it is unreal.

Such a civil war would not be between the North and the South. It would be between some outraged second class citizens and the rest of society, with urban areas all over the country as the battlegrounds.

It would not be fought with massed armies lined up on a Gettysburg farm. Strategy and tactics would be those of guerrilla warfare, with the guerrillas aiming to cut the many vulnerable arteries of our cities.

It would not be over in two, or three, or four years, to be finished with a formal treaty of surrender. It would be stretched out over decades, slowly draining the lifeblood out of America.

Such is the destructive potential of forces at work in our society today. Such are the stakes for all of us in the answer to the question which I first posed. Can we, people of all colors, working together, create a society of equal opportunity for all?

It is time to stop thinking that the problem of racism will go away if only a few rabble-rousers will quit inciting black people, or brown people. Or, that it will go away if only the magazines, the newspapers, and television will quit reminding black people, or brown people, of the inequalities that exist. The problem won't go away.

Neither will it be solved solely by court decisions, or by civil rights acts, or by educational opportunity grants, or by anything which money alone can buy. These things will help. They are necessary. But they cannot, in themselves, solve the problem.

It is time, now, for each one of us, personally, to do something about racism. Us. Today. Our personal commitment must be to the rejection of racism in every facet of our lives. We must do this not only because we are afraid of what will happen if we don't do it. We must do it because we know in our hearts it is right. It is moral. It is what we want to do.

This, then, is the larger context into which we must place the problem of race relations on the campus. What we have is not a game, to be played like a water fight or a panty raid. It is a deadly serious struggle for the soul and for the destiny of America, and we on the college campus are right in the middle of that struggle.

It is necessary for us here to provide an equal chance for all who want to build, an equal chance for all who want to earn the respect of others, an equal chance for all to express themselves in the ways most meaningful to them, an equal chance to feel and to know pride in one's person and in one's culture of whatever color it may happen to be.

It is also necessary for us here to protect the integrity of our institutions from those who despair so deeply or whose anger is so uncontrolled that the overriding emotion is hate; the overriding goal, destruction. Such protection cannot be insured by force alone. Chiefly, our institution is protected through the voluntary consent of its members. For that to be possible, individuals must respect the rights of other individuals. They must respect the institution—its goals, its performance, its leadership, its capacity for change. There must be a feeling by individuals that they have a personal stake in the success of the institution. There must be enough of all of these things so that consent is voluntarily given.

It is necessary for us here to decide what we want to accomplish. If we don't want to get anything done, then it doesn't matter much how we do it. If we do want to get something done, then it matters very much how we do it. Let me cite three examples.

First, there is the problem of timing. Some things are possible today. Some next week. Some next month. Some might take a year. Some, more than that. Just as surely as progress depends on our acting soon enough, so also does it depend on not acting hastily.

Second, there is the problem of pressure. Without strong pressures, even if ideas are good, nothing is likely to happen. But just as surely as progress depends on pushing hard enough, so also does progress depend on not pushing too hard—so hard that we blow both the system and our objectives.

Third, there is the problem of winning support. To win support, it is necessary to attract allies to the cause. To attract allies, it may be necessary to compromise. But to maintain the integrity of the goals, it is necessary not to compromise too much.

I appreciate the dedication of UCR students to constructive achievement. You have concerned yourselves with both your needs and my problems. You have generated both constructive criticism and constructive pressure. You have shown respect for your fellow students and for the needs of the whole campus.

I think we can say that, together, we have made a start toward campus solutions for some of the problems of race. Compared to what we can do, however, it isn't much of a start. Even so, I would like to describe to you some of our beginnings.

Our most rapidly growing project is the Educational Opportunity Program. Its purposes are two. One is to provide financial help for students who would not otherwise be able to attend UCR—particularly from minority groups. The other purpose is to provide special counseling and, if necessary, tutorial assistance.

From five students in 1966, the Program has grown to over 80 students this year. The percentage of entering Freshmen who come from other than white racial backgrounds was doubled over last year, with the total representing nearly ten percent of the class.

The EOP grants $1,900 for each of the student's first two years. This is to permit him to work full time at his studies. Each grant starts with a contribution of $165, raised by the campus. This is matched five-to-one from special funds of the Regents. The Federal Government adds the rest. After the sophomore year, EOP students work part-time to earn one-half of what they need, thus making more grant money available for additional EOP students.

Recently, EOP programs have come under attack because of the activities of some EOP students on such campuses as San Francisco State and San Fernando Valley State. Why, it is asked, should I help contribute to an EOP grant for someone who is not seriously committed to his academic work? Why should the University contribute to a grant for one who is not willing to live within campus rules? Why don't we eliminate the EOP and support instead those students who really want an education?

I can't speak about the substance of these charges as they relate to other campuses. I can state forcefully that they do not apply to UCR.

Furthermore, I am, as Chancellor, working to substantially expand the EOP program of this campus each year for as far as I can see into the future. That expansion should be not only in the number of grants, but in the quality of our programs for counseling and tutoring. And next year, EOP will get underway with still another dimension—a graduate fellowship program.

As I have a responsibility to EOP, so also does each student who is enrolled under the Program. It is his responsibility to do everything in his power to succeed in his academic work. His success will help make the Program succeed. As the Program succeeds, the greater will be the help which will be available for future UCR generations.

The Program is sound. EOP students are doing well. Many of them are represented in the brightest segment of our student population. EOP deserves the support of every one of us.

Closely related to EOP is the policy of the University of California and the State College System which permits a chief campus officer to admit each year, in exception to regular admission rules, a number of students equal to four percent of the total number of entering students. This policy has been in effect for ten years, with the exception level originally set at two percent. Recently, the exception level was doubled to four percent.

Although many of our EOP students have qualified under regular admission requirements, some have not. The latter have been admitted by my special action, on the recommendation of the Dean of the College of Letters and Science after he has consulted with the EOP advisory committee. In each admission, there is a determination made that the student has a good chance for academic success at UCR.

Recently, as with the EOP, this policy of making exceptions to the admission rules has also come under attack. The reasons have been much the same as they were with the EOP; namely, the alleged activities of some special admission students at other college

campuses. There are strong pressures to reduce the four percent back to two percent.

Why, critics ask, should students who do not meet regular admission standards be admitted when others who do meet these standards are being turned away from campuses which are already full? That is a difficult question. I will answer it in two parts.

One answer is that, in the experience of UCR, grade reports clearly indicate that special admission students have satisfied UCR's academic requirements. Beyond this, they have made many important contributions to the life of the campus.

The second part of my answer is this. The majority student who did not get into the campus of his choice is more likely to find a satisfactory alternative than a minority student who has the capacity but, for some economic or social or other reason of background, has a record which is technically deficient. Call this discrimination in reverse, if you will, but whatever the term, I believe the policy to be both necessary and desirable. Hopefully, the State, through the University, the State College System, and the community colleges will not allow unsatisfied enrollment demand to build up to the point where it might itself tend to produce its own set of social tensions.

Our UCR four percent special admission program is sound. It is my responsibility to see that it continues to be administered in that way. It is the responsibility of UCR's special admission students to continue to succeed, not only for what that means to them personally, but also for what it means to the continuance of the program.

Both the EOP and the special admissions program have helped to begin to correct some deficiencies of UCR student life which should have been attacked long ago. As UCR has been a white student campus, so also has it been white in its non-academic and academic personnel.

In the field of non-academic personnel, three types of policies have been directed to this particular problem. One is a general push by the administration to have all departments explore thoroughly all recruitment sources, including black and brown, prior to filling a vacancy. Overall, the proportion of UCR non-academic employees from minority groups has been increased by nearly fifty percent over the last two years.

The second of these non-academic personnel policies is illustrated by UCR's membership in the Riverside Job Opportunities Council. The purpose of the JOC is to help find jobs for so-called hard core unemployed persons—persons not likely to be hired because of some physical handicap, or a record of having been in jail, or for such a simple reason as having given up hope of ever having a job. Each of the thirteen employer members of the Riverside JOC has agreed to fill at least fifteen percent of their vacancies from candidate lists developed by the JOC. They have also agreed to supply whatever are the special training needs of the employee to bring him to the standard level of qualifications for the job. Of the 117 persons placed so far by the JOC, eleven are at UCR, and ten of these are members of minority groups.

Third among these non-academic personnel programs is a special drive to recruit for high level decision-making positions from minority groups. Since July, six such appointments have been made. We had been told that there were no blacks or Mexican-Americans qualified for these jobs. The contrary, in fact, was the case.

These three non-academic personnel programs add up to a major plus for UCR. I don't mean this in the sense that it is enough. But I do mean it in a qualitative sense. The functions and life of UCR have been much enhanced by these new presences who are here among us.

The problem in the field of academic personnel is more difficult. The degree of specialization required is so high. Its long-range and short-range aspects tend to be so different.

Presently, in the long-range context, UCR has two members of the faculty who are black, and not many more of Mexican-American extraction. Each of these individuals came here by the traditional route, and that included graduate education at a well-recognized university.

In the filling of vacant faculty positions, all academic departments have been urged to make every possible attempt to find qualified faculty members from minority backgrounds. I expect to have some progress to report before the start of the next school year.

This illustrates the long-range aspect of the problem. It will really be solved only when many more black and brown students go on to undergraduate work, when they decide to make college and university teaching their career, when they go on to graduate school, and when they enter the faculty job market. This is one reason why the continuation and improvement of the EOP and the admission waiver programs are so critical to all of higher education. Each provides a significant assist in increasing the number of black and brown teachers, currently in such short supply.

There are also the possibilities of short-range solutions. A committee of the Academic Senate has made several proposals. They relate both to faculty recruitment and to matters of curriculum, which is the responsibility of the faculty. As has previously been announced, it is my intention to appoint as soon as possible an individual to a high level position in campus administration, whose major responsibility will be in this field, working with the faculty in developing ideas for faculty recruitment and curriculum, and working with the faculty, the students, and the administration in an attempt to put the ideas into practice.

In addition to these functions, this officer will be responsible for coordinating a whole range of other programs. One is the EOP. Another is the Upward Bound project. Still another is UCR's cooperative program with California State College at San Bernardino and neighboring community colleges to enable teachers who have never had an opportunity to complete their education to do so. This officer will also relate closely with such other units as Tutorial Project, the Community Service Office, the School of Education, the Dean of Students, the Admissions Office, and the Riverside Urban Coalition.

The entire University of California has made a major commitment to the urban crisis. Funds which UCR has just received from the President of the University make it possible to apply new ideas to the recruitment of minority students, to give support to the efforts of United Mexican-American Students to provide special services for the Mexican-American community, to assist Tutorial Project in its work with Riverside schools, and to further develop student internship opportunities with task forces of the Urban Coalition. Underway, as well, are programs to bring black and brown, along with white, culture to the campus.

On Friday, primarily through the efforts of the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education and the Black Students Union, you will have the opportunity at noon of hearing Mr. Lou Smith, Director of Operation Bootstrap in Los Angeles. This talk will be followed by a series of encounter groups through which there will be an opportunity for all students to become more aware of, and more sensitive to, those who are different from them. After Mr. Smith's presentation and the Friday afternoon group meetings, the administration, through the Counseling Center, will continue the encounter group program throughout the remainder of the year.

Perhaps there are some who feel that this is a great to-do about nothing. I hope that it is a great to-do. But I assure you that it is not about nothing. It is about the most critical issue in our Nation. It is about the most critical issue at UCR.

I invite you to join with me in the recognition of this fact. I invite you to act with me on the basis of this fact.

IT IS TIME FOR A REAPPRAISAL OF OUR RHODESIA POLICY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as the United States continues to participate in the economic sanctions against Rhodesia and as some press for implementing these and new sanctions with renewed vigor, I suggest that the question be fully reviewed with emphasis on two areas.

First, in discussing the question of Rhodesia and her independence, let us look objectively at the problem and our participation. Second, let us examine this problem in the proper context, the context of Africa.

Too many times and for too long a time we have allowed emotion and our particular political prejudices to govern our actions, and in doing so we have at some moment failed to even apply these standards with consistency.

We are quite naturally prejudiced toward our system of one man, one vote, and believe it best for true self-determination. But there is the practical question of whether it will work, immediately, in all nations, and especially at this time in Rhodesia. If we are to take this position we should at the least apply it to all nations, that is, to all Communist nations, to all dictatorships, and so on. Only emotionalism allows us to cover over our contradiction and double dealing.

Relating to this is the problem of forcing—and we are engaged in just that—a nation with different culture, political heritage, economy, levels of industrial, educational, and agricultural development to assume a potentially dangerous and in many ways alien and unworkable political system. The results of our forcing should it succeed will be the disintegration of a modern state. And with this disintegration the loss of opportunity for the African population which we profess so much concern. It will be a tragic example of political myopia should it happen.

Prof. Svetozar Pejovich recently presented his views on the Rhodesia question during a lecture seminar at De Paul University. I would like to include them in the RECORD. He treats these problems and our policy positions in a controlled, unemotional, revealing manner. I hope they can be examined in the same way. They follow:

RHODESIA TOMORROW: AN EXPERIMENT IN RACIAL COEXISTENCE

(By Svetozar Pejovich, associate professor, Texas A. & M. University)

The proclamation of Rhodesian independence in 1965 has led to a general revolt

against this small country. The revolt is spearheaded by the African bloc in the United Nations, and actively supported by the governments of Great Britain, United States and Soviet Union. The justification for economic and political sanctions imposed by the UN, whose explicit goal is to defeat the Rhodesian quest for its independence, was editorially explained by the London *Economist* as follows: ". . . the suburbful of whites who are now attempting to grab for themselves a sunny slice with four million black servants must be convinced, not necessarily gently, that history will not allow it. For Britain, and above all for its Prime Minister, this is one of those moments when destiny throws down the challenge." [1]

The purpose of this paper is to make a contribution towards an objective evaluation of the current crisis over Rhodesia. The paper is divided into three parts: it begins with consideration of the facts of political and social life in Rhodesia, proceeds to the subsequent analysis of two major criticisms against Rhodesia raised by the opponents of that country, and ends with the author's opinionated interpretation of the implicit reasons for the current hostility towards Rhodesia.

I

One could hardly think of a better source of information as to what the government of Rhodesia wants the country to be like than the proposed Constitution. A careful analysis of the 1968 Report of the Constitutional Commission [2] should help the reader to form his own judgment.

The Constitutional Commission was formed shortly after the proclamation of independence in 1965. Its Report was published in the summer of 1968, after rather long and extensive hearings which included representatives of all races and professions. Barring some "external" interferences the proposed Constitution will, in all likelihood, be adopted in the near future.

Some important, and for the purpose of this paper relevant, recommendations of the Constitutional Commission are: *System of Government*. The Report acted for a unitary system of government. It rejected, and the significance of this rejection must not escape us, the policy of separate development of races (apartheid). The Commission found that all races in Rhodesia are already integrated in the economic sphere, and that no majority of any ethnic group supports complete partition.

The Commission also rejected a federal form of government on the ground that in the Rhodesian situation it would be no more than an unhappy compromise between a unitary form of government and complete partition. The Report took some pleasure in quoting Sir Ivar Jennings, who is reported to have said: "Federation is not a magic formula. It is nothing more than a name of a complicated system of government which nobody would wish to see established anywhere if he could think of a better." [3]

Parliamentary Structures. The Commission recommended complete racial parity in the Legislative Assembly as the most practical solution for a multi-racial country like Rhodesia. The recommendation was made in expectations of the following benefits: (1) complete racial parity will tend to remove suspicion among Rhodesians of anyone of the main races or ethnic groups that they may be permanently dominated by one or more of the other main races or ethnic groups; and (2) complete racial parity will keep the representatives of different races together in the Parliament. They will sit there as equals with a likely result that both the elected representatives as well as the people in general will develop confidence in each other.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The Commission rejected the majority rule out of fear that it would lead to the supremacy of one race over all others. Also, the idea of two chambers (one European and one African) was rejected on the ground that it could lead to a strong rivalry between them resulting in frequent deadlocks on legislative matters.

Composition of the Parliament. The Report proposed a Legislative Assembly of eighty seats allocated as follows: forty seats for representatives of European voters, twenty seats for representatives of African voters and twenty seats for representatives elected under a qualified common roll.

It is precisely on this point that the Commission tackled the major issue of the current crisis over Rhodesia. The Report makes it abundantly clear that the white minority will have a majority in the Parliament for an unspecified period of time. Yet, it leaves no doubt that the objective of complete racial parity will be attained as soon as the majority of voters on the common roll are Africans. The important question is how long it will take the Africans to gain a majority on the common roll. Obviously, it depends on the required franchise qualifications and the rate at which black Rhodesians can attain them.

The franchise qualifications are the same for *all* Rhodesians over twenty years of age. They are:

(1) citizenship; *and*

(2) the annual income of not less than £900; *or*

(3) property valued at no less than £3,000; *or*

(4) the annual income of no less than £600 plus four years of secondary education; *or*

(5) appointment to the office of tribal chief or headman; *or*

(6) serving as a member of a religious order which practices a vow of poverty.

How soon the black Rhodesians may hope to attain these qualifications must await a detailed economic analysis. The current situation is as follows: the average wage of about 350,000 Africans (compared to the total white population of about 225,000) is above £200 per year,[4] and the number of African students enrolled in secondary schools is about 14,000.[5]

Senate. The Commission proposed to add a conservative bias to the Rhodesian system of government by recommending the establishment of a second chamber, the Senate. According to the proposed Constitution, the Senate will possess effective power to review and delay the passage of legislative measures. It will consist of six chiefs elected by the provincial assemblies of tribal chiefs, six African members chosen by tribal and urban electoral colleges, twelve Europeans chosen by an electoral college, and seven members appointed by Head of the state.

Head of the State. He will be elected by both houses of the legislature. Head of the State will perform duties of a conventional nature, that is similar to those discharged by the sovereign of Great Britain.

II

Let us now turn to the arguments raised by the opponents of the present government of Rhodesia. They, that is a substantial majority of the United Nations, claim that (1) Rhodesia is a threat to the peace, and (2) its refusal to recognize the one man—one vote principle is a flagrant denial of human freedom.

The Security Council of the United Nations accused Rhodesia of being a threat to the peace by citing statements made by the authorities in Rhodesia such as a threat of economic sabotage against its northern neighbors. Yet, it is generally recognized that Rhodesia's northern neighbors are the ones that threaten to launch attack on a substantial scale. It is from Zambia and not from Rhodesia that radio broadcasts say: "They (i.e. the Rhodesian white) are lice; destroy them; you know how." [6] The terrorist activity in Rhodesia is carried out by saboteurs trained in Zambia and Tanzania. For example, on the night of May 16–17, 1966, Mr. and Mrs. H. Viljoen and their two small children were sleeping in their farm house in the Hartley district. A noise outside the house prompted both parents to get up and investigate. They were gunned down by a group of terrorists armed with made in China weapons.

It would violate one's sense of elementary logic to accept or take seriously the claim that a small country like Rhodesia is a threat to the peace. No terrorist has ever been sent from Rhodesia to another country, no radio broadcast from Rhodesia has ever called on other people to revolt against their governments, and no Rhodesian official has ever threatened other countries with armed intervention. Yet, other countries, who have been doing all those things to Rhodesia have taken it upon themselves to condemn Rhodesia for being a threat to the peace.

The difficulty which arises in substantiating the claim that Rhodesia threatens the peace is readily seen from the following quote: "On the occasion in point, I heard a State Department official answer relevant questions; a doubter put a query: How, in actuality, was the purported miscreant, Rhodesia, threatening the peace? The answer came: Obviously, the United States could not condone the situation there. The inquirer persisted: What country was Rhodesia presumably about to attack? The answer: Not precisely any country; the situation was subtler than that, some of Rhodesia's neighbors were acutely unhappy about it . . . a sort of thing that could not be accepted. A third question: Wherein precisely was Rhodesia in rebellion? The answer: The British government had left no room for doubt about the matter, and so it would be pointless to go into technicalities." [7]

The second major criticism of Rhodesia concerns its refusal to grant voting rights to all its citizens over twenty years of age. A good many people, by habit and sentiment, subscribe to precepts of majority rule. The United Nations request, as a condition for the recognition of Rhodesia, one man—one vote political system.

In other words, the United Nations reject the system under which the right to the franchise in Rhodesia is independent of race and color, and based on educational and property qualifications. Moreover, the frankness of Rhodesian officials in expressing their fear of the unconditional enfranchisement of Africans has been used to create an impression that the Rhodesian government is keeping Africans in political subjugation. For example the following statement has been attributed to Ian Smith: "There will be no black rule in my time." This alleged assertion made headlines everywhere and it is constantly repeated; but the repeated denials seldom get printed. What Smith had actually said, in a CBS telecast was: "If we had a black nationalist government—a black extremist government in my lifetime, then I believe we would have failed in our policy . . . which has always been no discrimination between black or white." [8]

A somewhat puzzling picture emerges when the behavior of those who preach the one man—one vote system for Rhodesia is examined. The London Economist said: "Britain should make very clear its eventual aim for Rhodesia. This is to reach majority rule there. But it should be made quite plain that when Britain regains control over its colony's destiny it will not hand power over immediately: rather it will go for a slow version of the stage-by-stage advance." [9]

On May 26, 1966, President Johnson said: "The United States could not condone the perpetuation of racial or political injustice anywhere in the world." Yet, at the onset of American independence the franchise was limited to a small portion of American adult

males, qualified on a basis of property and income. "The Declaration of Independence did not enfranchise females, or any non-whites whatsoever, elevate any Indians, or emancipate a single slave. The realization of American rightly vaunted equality and wide participation in public affairs took much time and effort and even yet does not proceed without disorder." [10]

Finally, the African countries themselves are not known for strict respect of free elections based on the one man—one vote principle.

In summary, the governments of Great Britain, United States and many African countries, whose explicit purpose is to defeat Rhodesia's quest for independence for that country's alleged threat to the peace and its refusal to confer unconditionally the right to vote upon four million tribal Africans, have no moral basis for their criticism. It is not to imply that one should not, given his philosophical orientation, criticize Rhodesia. The point is that those who are most outspoken critics of that country should, for the sake of objectivity, be subjected to the exact same kind of criticism.

III

To discover true reasons for Great Britain, United States and many African countries' hostility towards Rhodesia one must obviously go beyond the facade of words and speculate about various alternative possibilities.

It can be argued that the proposed Constitution and the goal of eventual racial parity is merely a screen of smoke behind which the white minority in Rhodesia is trying to conceal its intention of permanent domination. If this were the case the ruling elite in Rhodesia would pay, sooner or later, for its shortsightedness. Thus, to accept this argument one would have to assume that white Rhodesians are an utterly unrealistic bunch of people.

The recent emphasis on African education in Rhodesia indicates that they may not be that foolish after all. "A team of three Americans headed by Rep. John Ashbrook has recently reported that there have been spectacular advances in education and that the demand for places in secondary schools has yet to equal the supply. Far from being excluded from opportunities, Africans are not yet voluntarily taking advantage of the facilities available." [11] Over two decades (1947–66) the number of African primary and secondary schools operated by the Rhodesian government increased from six to seventy-seven and from one to seventeen respectively.[12] Also, the objective is for 50 per cent of Africans to go to school after age 15, while in Britain only 34 per cent continues to go to school after that age. Finally, expenditure on education stood at 18.5 per cent in the 1966 budget in Rhodesia, and only at 14.3 per cent in Zambia.

Secondly, the concept of racial parity can be criticized on the ground that it prevents the majority race from governing the country. The validity of this criticism depends on a very important assumption that the one man-one vote principle is universally applicable.

This principle was developed by a Western man for a Western community. Its major implication is, upon which the whole concept of classical democracy rests, that the minority can change status quo and become the majority in due time. The only thing the minority has to do is to convince a sufficient number of people to side with it at next election.

The problem is more complicated in a multi-racial African country like Rhodesia. Its two major races belong to two diametrically different cultures. Thus, the majority rule there would render the white minority a *permanent* minority. The minority would stand no chance of changing status quo at next election *via* selling its ideas to the majority. The latter would feel those concepts to be either alien to its structure of value and aspirations or it would simply fail to understand them. Moreover, the problem would be aggravated by racial prejudices. In any case, the majority rule would do to the rise of democracy in Rhodesia just opposite from what it was created to do and has done in the West.

The proposed Constitution in Rhodesia, if analyzed in the light of preceding paragraph, represents an attempt to preserve democracy there by adopting the Western concept of majority rule to the specific conditions prevailing in a multi-racial community where alien cultures meet. Complete racial parity will, it is hoped, free both races from fear of being dominated one by another.

The question that remains to be answered is: why doesn't the Rhodesian government introduce complete racial parity here and now rather than at some future time? The answer can be found, assuming that white Rhodesians are sincere in saying that they want racial parity, in the franchise qualifications. The African representatives in the Parliament will be responsible to those citizens who either have interest in preserving the state (on account of property qualifications) or have become "Westernized" (on account of educational qualifications). In this manner the white Rhodesians hope not only to achieve complete racial parity but to preserve their island of Western civilization in a relatively hostile environment as well. If not, the Africans qualified to vote will know what they are rejecting if they chose to reject it. And many people believe that to reject an alternative with full understanding of what is being rejected is preferred to a rejection based on emotion, hatred and ignorance. In other words, the only hope of survival for white Rhodesians is to have the equal number of representatives of various races working together in the Parliament being responsible to responsible citizens, and eventually gaining enough confidence in each other so that the differences between them could be attributed to differences in policy rather than racial differences.

Finally, the most likely reason for economic and political sanctions against Rhodesia is that "American and British politicians tend to think in terms of the aspirations of African *politicians*. They are not directly concerned with the welfare of the African masses who, unlike their leaders, are not possible future voters at the United Nations; and sometimes the Western politicians seem to think that it is expedient to retain the friendship of moderate leaders in African territories; while even the moderate leaders find it desirable to appease the racial emotions and resentments of the black people. If they did not, they could not survive, it is felt, against more extreme rivals, who feel that they cannot afford the entrenchment of a non-racial political equality, a reasonably achievable franchise available on equal terms for every literate and responsible Rhodesian whatever his color." [13] It is a tribute to the *instinct of survival* of African leaders that they have realized that to defeat Rhodesia is crucial to their accumulation of political power. It is a tribute to their *political skill* that they have been able to conceal that behind the facade of propaganda about the enslavement of black Rhodesians. It would not be a tribute to the intelligence of the reader to let that distinction pass unnoticed.

The major results of discussion presented in this paper are: (1) Rhodesia does not intend to pursue the policy of separate development of races (apartheid); and (2) the proposed concept of complete racial parity, that is one race—one vote principle is an attempt, which some people will approve of while some others will not, yet a *bona fide* attempt to solve the problem of peaceful co-existence of various races possessing completely different cultures.

The future of Rhodesia? It will depend on the extent of true determination of its rulers to carry out the experiment of complete racial parity, as well as on the willingness of other governments to let them do it.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "Tackling Rhodesia," *The Economist*, November 13, 1965, p. 689.

[2] *Report of the Constitutional Commission*, Salisbury, Rhodesia: Government Printer, 1968.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[4] *Economic Survey of Rhodesia, 1966*, Salisbury, Rhodesia: Government Printer, 1966, pp. 26 and 28.

[5] F. Rich, "The Economics of African Education," *The Rhodesian Journal of Economics*, August, 1967, pp. 13–24.

[6] A. Williams, "Rhodesia—Land of the Fearful," *Houston Post*, April 6, 1966.

[7] C. Marshall, *Crisis Over Rhodesia*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1967, p. 4.

[8] W. Hutt, "The Rhodesian Columny," *New Individualist Review*, Winter 1968, p. 8.

[9] *The Economist, op. cit.*, p. 689.

[10] C. *Marshall, op. cit.*, p. 64.

[11] Hutt, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[12] F. Rich, *op. cit.*

[13] W. Hutt, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WELSH

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, after some 27 years of dedicated public service, Dr. Ed Welsh has resigned. During this period he served directly under two Presidents—Kennedy and Johnson—and has the distinction of being the only formally appointed Executive Secretary in the history of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, a post which he has held with great distinction for the past 8 years.

Thanks to his years of experience on Capitol Hill, he was able to serve the needs of both the executive branch and the legislature in a mutually cooperative and productive manner. During his tenure as Executive Secretary he made numerous appearances before committees of the Congress, and he and his staff have been instrumental in supplying the committees with insights and information which served to promote the most efficient management of the Nation's investment in the space resource. Thanks to his endeavors, the business of the Council and the operations of its staff were organized with great effectiveness. He personally was responsible for the first public articulation of the basic policy of U.S. space activities—that they included space projects to keep the peace and space projects to increase the well-being of all mankind.

He played a key role in Council activities that led to recommendations to the President with respect to the Apollo, MOL, SST, and communications satellite program. He was a principal drafter of the President's basic communications policy statements and of the substantive

legislation which established the Communications Satellite Corp.

Thanks to his organizing ability, the Council staff represents a broad spectrum of high professional skills in space and aeronautics activities. It is notable that the Council's staff budget has always been kept small to support only essential functions, and that the present budget is 4 percent less than that initiated in fiscal year 1962.

As a spokesman for the space program, Dr. Ed Welsh has been instrumental in keeping the public informed as to the economic, social, and technological benefits which are constantly being obtained from the national air-space investment. He has also helped to educate the public with respect to the extent and scope of the space and aeronautics accomplishments and potentials of other nations, particularly the U.S.S.R.

So as Ed Welsh departs for new endeavors in an illustrious career, we wish him every success. He will be missed.

MOORHEAD LAUDS PITTSBURGH ACTIVIST

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dorothy Mae Richardson has given more than a few people in Pittsburgh evidence why she merits the description "community activist."

A dynamic perservering woman, Mrs. Richardson has led the fight for better housing in Pittsburgh from the neighborhood level. She rallied her neighbors to fight the environmental conditions that breeds slums and she has seen her efforts blossom.

Defiantly admitting that she lives in a slum, Mrs. Richardson and her organization CASH have worked closely with—and sometimes in defiance of—Pittsburgh housing agencies.

On numerous occasions she provided me with assistance in my urban housing endeavors.

Most recently, she helped coordinate a housing symposium that I initiated in Mrs. Richardson's community, the northside of Pittsburgh.

The February 15 issue of the Pittsburgh Press chronicled the story of Dorothy Richardson and her crusade to better the neighborhood she calls home—and other areas of the city.

Today, I would like to introduce this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of an outstanding contribution to Pittsburgh's drive to eradicate its housing problems:

Mrs. Dorothy Mae Richardson is a large woman, with tolerant eyes, a gentle voice, and an overwhelming impatience with the status quo.

But unlike most of us, who are content in our placid routines, she has allowed her discontent to boil over, but in a carefully controlled way. As a result, today Mrs. Richardson has a voice of some power in the community.

"Mayor Barr calls me Dorothy," she confides with a grin, and she's on a similar first name basis with professors, builders, realtors, politicians, churchmen and other leaders.

"Just because a person gets a big job doesn't mean he turns into a sage overnight. They're just people, trying to do a job. Now I'd like to help them do a better job," she says in her slow voice. "They can't know what's going on in the slums unless someone shows them. That's all we're trying to do."

Mrs. Richardson helped found and now heads CASH, Citizens Against Slum Housing. Because of her drive and determination, "120 really hard workers," as she calls them, are chipping away at Pittsburgh slum problems.

"It's frustrating and very slow but I always say that we just have to 'keep on keeping on.' The minute we stop the pressure, it's bad. We just can't afford to get tired."

Mrs. Richardson would make a good general, because she's expert at assigning specific duties. She laughs as she recalls one example:

"Our housing demonstration in City Council—well, we had so much talking round and round the subject, you know, and nothing being said. Well—I put one lady in charge of talking about rats, another one in charge of roaches, another one the high rents and no repairs, the holes in the floor. It was really something. We never let up. They'd try to ramble on and get us off the subject, but we wouldn't let them. Know what—it worked!"

Mrs. Richardson feels she's an authority on slums because she lives in one. North Side's Charles St. winds along the hill from Perrysville Ave. to Brighton Rd., and in the last few years, the lower end of the street has gone from middle class to downright depressed housing. On a cold winter day, driving down the street can be a lesson in desolation. Some houses are boarded up, others sag in forlorn rows, and there are the hallmarks of poverty—rubbish, garbage and trash.

Mrs. Richardson's small brick row house is painted gray, and inside, the living room walls are yellow, the rug is green, the furniture modern, and symphony music plays softly on the hi-fi.

In fact, once you're cozy inside, the tendency is to forget what's outside, but Mrs. Richardson never does.

Her phone is constantly ringing, and she handles problems of procedure, tactics, and very often, personality with some dispatch. She says:

"It's hard to get people to stick to a project. Nobody minds showing up for the speeches or marches, but there's so much groundwork to be done, and it's not glamorous."

She's really dedicated to the "elbow grease philosophy," to the premise that Negroes must learn to help themselves—in running their own organizations, as well as simple housecleaning jobs. She says:

"When we moved here 21 years ago, it was mostly white. It was a nice neighborhood. Then they tore down houses to make room for the Arena, and some Negroes starting moving in. Maybe one family in a block, then all the whites moved out.

KNOWS VIOLENCE FIRSTHAND

"Then the changes came. The streets weren't kept clean, the sewers would stink—but then I was prejudiced myself. I thought I was too good for that rough element moving in. 'My stars,' I used to say to myself, 'soap and water's free—they could at least scrub their floors—but they're just too lazy.'

"But then I thought it out. These young people were brought up during the second World War. Their parents were out working in the steel plants or wherever, and they just didn't get the right bringing up. They just never learned how to clean. That's when we got together some block parties."

This means Mrs. Richardson recruited some women from her church and neighborhood, went around pounding on doors and teaching homemaking skills.

"We scraped grime and grease off baseboards, hauled rubbish away. We got the City to haul 22 truckloads of junk away from one court. We even got the landlord to agree to give us enough poison and spray to fumigate the houses."

The only trouble was, the crew went through the first house from cellar to attic, and used up five gallons of roach spray.

"When we wanted more, the landlord reneged," recalls Mrs. Richardson with a disgusted look. "Now those places are as bad as they ever were, in fact, they're boarded up. Roaches travel, you know, you can see them even on the sidewalk."

(At last report, to Mrs. Richardson's delight, the boarded-up houses are scheduled to be rehabilitated by the North Side Civic Constructors.)

But she doesn't make saints out of tenants and bad guys out of all landlords.

"One woman's house was so awful and we made so much fuss that the City moved her into the projects. Now you should see how she's wrecked that apartment there, and the neighbors are up in arms. We made a real mistake there. She's just not a responsible person."

One of Mrs. Richardson's plus qualities is her humanity and practical frame of mind. She doesn't insist that she's always right. One realtor respects her because she "is militant but in a reasonable way—she knows both sides."

Mrs. Richardson, a widow for two years, trained for her present position all her life without knowing it. She always did church charity work (she's a member of the Tabernacle Baptist Church), is a Democratic committeewoman and Boy Scout den mother.

"We were scared, so we planned our son's activities through Scouting, and planned their friends that way too. (Her two sons are 26-year-old Brother Timothy of the Capuchin Order, and Air Force Sgt. John, 22.) We used to have awful gang fights—they'd use that ball field back of here—one gang from Manchester ripped the boards out of my fence as they marched up the street. That's when I knew it was bad. This kind of violence is awful.

"We always had mischief—boys would steal potato chips or cokes, but this new breed is something else—the ones with the greasy rags tied around their heads and the knives.

"Those kids that steal food—you should see where they live—not a chair to sit on, no table, no heat or light—maybe a pot of greasy cold beans—nothing else. That kid wants something different to eat. I don't approve of it, but I can understand it at least."

So Mrs. Richardson has had much experience with the Youth Squad, Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Action Housing, ministers, priests, social workers, neighborhood groups like Perry Hilltop and Pleasant Valley Council. And, of course, all this training has made her an efficient leader of CASH. She could dramatize slum conditions for City leaders from firsthand knowledge.

And CASH's accomplishments have been steady and gratifying. Pittsburgh now has a Housing Court, a new housing code enforcement division combining City and County inspectors, a City Relocation Agency to help displaced persons find adequate housing; and adoption and enforcement of the State Rent Withholding Law.

And Mrs. Richardson's next project is the Housing Clinic.

"I want to work with sociologists and psychologists at Pitt to find out the best way to set this up—how we can inspire pride and cleanliness in people. You know, there's got to be some way. We have to find a way to teach homemaking."

The clinic, still in the planning stage, is tentatively scheduled for some time this spring.

Her vice chairman in CASH, Carl Brown, has no doubt that the clinic will become a reality.

"Dorothy's like the toughest bulldog you ever saw. Once she's on to something, she never relaxes. And she probably knows Pittsburgh's housing problems better than anyone else in the City. We never worry when she talks—because she's got the facts.

BULLDOG DETERMINATION

"She knows she's fighting a giant—lots of things have been sacred cows for years—like the Housing Authority—but Dorothy doesn't let that scare her.

"And the people she knows are fantastic—who else would have the nerve to march out to Pitt to ask the best people to help us. That's what she does, and it works. She doesn't use fancy words, but she's great with those words 'why' and 'when can we start?'

"She never takes any money for herself, and you can imagine the jobs she's been offered. She's a born organizer, but she thinks if she took money, it would tarnish her and hurt our cause. So she still does occasional day work for one woman. She's really a spiritually strong person.

"Schools used to teach home ec—but now you make a few cookies and that's it. Dorothy knows our girls have to learn housekeeping somewhere—so we'll have a clinic, don't worry."

Mr. Brown considers Mrs. Richardson's ability to get Dr. Clifford C. Ham, urban affairs expert at Pitt, to help CASH with its presentation before City Council, one of her real triumphs.

"Can you imagine what it would have cost if we'd had to pay for this kind of a study? We'd never have been able to do it," he says.

Although Mrs. Richardson is noted for her calm and easy manner, she has been known to show tears and temper as tactics to get things done. She despises violence, suspects many riots are Communist-inspired, and she thinks the Afro haircuts and costumes and separate black nation "a lot of nonsense."

"I don't need that stuff to know who I am. I'm a Negro, but an American Negro. The only way we're going to get anywhere is to live with white people on an equal basis—to work together to live better. It's going to take a long time, but I think we'll make it."

That's the credo of Dorothy Mae Richardson, whose dream is to take the word slum out of the American vocabulary.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy speech contest. This year over 400,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for five scholarships which are awarded as top prizes.

I am very pleased that the winning speech for the State of Michigan was delivered by a constituent of my Third Congressional District, Miss Bozena K. Bienias of Battle Creek. In order that my colleagues may share its contents and appreciate its message, I insert it at this time in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Bozena K. Bienias)

It is commonly known in every country of this world, that America holds and has to offer the most desperately fought over, and most revered of all man's treasures, freedom. We do not sell America calling it a utopia though. It is enough that we Americans have within our grasp the power to choose. Here lies the difficulty. Here waits the challenge.

We know that the world is not as it should be, that while knowledge has increased, happiness from liberty hasn't always. In the presence of hunger, unemployment, faults in government, and countless other handicaps, it's no wonder that democracy has had a hard time all over the world and in our country too.

America can offer its people a valuable weapon in her constant struggle to keep freedom. A well-planned, coordinated educational system is America's only light to search out and remedy tomorrow's problems. Through education and subsequent knowledge, the individual can learn and come to understand the enormity and awesome complexity of a democracy. Education will develop and nurture what will come to be his own logic and reasoning. From this point, the wisdom required to deal with the problem will come from himself.

Freedom offers its challenge to all of us. Undeniably it is a relatively difficult challenge to accept for those Americans who have felt the agony of its absence in our country. But freedom asks us to exchange our bitterness for the thought of the common good. It is a difficult challenge, and it takes the strength of an American who refuses to let his emotions control his reasoning, justified as they may be. Freedom orders us to demand it of others, but dares us to take it away from them.

I feel happy that every day I can do something for freedom. I can study it, trying to find flaws and ways of eliminating them. I can discuss these questions with my friends, knowing that it will increase stimulation and even implant interest. I can participate in class and thereby double general enthusiasm. In simply living each day, I'm learning about myself and all men. This in itself is a service in the name of freedom, for it isn't a mass of historical puppets that are involved, but humans like myself.

In conclusion, I have hope that my country will forever stand the representative of democracy, as long as she continues on the road that she follows today. As long as we keep on looking to freedom, keep on straining for it, as long as we come near to it, freedom will spread and deepen its influence, convincing the world that it is possible.

JACOB D. BEAM: SAME OLD CROWD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, if there is a national buildup of concern and loss of faith in the leadership of our country do not blame it on the people, their anguished cries are but an effect.

The cause of any citizen's frustration lies in the many provocations from our leaders.

With 200 million Americans to choose from the folks at home just cannot take the same old "soft" crowd. There is bound to be a few pro-Americans who can restore confidence with our people.

Edward Hunter has expressed the sentiment well in Tactics for February 20, 1969, which I ask be reproduced in the RECORD followed by a portion of the Publishers Hall Syndicate column by Evans and Hall.

The material follows:

[From Tactics, Feb. 20, 1969]

SAME OLD CROWD AT STATE DEPARTMENT

The Washington bureau chief of one of the major London newspapers told an American associate that the projected appointment of Jacob D. Beam to be American ambassador to the U.S.S.R. was being interpreted in Europe as the signal to it that the new Administration "is afraid of the Soviet Union." He declared it widely known that Beam's record, clearly documented, portrays a man who is highly vulnerable to intimidation and seduction by pro-Soviet apologists and agents. He stressed that this assessment is accepted in the foreign ministries of Europe, especially in Germany and behind the iron curtain.

Beam's selection, if it goes through, will be regarded as the pivotal choice of the new, Nixon Administration. The attitudes and policies toward it by the European governments will be based on this premise. Even if the appointment were withdrawn at the last minute because this reaction became known at the White House, the damage would not be fully eliminated. The fact that even consideration could be given to such an appointment is damaging.

Beam is well known at the United Nations, where he frequently shuttled during his State Department service domestically. Members of such delegates as Burma, Thailand, the Philippines, and other Southeast Asian states concerned with a longrange solution to the Viet Nam fighting called the prospective appointment "a disaster." A German foreign correspondent accredited to the United Nations obtained this reaction by canvassing the delegates.

The reaction among top American diplomatic and military observers in Washington reinforces this appraisal. They include those who have sat with Beam on the policy planning staff of the State Department or dealt with him as representatives of the Pentagon and the C.I.A. Beam is regarded by them as belonging to the "older generation" of pro-Soviet, socialist-oriented officers closely allied with the younger members of such agencies as the State Department, the National Security Council, and the intelligence agencies.

Included in this element are a number of assistants now in the White House as aides to Henry A. Kissinger, the Nixon Administration's major foreign policy adviser. Knowledgeable observers in Washington note, too, that Beam in Moscow would deal mainly with Helmut Sonnenfeldt in Washington, one of Kissinger's aides, the most important on Soviet affairs, until January, the State Department's top intelligence research official dealing with the Soviet Union.

Sarah McClendon, courageous veteran Washington correspondent, recalled in a recent column that Sonnenfeldt "was the one who predicted the Soviets would never put missiles in Cuba." He scoffed at naval reports that Soviet vessels were transporting these missiles to Cuba, and was instrumental in delaying our reaction until the last, dangerous moment. The common characteristic of today's so-called "liberals" is that they refuse to believe anything opposed to their appeasement line until it hits them—or rather the United States—over the head. Yet these types manage to occupy our most vital research and even policy posts.

The take-over of our foreign service by such types that hitherto denounced Nixon the most has astonished even the ultra-liberal, socialist organs that consistently have been hitting Nixon with a barrage of virtual vituperation. An example is the New

Republic. Its Feb. 15 issue goes into detail regarding the unanticipated staffing of the White House and the State Department by these characters.

An article regarding this phenomenon by John Osborne, New Republic associate editor, entitled "Nixon's Command Staff," declares this of Nixon's prize appointee:

"Kissinger turned to State, Defense, and the academies for a talented staff—'a real powerhouse,' said a departing Johnsonite—that by last week totalled 25 substantive officers and is to peak at around 30, twice the number that served Kennedy and Johnson. It is hardly the aggregation of 'new faces' that Mr. Nixon seemed to have in mind before he took office, but there are dissenters in every establishment and Mr. Kissinger may have some of them among his recruits.

"They include such career Foreign Service men as Viron Vaky (Latin America), Helmut Sonnenfeldt (Soviet affairs), Donald Lesh and Robert Houdek (who worked in Dean Rusk's personal secretariat). Morton Halperin, chief of the McNamara-Clifford policy and arms control planning staff at the Pentagon and a writer of distinction on foreign affairs, is one of three recruits who ranked as deputy assistant secretaries at State and Defense. Another of them is Richard Cooper, a Yale economist and specialist in international monetary affairs. Col. Alexander M. Haig, lately a deputy superintendent at the West Point Military Academy, has been brought in to record the discussions and decisions at NSC (National Security Council) meetings and to assist in NSC staff management. One of Mr. Nixon's campaign advisers, Richard V. Allen, was appointed deputy to Mr. Kissinger before the serious work of staff organization began after the Inauguration. A Kremlinologist with stern views on how to counter Soviet and Chinese Communist power, he has taken some lumps from columnists, and for the present, has been put under wraps in an office well removed from Kissinger's."

Various Senate and House staffs were at first unbelieving and then shocked that Beam could be considered for our decisive Moscow post. "The kindest description that can be made of him is that he's a compromised boob!" a Senate analyst exclaimed. He recalled that Beam was ambassador to Warsaw when the embassy was virtually peopled by Polish mistresses assigned to its staff by the Soviet and Polish intelligence agencies. They idled around the offices, toying even with the files—seeming just to be "toying" with them. Even if the head of such a mission were no communist—and there is general agreement on this as regards Beam—to allow such dangerously scandalous conduct by members of a diplomatic staff would disqualify anyone from any position of trust.

These indiscretions characterized our Warsaw embassy under Beam from top to bottom. Some of the disastrous consequences have become known. We lost the services, for instance, of our top informer-in-place in the Polish capital, the strategically located "Michael Goleniewski," the cover name under which he became widely known in the United States; he now is known as Aleksei Nicholaevich Romanoff. He had to flee to the United States.

When the scandal under Beam became too obvious to be concealed any longer, Irvin N. Scarbeck was surfaced, and returned to Washington for trial and a prison sentence. He probably was the least of the security cases on our foreign service staff in Warsaw. Under Beam's supervision, too, the communists were able to do the actual constructing of our new embassy in Warsaw with such slight control that they could go to fantastic extremes in making it a sieve for their intelligence network, room by room!

Beam allowed the reds to bring the bricks for the new embassy from Yugoslavia, where they were made to custom-made specifications of the communists, so that every critical room in the embassy building, including the decoding and encoding rooms and the top secret file rooms, had listening devices implanted in the walls. Imagine! For at least a year, Moscow and Warsaw agents could sit comfortable in their offices, sipping tea and gulping vodka, while hearing every word of every conversation that took place in our embassy, including the coding and the decoding of the top secret cables by the American coding clerks. They even could keep check on how the girls were doing their job.

Beam, as has become customary in the State Department in such affairs, was promoted. Obviously, there were those who considered this as work well done. Maybe this is why he is slated, as this is being written, to be elevated to the ambassadorship in Moscow. He is ambassador to Prague at present, and was there when we were surprised by the Soviet invasion of the country to which he was assigned, Czechoslovakia.

Moscow already has been contacted in accordance with protocol, this editor has been informed, and asked whether Beam would be acceptable as the new, Nixon ambassador. The Soviet Russians must have laughed as they made their formal acceptance. A communist as envoy would be less useful to Soviet Russia's relations with us, in its preparation to Pearl Harbor our mainland from space, than a compromised boob.

This Warsaw spy and sex scandal, as it is referred to worldwide, covers such an extraordinary area, touching upon all of our worldwide diplomatic undertakings, that it seems unbelievable, even as a fictional spy thriller. Indeed, because of its fantastic ramifications, one Congress staff in discouragement even recommended that no speech be given on the floor in the case, because it would be ridiculed at once by the fake "liberal" press as ridiculous on its face. Indeed, the fantastic proportions of the Warsaw sex and spy scandal have evoked skepticism and even disbelief among even normal critics of the State Department who are unacquainted with this area, and who simply declare, "I just can't believe it."

The sinister background to the bizarre nomination for our vital Moscow ambassadorship includes a press operation. The N.Y. Times and the State Department frequently work hand in glove on critical issues involving American security, particularly as regards Soviet-American relations. The case of John Paton Davies, who was technically cleared as one of the last, sly acts of the Johnson Administration, is a scandalous case in point.

The N.Y. Times came out with a purported "scoop" on Feb. 1, in a 28-inch story by Peter Grose from Washington. It came forth with the flat announcement: "President Nixon has chosen as his envoy to the Soviet Union a cool career diplomat who is well versed in both Communist affairs and disarmament." Thereupon it produced a highly laudatory biography of the amourously hoodwinked gentleman, referring to him as "reticent and discreet." He surely was all of this in regard to the behavior in his embassy at Warsaw.

Not a word was printed, however, regarding this extraordinary experience of his during the period of the sex and spy scandals in this embassy. Indeed, while space is given to practically all his other assignments, this important Warsaw period becomes an unevent. At least, in New York City.

Not so, though, in the N.Y. Times News Service, article, also under Peter Grose's byline, as syndicated across the country, and published, for example, in the Philadelphia Bulletin as a page-one article. This story, also with a picture of Jacob Dyneley Beam—his whole name is given—is 27 inches long. One paragraph of seven lines refers to his service in Poland as follows:

"In 1957, he received his first ambassadorship to Poland, which carried with it conducting negotiations with Communist China. In 1960, he returned to Washington to work with the disarmament agency."

The N.Y. Times knows better than that. This isn't even news management; it is news fabrication, the rewriting of history. Soviet Russian historians are obliged to engage in this practice, conforming to the dialectical materialist conception that some persons are un-persons, some events are un-events—they never existed. An intriguing television program, "My Favorite Martian," has the man from Mars improvising a time clock that can put you back in history to any period, and anything you do then—or don't do—will determine everything that happens afterwards, bringing about changes accordingly. History, under Marxism, is rewritten accordingly, for operational purposes.

Beam did not return to the United States in 1960. He still was ambassador. He remained so for more than a year, to 1962, during the culminating period of the Warsaw sex and spy scandals in his embassy. While detailing his career at all important points, this is what the rewriters of history would want to leave out, as an un-event, in any build-up of the man to pressure President Nixon into appointing him to a new and even more strategic post. The syndicated article, interestingly, does not have the appointment already determined, as was declared in the N.Y. Times, but says: "President Nixon will announce this week his choice" and that it would be Beam, a subtle difference. In one, we have the past tense used; in the other, the future tense.

Actually, the latter was closer to the facts. An article written this way can have either of two purposes, or both. The operation—and in this case it is an operation—may present a desired event as a fait accompli, or as already decided. In the latter instance, this falls into the category of the balloon d'essai, the well-known, political trial balloon that determines public reaction, enabling a politician to find out what he can get away with.

How was Nixon maneuvered into this? He has made himself particularly vulnerable to such intrigue. The recommendation of Beam, a compromised boob with a public record of security laxity extending to his personal life, and administrative incompetence of disastrous proportions, was made by Kissinger and Sonnenfeldt. Both have worked with Beam when he was connected with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and later. Since Secretary of State Rogers and Elliott Richardson, undersecretary for the department of state, both are newcomers, and since Idar Rimestad, undersecretary for administration, also was at the Arms Control agency simultaneously with Beam, the facts known to practically all other persons in the State Department were glossed over or suppressed in presenting Beam's nomination to Nixon.

The operation to put Beam over is a quickie that recalls such similar attempts, as recently with Abe Fortas, that only narrowly we defeated, thanks to the alertness of Sen. Thurmond and his fortunate membership on the Judiciary Committee before which the nomination had to go. Beam already had been returned from Prague conveniently for consultation so he can be on hand for a quickie testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

At least two senators have brought the pertinent information graphically to the President's attention. Others unrelated to government have done so likewise. The quickie operation was derailed, and as this is being written, the nomination has not yet been announced, half a month after the N.Y. Times sought to make it a fait accompli. "It's a thing floating around," and "it's dropped out of sight," were two baffled reports from up high, with the emphasized clause added, "for now." Readers of Tactics and their contacts can continue to have such impact, if not distracted by our greatest obstacle, the defeatism in conservative ranks.

Ample warning, reinforced by documentation, was provided by Tactics for this en-

tire operation of infiltrating the Nixon Administration with the people Humphrey likely would have appointed. Tactics ran what constituted a series on this crucial problem. Developments show the accuracy in detail of these analyses, which could have remedied the situation if too many persons had not relaxed into the comforting, "Ain't it awful" syndrome, or simply took refuge in rooting for Wallace. Nothing stopped them from simultaneously exerting tactical influence elsewhere. A major reason for red gains is that they fight in all echelons. We can do so, too, and this case is a fine opportunity.

[From the Publishers-Hall Syndicate]

To the predictable outrage of the anti-Communist far right, their lone representative on the White House staff—Dr. Richard V. Allen—is being quietly submerged in favor of solid, professional foreign policy specialists.

Included among the aides being selected for the Kissinger staff, besides the previously announced Daniel Davidson (presently assistant to Ambassador Averell Harriman), are Mortimer Halperin (an arms control expert) from the Pentagon and Helmut Sonnenfeldt (Soviet intelligence), Lawrence Eagleburger (Under Secretary Nicholas Katzenbach's office), Richard Sneider (Japanese desk) and Viron Vaky (Latin American affairs) from the State Department. From outside the Government, Prof. Robert E. Osgood of Johns Hopkins is a top prospect to join the staff.

WOOING BLACKS

Instead of screaming, Southern political agents of Mr. Nixon have fully backed the Republican National Committee's unannounced decision to lift its 1969 budget for political work among minorities to a record amount for a nonelection year.

The plan, originating with minorities division leader Clarence Townes, is to spend $175,000 at the National Committee to proselytize Negroes and Mexican-Americans for the Republican Party.

Strongly backed by National Chairman Ray C. Bliss, there was nevertheless some opposition among party pros to this high spending among voters who spurned the Nixon-Agnew ticket.

Harry Dent, the Republican South's chief resident political agent in the Nixon White House, heard about the complaints and immediately came down hard for Bliss and Townes. More surprisingly, so did Mississippi State Chairman Clarke Reed.

In 1968, the National Committee allotted $150,000 for election-year work with minorities but spent a good deal more. The budget in 1967 was $90,000—but $124,000 was spent. With Mr. Nixon determined to build a majority party, spending well above the 1969 budget is probable.

WHITHER CHOTINER?

A major question at the Republican National Committee: Will Murray Chotiner go away?

Chotiner—Richard Nixon's first political manager and most controversial adviser—has had a desk at the committee since election day although he is limited to Inaugural activities. Committee staffers are uneasy as to whether he will leave on Tuesday as scheduled or remain as Mr. Nixon's agent.

SOLICITOR STAYS

Another sign of the Nixon policy of maintaining continuity is the decision by Attorney General John Mitchell, likely to be announced Tuesday, to retain Erwin N. Griswold in the key post of Solicitor General at least through the current Supreme Court term ending in mid-June. Griswold, longtime dean of the Harvard Law School and a nominal Republican, had a protracted and congenial conversation with Mitchell two weeks ago.

LAW AND ORDER

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, the national commander of the American Legion, William C. Doyle, recently gave an address before the New York State legislative banquet in which he made some timely remarks concerning the crisis in law and order which confronts this Nation. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

AN ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. DOYLE, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE BANQUET, ALBANY, N.Y., FEBRUARY 10, 1969

This traditional dinner in honor of New York State Legislators who are veterans is as venerable as The American Legion itself for this is the 50th Annual event that we participate in here tonight, and next month the Legion observes the 50th anniversary of its founding.

These are golden moments for us, and we trust for you, as we mark a half century of splendid Legion-Legislative relationships here in the Empire State and, for our own organization, a half century of dedicated service to God and Country and to our fellow man.

Unfortunately, we do not observe these golden moments in a bright period of American history where we might reasonably expect to relax for a moment in the reflected glory of past achievement. These are demanding times that exact from each of us full attention to the problems of the moment, with little time for basking in reflected glory.

The American Legion, in observing its 50th Anniversary, is operating this year under the theme of: "Fifty Years of 100 percent Americanism—a Commitment to Freedom." We don't consider that phrase an idle boast or a claim to super patriotism, but a simple statement of fact fully supported by the performance of the Legion over a half century.

However, we have conceded that we cannot rest on performance, but must live with the realities of today and, in the light of those realities, seek to plan for the future as effectively as we can. We have to live with the realities, and give our best efforts to the seeking of sound solutions to the problems of today, or there will be no future for which to plan.

Be assured that the Legion is making plans, and we are making them with confidence, because we are convinced we can unsnarl these terrible problems which seem to be without solution. We are convinced America can produce the leadership to inspire the better qualities of citizenship within each of us, and we believe that right now the very best any of us can produce is demanded of all of us.

It matters little who we are, or what our role may be. What does matter is that each of us is a responsible human being, that our responsibilities are to each other and to the society of which we are a part, and that each of us had better start exercising that responsibility whether it be as a parent, as a leader of men, or as an individual.

We are not going through a period of turmoil and unrest for the first time in the history of this country—not by any means—but what makes this particular period of unrest so important to us is the fact that we are involved in it. As some of you may know, my visit to New York is being interrupted by the annual American Legion pilgrimage to the Tomb of Abraham Lincoln, in Springfield, Illinois.

While we are immersed in our problems of this moment of history, a quick look at the life and times of Lincoln impresses us with the fact that the concerns of other eras were not unlike our own. We are concerned about the rule of law in today's society. We are concerned with the concept of people taking the law into their own hands. We are concerned that some people feel they can be selective in their regard for the law—obeying those laws with which they agree, disobeying those with which they do not agree. We are concerned that some resort to violence, rather than to lawful recourse, to correct their grievances.

There had to be similar problems in Lincoln's day to have prompted this line in a message to the Illinois State Legislature in 1837. Lincoln said then, and we still know it to be true today: "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law." This is a typical example of the wisdom of the great emancipator, an example of the timelessness of his pertinent observations about his fellow man and about our form of government.

Our 16th President, long before he assumed the presidency, was well aware of the need for high regard for the law on the part of all citizens and of the insecurity that could come to the many because of the lack of responsibility of the few.

You members of the New York State Legislature, and other distinguished guests of the official family of the Empire State, are as aware of and as concerned about this need for the maintenance of law and order and for the strengthening of our system of justice, as anyone else in this great land.

When I speak of a system of justice, I mean a system that has as great a regard for the rights of law abiding citizens as it has for the rights of the violator of the law. Believe me when I say we stand four-square behind a system of justice that is equally concerned with the rights of every citizen.

A free society is vulnerable to the action of extremists, for extremists too are afforded the protection of a system of equal justice and they are the first to exploit that protection even as they seek to destroy the system that provides it.

We have seen instances time and again across this great land where radicals of one breed or another have taunted and baited the forces of law and order and goaded these forces into action. Then comes the old familiar cry of police brutality. I suspect you and we are in agreement in the belief that there are many more charges of police brutality than there are cases of such brutality.

As a part of this 50th Anniversary observance of The American Legion, we seek new methods of impressing upon all Americans the need for an effective system of law and order. Needless to say, that system must be administered with justice, yet some seem to think they have made a new monumental discovery by adding those two words "with justice," to any mention of law and order.

We see all about us the signs that point up the need for our society to turn again to a healthy respect for law and order. These are tragic signs of the kind we have come to expect from other corners of the world, but not in America.

Among these ominous signs that call a nation and its people to order are rioting, burning, looting, and other criminal acts sometimes masked in the issue of civil rights. Undoubtedly there is a cause and a case for those who labor legitimately in the vineyard of civil rights, but let's recall once more the words of Lincoln: "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

President Nixon, just days after his inauguration, told a group of employees of the Department of Justice: "There's never been a time in this nation's history when more Americans were concerned about law enforcement," and the very same day that word appeared in our daily papers there was a progress report published by the National Commission on Violence, suggesting the so-

lutions to rising street crime, city riots and campus disorders will demand a national effort embracing "the active engagement and commitment of every citizen."

A most pertinent note in this progress report says: "The key to much of the violence in our society seems to lie with the young."

"Our youth account for an ever-increasing percentage of crime, greater than their increasing percentage of the population. The thrust of much of the group protest and collective violence—on the campus, in the ghettos, in the streets—is provided by our young people. It may be here, with tomorrow's generation, that much of the emphasis of our studies and the national response should lie."

Surely there is a responsibility of government here to determine the underlying causes of this national problem and to seek solutions. However, there is a more fundamental responsibility to these young people—a more personal responsibility—and one which, in the long run, should prove to be more influential than anything the government can do, and that is the proper exercising of family and parental responsibility to our children.

Every parent, every family, has a great deal to do with the way the young people coming out of that family environment will react to society and to life. None of us, as parents, can afford to be too busy to give proper guidance to our children, nor can we afford not to listen to their problems and try to help them solve them.

You and I, as parents, have a great deal to do with moulding the character of our children, and we had better step up to that responsibility or be prepared to accept a major share of the blame for the storms of protest and the backlash of disorder and violence which accompanies it.

Our generation is not totally to blame for what is taking place in this country today, but neither are we without blame if, in any way, we have failed to give guidance and counsel to our youngsters in the home when they have needed and wanted it.

By our teaching and by our example, parents have a great deal to do with the attitudes with which youngsters will face life. It should be in the home that a youngster learns right from wrong, that he learns something of the values for which his country stands, that he learns a respect for law and order and common decency and a respect for the rights of others. The American Legion never has discounted the role of the church and the school in this all-important matter of formulating attitudes of the young, but if a youngster comes out of the home without proper guidance the work of the church and school is made increasingly difficult, if not impossible.

This is one method by which we can shore up our defenses against lawlessness and violence, and one in which every citizen has a part to play.

The interim report, or progress report of the Commission reveals other shocking statistics, such as more than a million persons participating in demonstrations over the past five years. This is less than one-half of one percent of the population, but it still is a lot of people. More than 200 persons have died and well over 8,000 have been injured in violent urban outbursts.

The American Legion's National Executive Committee has given voice to the Legion's concern for this problem and has adopted a resolution calling for the Legion at all levels, and most importantly the Post right in the local community, "to assume positive roles in American communities, whereby Legionnaires at all levels may assist in finding and contributing to solutions to the complex problems that are eroding the peaceful, prosperous life of many cities and towns."

Local Legionnaires and local Posts are best qualified to know local community problems and to devise methods which they feel will be most successful in helping to cope with those problems. We believe we can and should go beyond the matter of recognizing our police for a job well done. We believe we should roll up our sleeves and pitch in and help them get it done. I don't mean to suggest we take the law into our own hands, not at all, but there are things that can reasonably be done to help. For example: Many metropolitan police departments are engaged in activities such as community relations programs, designed as crime prevention programs and through which people get to know them better. Police sponsored athletic programs are a case in point. The Legion can well involve itself in this crime prevention type of activity, and Legion Post homes can be made a haven for activity aimed at the prevention of crime.

We can be of help in other ways, one of which is important to you as members of a state legislature, and I'm here to insure you that you will have the wholehearted support of The American Legion for any legislation you may consider that will strengthen the hand of our courts and our law enforcement agencies in dealing with crime and the criminal.

Finally, there is the matter of student unrest on campuses across the country and this certainly is a problem of considerable concern in New York. The American Legion believes in fredom of speech. The American Legion believes in all freedom, including academic freedom, but we do not believe any freedom is absolute and we are concerned over those who mistake license for liberty.

I have said it before, and I repeat it here: Youngsters who are smart enough to gain admission to our institutions of higher learning are smart enough to know there are rules and regulations by which those institutions are governed. If they don't want to abide by the rules they should get out.

Those in positions of some authority, teaching assistants, or full fledged faculty members, who join in these demonstrations and who encourage them, must shoulder a substantial volume of the blame for these incidents when they become violent and lawless. Lending support to an incendiary situation with the full knowledge that it can get out of hand is just the same as touching a match to that situation.

Are these the kind of people who should be entrusted with the all-important responsibility of teaching our young? I'm simply asking the question, but I think it is a question that should be asked by those who are called upon to support these institutions by tax dollars, and one for which they deserve an answer.

GOVERNMENT CONFUSION

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed is an excellent editorial written by Mr. Homer Lane, of KOOL radio and television. He points out the schizophrenic character of the Government. The Federal Communications Commission's recent proposal to bar advertising from radio and television stations is discussed in this editorial. The thoughtful points he makes deserve full consideration:

GOVERNMENT CONFUSION

Tobacco companies spend more than 200 million dollars a year advertising on radio and television. That's a lot of money, and because it is, there will be many who think that's the only reason for this editorial. They will be wrong.

Personally, I don't smoke, I used to smoke as many as three packs of cigarettes a day. However, I made the decision not to smoke about ten years ago.

We don't believe that cigarettes are beneficial. We don't know anyone who says they are. However, and we know this is not the popular thing to say, the truth is that no one has ever proven that cigarettes are harmful or that they are the cause of any disease. In fact, there is a large body of research although little publicized, that indicates cigarette smoking to be relatively harmless.

The Federal Government encourages the production of tobacco by subsidies to growers. In fiscal 1968, the government paid out 61 million dollars in price supports. We sent nine and a half million pounds of tobacco to Viet Nam under our food for peace program. Last year, federal, state and local governments collected from the sale of cigarettes four billion, 96 million, 696 thousand dollars in taxes, of which two billion, 66 million went to the Federal Government.

These are some of the reasons we believe it is wrong for the government to say that cigarettes, a perfectly legal product whose production is encouraged by government, from whose sale the government collects billions in taxes, cannot be advertised on radio and television. Now, if the government really believes that cigarettes cause disease and death, then let's make it illegal to grow tobacco and sell cigarettes. Let's not be hypocritical and widen the governmental credibility gap.

CAMPUS DISRUPTIONS

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, Michigan State University president, John M. Hannah, has been named by President Nixon as the Administrator of the Agency for International Development. Dr. Hannah, in his last convocation address, stressed that university faculties must realize the need to provide education for the majority and not submit to the disruptions by the minority.

A fine editorial referring to Dr. Hannan's address and the problem of rebellion on college campuses, recently appeared in the Muskegon Chronicle. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the RECORD; it is as follows:

AS THE CHRONICLE SEES IT: A CALL FOR FIRM LINE AGAINST CAMPUS HELL-RAISERS

The farewell "State of the University" address by Michigan State University President John M. Hannah laid directly on the line some important truths about student dissent and anarchism, and the place and responsibility of the university faculty in the face of "the protagonists of disruption."

As he spoke, squads of Lansing, East Lansing and campus police stood guard outside MSU's Fairchild Theater, facing a shouting rabble of student demonstrators who chanted "Open it up or shut it down. Pigs (police) off campus." At the end of the convocation, President Hannah, MSU trustees, faculty members and others who made up the audience had to be escorted by police through the auditorium's back entrance.

The demonstration was thoroughly disgraceful, and it is encouraging to sense that its most probable effect was to underscore

and make the more memorable President Hannah's challenge to the faculty—and, by extension, all faculties—to take steps to assure "that those who teach, and those who learn, and those who do research, and those who do public service will not be interfered with by those who would destroy the establishment and who would substitute chaos for order, repression for opportunity, allegiance to their point of view for freedom.

"The basic question," he said, is "only whether you have the courage and the willingness to defend order and freedom and basic decency and ethics, and integrity and morality.

"Or," he asked, "are you going to behave like an ostrich and dive your head into the library or laboratory and say, 'let someone else worry.' If you do, you run the risk of seeing chipped away the very attributes that make your profession attractive to you and useful to society."

The line established on the MSU campus, he said, "is simple and easily understood."

"It is that in granting full freedom to examine, to listen, to speak, to dissent, to picket, that there shall be no interference with the rights of all others to carry on the work that seems to them to be important—to teach, to learn, to do research, to perform public service.

"I hope," he concluded, "you have the courage to hold that position."

So, certainly, do we.

The president called on the faculty to "continue a firm position," supporting and requiring "that whenever the protagonists of disruption interrupt the orderly operation of the university, that at that point the university request the civil authorities to take whatever steps required to permit the university to function in accordance with its objectives."

It is interesting—and relevant—to note that the MSU demonstrations of the past week were triggered by the firing of a member of the facutly—Bertram Garskopf, a psychology professor. Prof. Garskopf, one of the faculty "activists," was on the scene outside during President Hannah's address, rallying the demonstrators and manning a bullhorn, calling for "student action against the establishment."

This brings us to comment on what is the really hair-raising part of the campus protest movements. It is not the irrational, irresponsible and obscene actions of the student demonstrators themselves, although this is ugly enough. What is more unsettling is the eager acquiescence in anarchy on the part of some of the faculty members who purposely promote the disruption of their own institutions by aiding and abetting the rioters and the pornographers.

The sad probability here is that it is the great majority of their dedicated, sober and scholarly colleagues who will wind up with the short end of the stick, facing a public that is becoming increasingly outraged.

Through their own unwillingness to get involved they are turning their campuses over to a rabble of misguided toughs and naive misfits who are being led around by a small coterie of dedicated campus Reds bent, as Dr. Hannah observes, not on the improvement of our society, "but on confusion, disruption, destruction and chaos." The very impracticability of many of their demands shows their true purpose, which is destruction of the university system through hell-raising and commotion.

Only a handful, of course, is speaking. The overwhelming majority of college students would like to get an education. But the handful has demonstrated its horsepower and in many cases the faculties, in the name of academic freedom, are abdicating their responsibilities and, in a real sense, selling out their own futures.

President Hannah is saying that the time has come for faculty, administrations, trustees and regents to decide whether to give battle or surrender. Giving battle will mean the prompt calling of police when classes are interferred with and the free movement of students is blocked. It will mean the prompt dismissal not merely of the ringleaders, but of all who actively participate in riotous efforts to seize control.

University authorities can't win the battle alone. The press, the courts and the general public will have to make it plain—and there are indications they are ready—that the right to teach school overrides any right to wreck a school. Using muscles instead of minds to express dissent has no place in a democratic society.

The way to run a university is to run it, first, and improve it, second. The student activists must understand that the right to attend a university is a privilege. Those who abuse that privilege by striking at the freedom of the university have no just cause for complaint if their misconduct leads to expulsion from the community whose rules they refuse to accept.

BIAFRA

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I was able to visit first the secessionist Republic of Biafra and the Federal Republic of Nigeria. However, this visit filled me with dismay at the future of these two peoples as they struggle to find a means of mutual existence. There are many facts that complicate the Nigerian-Biafran situation. Let me make it clear that I am interested in political, military, and economic neutrality by the United States in this conflict. However, I am deeply disturbed by the feeling that our country has not done enough to aid the starving Biafrans nor to facilitate relief for either side. I do not endorse the proposal of secession for Biafra. I do, however, share the conviction that there is a future for both these peoples and governments living in unity and peace in the future. Although I support the conception of a unified Nigeria, I will not support it now in view of this unity being achieved at the cost of 10 million dead Biafrans.

Starting from this premise then, there must be something that our country can do. I would like at this time to submit eight proposals which I have endorsed on my return from Biafra. My companion for this trip was Fulton Lewis, the well-known news commentator for the Mutual Broadcasting Co. Mr. Lewis has endorsed these proposals and is similarly inclined and active in Biafran relief efforts in the United States.

I, therefore, submit these proposals as a guideline and a source of information for my colleagues.

First. The United States must immediately utilize all of its diplomatic and economic resources for the purpose of bringing about a cease-fire between the Nigerian and Biafran forces. The situation is even worse than has been reported. More than a million Biafrans, mostly women and children, lie dead as a result of 19 months of warfare and millions more face a certain and horrible prospect of death by starvation in the future unless something is done to achieve an end to the fighting and a dramatic increase in relief efforts.

Second. The United States should sponsor the construction of a new airfield inside Biafra which would be operated by neutral international authorities and would be used only for humanitarian purposes. The Biafrans can continue operating the existing Uli airfield at their own risk for whatever purposes they wish, but the new facilities would enable international relief organizations to initiate the daytime mercy flights which will be essential if the current rate of death by starvation is to be curtailed. Present night operations at Uli satisfy only 10 percent of the need for food and medical supplies. In addition, the United States should also take the lead in trying to negotiate the establishment of a demilitarized land route from Port Harcourt to Umuahia and a river passage using channels of the Niger River. Both of these would be used only for humanitarian purpose.

Third. The United States should accelerate sharply its role in the international relief operations and that role should be more realistically geared to the needs of the suffering. At present, 90 percent of the U.S. Government-sponsored relief shipments are sent to Nigerian-held territory where 10 percent of the need exists. Only 10 percent of our shipments reach Biafra where the 90 percent of the need exists. In addition, some 13,000 tons of U.S.-purchased food continues to sit and rot on the docks in Lagos while millions go hungry only a few hundred miles away.

Fourth. The United States should take immediate steps to insure its military neutrality in the Nigerian-Biafran conflict and should insist that neither side use U.S.-made weapons of war. The Nigerians, in particular have used 105-mm. howitzers and 106-mm. recoiless rifles given to them by the U.S. Government prior to—and according to Biafran spokesmen during—the current conflict.

Fifth. Likewise, the United States should adopt a policy of diplomatic neutrality, giving neither side in this war a favored diplomatic status. If present diplomatic contacts are maintained with Nigeria, similar contacts should be opened with the Government of Biafra.

Sixth. The House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees should immediately appoint a special subcommittee to conduct an on-site inspection of the situation in both Nigeria and Biafra.

Seventh. The Nixon administration should conduct a sharp reappraisal of attitude and policy regarding the situation in western Africa with a view toward adopting a new program which will be in the best interests of our own country, of Africa, and of the people of both Nigeria and Biafra. Such a policy should be consistent with our own professed devotion to the doctrines of justice and the rights of peoples to self-determination. U.S. policy for the entire African continent must be conceived and written in Washington, and not in London. British interests are not always consistent with our own.

Eighth. The Nixon administration

should streamline existing State Department machinery so that when the decision is made to dispatch U.S. relief assistance, these shipments will reach their destination with all possible speed and efficiency. A "relief coordinator" should be responsible for stimulating private relief efforts and for coordinating these with Federal Government relief programs. He would also have the task of working to overcome diplomatic obstacles which frequently delay or divert relief shipments.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the conscience of the American people is growing increasingly outraged over the tragic war between Nigeria and Biafra. As Richard Nixon stated on September 10, 1968:

> The terrible tragedy of the people of Biafra has now assumed catastrophic dimensions. . . . This is not the time to stand on ceremony or to "go through channels" or to observe the diplomatic niceties. The destruction of an entire people is an immoral objective, even in the most moral of wars. It can never be justified; it can never be condoned.

It is a source of great encouragement to me that so many Americans from every part of the Nation, representing every phase of the political spectrum, of every race and religion, the young and the old alike, have joined together to achieve an end to the horrendous suffering which this war has caused. The Vietnam war issue has divided our people. The Nigerian-Biafra war issue has cemented them together into a harmonious chorus which is crying for its leadership to get off the sidelines. On this question, Americans are most definitely marching "forward together."

It is my hope that this "sense of the Congress" resolution that I have introduced—the need for an immediate cease-fire—will get the support it deserves, and the action it demands.

In addition I am including some quotations from Mr. Lewis' weekly newsletter Exclusive which I feel are of major influence as his opinion is respected throughout the United States and in many parts of the world:

[From Exclusive, Dec. 20, 1968]

UMUAHIA, BIAFRA.—*"We are Biafrans, fighting for our freedom!* By the name of Jesus, we shall conquer!" Those are the words of the most popular battle song in this besieged part of the world known as Biafra, and those two sentences express very vividly the strong sentiments of the more than twelve million people who live here.

With the conviction of a *Patrick Henry* and the courage of a *Moshe Dayan*, Biafra has voluntarily proceeded to take on what sometimes must seem like the entire outside world in her struggle to preserve the economic and political independence declared May 30, 1967. With no air force and no navy, and with an army which consisted of only several thousand untrained and inexperienced soldiers—armed with a grand total of 125 rifles—Biafra went to war nearly eighteen months ago against an enemy, the Nigerian Federal government, which boasted an infantry of 50,000, supplied and supported actively by at least two major world powers—Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

Through unexcelled courage and determination, the Biafran forces have defied predictions by international military "experts" who said they would be crushed by the Nigerians in just 48 hours. After a year and a half, the secessionist eastern region of Nigeria continues to exist and may, indeed, be on the verge of scoring some dramatic military victories of its own which could turn the tide of this war.

It is impossible to spend any time at all here without being extremely impressed by the Biafran people. I have had the pleasure of meeting and talking to hundreds of them during the past few days ranging from Lt. Colonel *C. Odumegwu Ojukwu*, the head of state, to a vast array of his military and civil leaders, to civilians in the market place and in the villages throughout the Biafran stronghold. Without exception, they are agreed on a number of points:

(1) Biafra's cause, they say, is a just one. The citizens of this "nation" feel that they have been denied their God-given human rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness by the Nigerian Federal government. As a minority in the Federal setup, they believe they were exploited and persecuted during seven years of Nigerian independence from the British Crown, and now the Biafrans insist that they be allowed to create their own independent country—the Republic of Biafra.

(2) This, Biafrans say, is a war of survival and there is no hope of reunification or even reconciliation with the Nigerian Federal government which, they earnestly believe, is bent on a course of action which can only be defined as genocide. As a number of persons here have expressed it, "If we lose or surrender in our battle, we will be slaughtered. Thus we have no choice but to fight on to the last man, woman or child."

The cost of this war for Biafra has been great. Estimates of starvation are debated even here and there is no way of determining what the actual daily death toll is, but Red Cross officials and others charged with the responsibility of trying to alleviate the hunger in Biafra are agreed that the picture has improved somewhat during the past two months as more relief flights have arrived at Uli airport. Even so, they add, there are a minimum of 5,000 Biafrans—mostly women and children—dying each day through malnutrition (lack of adequate protein or carbohydrate in their diets) or through outright starvation, and this situation is destined to get much worse in the first months of 1969. The basic staples in the daily meal here are the yam and the cassava. The latter is in abundant supply since it can be easily rooted each year from the stalks of the previous year's crop. The cassava, however, has a protein content of only 2%. The yam, which has twice as much protein content, must be planted annually from seeds conserved from some of the previous year's harvest, and these seeds are not available since virtually all of the 1968 crop has been consumed.

In short, the present daily death rate is expected to double or perhaps triple in January and February. The real crisis of Biafra lies ahead.

The Biafran charge of "genocide" is based on several things. In the first place, the citizens here remember the pogroms of July–August and September-October, 1966, when Biafrans were forcibly ejected from Northern Nigeria. An estimated 30,000 Biafrans, mostly members of the Ibo tribe, were murdered as they tried to flee back into the Eastern region. A Time magazine correspondent gave this eyewitness account of one incident in which several hundred Ibos were killed:

"The massacre began at the airport near the Fifth Battalion's home city of Kano. A Lagos-bound jet had just arrived from London, and as the Kano passengers were escorted into the customs shed, a wild-eyed soldier stormed in, brandishing a rifle and demanding, 'Ine Nyamiri'—which is Hausa (a predominately Muslim tribe of Northern Nigeria) for 'Where are the damned Ibos?' There were Ibos among the customs officers, and they dropped their chalk and fled, only to be shot down in the main terminal by other soldiers. Screaming the blood curses of a Moslem holy war, the Hausa troops turned the airport into a shambles, bayoneting Ibo workers in the bar, gunning them down in the corridors, and hauling Ibo passengers off the plane to be lined up and shot.

"From the airport the troops fanned out through downtown Kano, hunting down Ibos in bars, hotels, and on the streets. One contingent drove their Land-rovers to the railroad station where more than 100 Ibos were waiting for a train, and cut them down with automatic weapon fire.

"The soldiers did not have to do all the killing. They were soon joined by thousands of Hausa civilians, who rampaged through the city, armed with stones, cutlasses, machetes, and homemade weapons of metal and broken glass.

"All night long and into the morning the massacre went on. Then tired but fulfilled, the Hausas drifted back to their homes and barracks to get some breakfast and sleep. Municipal garbage trucks were sent out to collect the dead and dump them into mass graves outside the city. The death toll will never be known, but it was at least 1,000."

Such accounts were repeated by eyewitnesses of other massacres. Those Ibos who were fortunate enough to make it back safely to the Eastern or Biafran region—some beaten and burned almost to the point of death—related tales of horror and these have been deeply imbedded in the memory of all surviving Biafrans. They are convinced that Nigerian forces, if successful in their present war effort, will not stop until they exterminate all of the Ibos' population of eight million and the six million other tribesmen who have chosen to associate themselves with the Biafran cause.

If the 1966 pogroms have not convinced Biafrans of the Nigerian "genocide" campaign, recent developments here have.

The Nigerian military effort has been directed primarily against the civilian population, and I can give personal testimony along these lines. At noon on Friday, December 13th, I sat in the office of Biafra's Chief Justice, Sir *Louis Mbanefo*, conducting a taped interview. In the midst of our conversation, there were a series of blasts just outside the window. A Nigerian air attack by two MIG and two Ilyushin 28 bombers (all Soviet supplied) was underway and the rockets and bombs rained down for approximately fifteen minutes. Chief Justice Mbanefo and I continued our interview crouched under his desk and later went outside the building to survey the damage. Less than 100 yards away from the Hall of Justice is a Methodist clinic for underprivileged children; inside, two young boys and a girl lay dead on the floor, victims of the attack. In the market place less than a block away, at least twenty other civilians were killed and scores injured. Across the street, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (which has two red crosses painted on the roof), several rockets had killed three nurses and one patient and had injured dozens more. There is no target which in any sense could be considered "military" within five miles of the city of Umuahia.

On Saturday, the following day, I was conducting another interview with General Phillip Efiong, Biafra's Chief of General Staff and the commander of this nation's military forces, while en route to a training center eight miles outside of Umuahia. Another air attack by two MIG's and two Ilyushin 28's forced us to abandon our cars and dive in a roadside ditch. Again, the rockets and bombs were dropped in Umuahia, although as the jets passed overhead at no more than 5,000 feet altitude they would occasionally sprinkle rockets in some of the city's outlying sections. Surveying the damage later, we found that the struck areas were again civilian markets and housing areas. The Red Cross headquarters at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was

hit, as was, ironically a prisoner of war camp. Fourteen Nigerian POW's suffered wounds.

The total casualties in just two days of air attacks were 67 dead, and more than 400 wounded—excluding the prisoners of war, all casualties were civilians.

The Nigerian commander, General Gowon, has stated that his pilots are under orders to strike only military targets but it was very obvious from the raids staged while I was in Umuahia that the attacks did not even come close to hitting areas which have any military significance or importance. Such attacks, therefore, have only reconfirmed Biafran suspicions that the Nigerians are intent upon slaughtering the people of this region including innocent men, women and children—that they are, in short, intent upon committing "genocide."

At least fourteen hospitals throughout Biafra have been either destroyed or attacked, as have dozens of churches and feeding centers. Nigerian air attacks continue to threaten the life-giving airlift of food and medical supplies into Uli, an airlift which is conducted at night under maximum security to avoid the rocket and bombing raids.

The net effect of Nigeria's air campaign has been to make the Biafrans more determined than ever to fight for their survival thus lessening any hopes for a peaceful settlement of this conflict.

(3) The Biafrans are unanimously convinced that they will be victorious in their uphill battle to preserve their independence. Their unusually high morale, they believe, is their most potent weapon. As they have held on far beyond the predictions of the enemy commanders, they feel that they have created dissension in the ranks of the "aggressors." Nigerian-held cities like Owerri and Enugu are slowly being surrounded and cut off by Biafran guerrilla forces, according to military commanders here, and these will soon be recaptured. Once the tide of the war is turned in Biafra's favor, it is reasoned, the Nigerian troops will retreat in a state of disarray and Biafran leaders are also encouraged by reports of an increasing desertion rate in the enemy army.

Although some of this talk is certainly exaggerated optimism, the Biafrans do have grounds for hope. A team of expert scientists, many of whom have only recently come "home to Biafra" from all over the industrialized world, are working day and night to develop some sophisticated, home-made weapons which will help reduce the odds which are now heavily on the Nigerian side. Grenades, copied after captured Soviet-design Nigerian models, are being mass-produced here already and surface-to-air missiles—heat seeking devices which are fired from something which resembles a stove pipe—have just been introduced in the Biafran defense arsenal. Official reports here claim that one such missile knocked out one of the attacking Ilyushin 28 bombers in last Saturday's attack. Although the plane went down behind enemy lines (and this fact has been confirmed by Nigerian spokesmen although they say only that it "crashed" from undisclosed causes) "guerrilla Biafra forces" identified the jet as bearing the serial number "BJ 10002" and named a Nigerian casualty as "Captain Salami." The three other persons aboard, all killed in the crash, were identified only as "one Russian and two British officers."

The Biafran leaders are now convinced that time will be on their side. They view the next month as being the "critical" period and if their war effort can survive this, they will be on the road to victory.

[From Exclusive, Jan. 10, 1969]

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"*We are willing to pay any price, but tell me:* How much more do we have to suffer? How many more of us will have to die? How much more hell are we expected to endure before we, too, achieve our rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?"

With this, a Biafran mother in a refugee camp some fifteen miles from Umuahia sat back down on the ground in front of a kindling fire and returned to her daily task of fraying shredded cassava which would then be mixed with water into a mashed potato-like consistency and fed to the camp's 400 children. Africans, for some reason, rarely cry but her eyes were moist and she was obviously a little embarrassed over having been a little too outspoken to the two visiting American guests, Ohio Republican Congressman *Donald Lukens* and me. Later, it was explained to us that this woman had lost her husband in the battle of Enugu. Two of her children had died, one from bullet wounds and the other from starvation—during the long trip back into the Biafran heartland through "enemy" Nigerian lines. One of the two remaining children had died from lack of proper nourishment at the refugee camp. Her last child, a 10-month old son, I was told, is "very sick" which, in Biafran language, means that his chances of survival are virtually non-existent.

This Biafran mother has suffered more than most, but, significantly, she has not slackened or become discouraged insofar as Biafra's struggle for independence is concerned. She asked only how much more she and her fellow countrymen will have to endure before they earn peace and freedom.

Of all my many experiences in Biafra, this brief conversation will be the most difficult to forget. This woman's words typified the attitude of every Biafran I met and they represented the qualities which make the Biafran Africa's most outstanding native product: courage, determination, endurance, faith and confidence.

Biafrans make no secret of the fact that they are disappointed in the United States stand on the 19-month-long war in western Africa. Aware of the fact that the U.S. has sacrificed tens of thousands of American lives fighting for the right of self-determination for the peoples of South Korea and South Vietnam, in conflicts which have been labeled by some as "civil wars," the Biafran questions what makes his cause different.

The analogy between Biafra's situation and that in South Korea and South Vietnam is a valid one. In each case, a formerly united territory (Nigeria, Korea and Vietnam) has been divided into two parts—the people, in one, claiming their right to independence and self-determination, while the leaders of the other initiated military action to force reunification under their domination. In the instances of Vietnam and Korea, the United States was a principal sponsor of territorial division and went so far as to militarily support the sectors which were fighting for independence and the right of self-determination. In these two struggles, American troops were aligned on the side which was combating communist forces.

In the war between Nigeria and Biafra, the United States has adopted a completely opposite policy. It has diplomatically supported Nigeria's demands for reunification, and has thus endorsed the philosophy that the people of Biafra shall not be entitled to their political independence and their right to self-determination. In this conflict, the United States has aligned itself with Moscow's communist rulers who have been the principal contributors to the Nigerian war effort.

State Department officials have offer a weak argument in support of this apparent hypocrisy. To become involved in the struggle in western Africa, they say, would be the beginning of a new Vietnam-like military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. In addition, to take a pro-Biafran stand in this war would be offensive to our allies in Great Britain (who are also supporting Nigeria). For these reasons, our diplomats explain, "The United States is necessarily locked into a position of non-involvement and non-intervention."

From the Biafran point of view, the policy of the United States has been anything but neutral in this conflict. Biafran forces have captured numerous American-made weapons which somehow had made their way into Nigerian hands, including powerful 105 mm. howitzers and 106 mm. recoilless rifles. The Biafrans also feel that they were sabotaged by an American citizen—a bizarre story which was published in the November 22, 1968 issue of "The Leopard," the weekly newspaper of the Biafran armed forces:

"About twelve weeks ago, the enemy entered Aba. Two weeks later, they sneaked into Owerri. Almost at the same time the vandals wangled their way into Okigwi town.

"Few of us knew why the Nigerian vandals moved so fast. The world now knows what happened.

"What really happened? What made the vandals achieve those temporary victories? The answer is British and American treachery!

". . . They got the man who had made millions of dollars from Biafra. His name is *Hank Wharton*—the man who was under contract to fly in the arms we had paid for to supplement our locally made ones. Their agreement with Wharton was that whenever the Nigerians planned a big offensive, Wharton should not fly in vitally needed arms and ammunition into Biafra.

"That was why our gallant forces were issued only five bullets each to defend Aba and Owerri and Okigwi."

Those sharp words printed in "The Leopard" are not exaggerated as they may appear to be. A highly respected and authoritative British magazine that specializes in intelligence and espionage stories—"Private Eye"—wrote in its issue of October 25, 1968:

"The one vital thing Biafra lacked was an outside base from which to fly in arms and other essential materials. The only country willing to give such facilities was Portugal. This decision placed the Biafrans in the hands of the international arms dealer *Pierre Lorez,* a Frenchman with considerable influence in Portuguese government circles. Lorez provided Biafra with Mauser pattern Czech rifles using 7.92 mm. ammunition, a calibre exclusive to that rifle. Biafra had in the meantime tied up with *Hank Wharton,* an American, who organized the airlift into Biafra.

"The then Commonwealth Relations Office, through the British Embassy in Lisbon, had been lobbying persistently to try and persuade the Portuguese to stop helping Biafra but they failed. At the same time, together with representatives of the Nigerian government, the Commonwealth Office tried to bribe Wharton's pilots to hijack planes and land them in Lagos (the capital of Nigeria). They were comparatively unsuccessful in this until August 1968 when they finally succeeded in persuading Wharton to change his loyalties to their side.

"At this time some 15,000 Nigerian troops were attacking Aba and 1,000 Biafran commandos had five rounds of ammunition per man per day to hold their advance. Meanwhile, two million rounds of ammunition were awaiting air shipment in Sao Tome, the Portuguese island south of Biafra. Hank Wharton made several excuses for non-delivery, among them bad weather, flat tires and lack of spares. The Biafrans were finally informed that one of Wharton's aircraft had 'lost' two engines and had been forced to dump eleven tons of vitally needed ammunition in the sea. During last August and early September (for a period of three weeks) the Biafrans received no arms or ammunition at all."

It was during that time that the Biafran forces were pushed back and the Nigerians took three major cities: Aba, Owerri and

Okigwi. Later in September, the Biafran government completely reorganized its plan for importing arms and ammunition. It established a new airlink using new pilots, new aircraft and new spares. This one is being manned by mercenaries from the Scandinavian countries who use Libreville, Gabon as their principal base. More recently, the Biafran forces have been able to launch new offensives. They predict that within the next few weeks they will retake Owerri and Okigwi. If that prediction comes true, these Biafran victories would probably cripple the morale of the Nigerian forces and could turn the tide of this war against Nigeria for the first time.

It is doubtful that Hank Wharton sabotaged the Biafran war effort as part of a pro-Nigerian plot hatched by the State Department or the CIA, but he is nevertheless an American citizen and thus, his actions were understandably interpreted by the Biafrans as being representative of, or at the least condoned by, the United States government. The Hank Wharton incident, coupled with the declared State Department policy of diplomatic support of Nigeria, coupled with the fact that Nigerian forces have blasted away at Biafran troops with American-made weapons—all of this has created an impression in Biafra that the United States is anything but neutral in this conflict. The Johnson Administration has been callously negligent of its responsibility to ensure our neutrality and this fact may indeed be no accident. The man who is in charge of writing U.S. policy for Africa, *Joseph Palmer*, is admittedly pro-Nigeria. He served as the U.S. Ambassador to Lagos before being promoted by LBJ to the position of Undersecretary of State for African Affairs. And there are recurrent and disturbing reports here that the Nixon Administration intends to retain Palmer in his present post after January 20th, which would mean a continuation of the bankrupt American policies toward Africa not just insofar as the Nigerian-Biafran conflict is concerned but as they also apply to: the Rhodesian issue; the white governments in South Africa, Southwest Africa, Mozambique, and Angola; a series of other complex problems involving the black-controlled nations on the African continent—problems which will lead to many future wars in that part of the world if they are not resolved soon.

State Department spokesmen rationalize that if Biafra is allowed to divide Nigeria, it will result in a series of independence movements which will destroy the unity of nearly every other nation on the African continent. There are two answers to that speculation. First, would that necessarily be bad in view of the fact that no African nation today—even those which are united—is a model of political or economic stability. None has fulfilled the State Department's dream of "the newly-emerging democracy." The second answer was told to me by Biafran Chief of State, Col. *Odumegwu Ojukwu:* "Just because you legalize divorce, it doesn't mean that everyone is going to rush out to get one." That is certainly true. The only areas which would pursue their independence would be those which feel that they cannot endure or prosper under their present, oppressive situation and, according to the American philosophy at least, these people have a God-given right to pursue their freedom.

Lastly, it will be necessary for the State Department to distinguish between 'involvement" and "intervention." It is true that the United States cannot spread itself thinly and risk its own national security by intervening in all of the world's disputes as an international policeman. Nobody has suggested this in the case of Biafra. It would be equally dangerous, in this small world of today, however, to ignore conflict like the one in western Africa because there, as in the Middle East and in Southeast Asia, the communists are pursuing a policy of colonization which is part of their overall plan of world conquest. At long last, we have learned of the necessity to become "involved" in the Middle East crisis. We have shipped arms to the Israelis to counterract the massive Soviet military subsidy of the Arab nations. In the Middle East, we have also learned the art of "involvement" without the kind of "intervention" which has cost us the lives of 80,000 American boys in Vietnam and Korea. If the Soviet drive in western Africa is to be stopped, if Moscow is to be denied control of that area's rich oil deposits which are essential to the security of the NATO nations, and if the Soviet Union is to be blocked in its campaign to acquire a seaport on the Atlantic Ocean (Lagos), it will require a considerable amount of U.S. "involvement" in the Nigerian-Biafran struggle. Such "involvement" now will preclude the necessity of "intervention" later.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSERVATION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Wescott E. S. Moulton, of Williston Academy, Easthampton, discussed the importance of conservation and the very serious problems our industrial society has created for our natural environment. Because of the importance of this subject, I place this speech in the RECORD:

WILLISTON ACADEMY CHAPEL,
February 1, 1969.

My text this morning is taken from various parts of the Bible.

Genesis, Chapter 1, Verse 1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." 115th Psalm, Verse 16: "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's: but the earth hath he given to the children of men."

In September 1870, on the banks of the Yellowstone River in Wyoming, an exploring party of 19 men sat around their campfire discussing what should be done with this unbelievable country they had been traveling through. Some wanted to stake personal claims for their own advantage, but Cornelius Hodges, a judge in Montana Territory, proposed the idea that Yellowstone's unique natural, spectacular beauty *not* be owned by a few individuals. He said, "I feel it should be a national park."

Thus a wonderful new concept was given its birth. The other men present on that historic night were persuaded and each promised to urge the proposal as vigorously as they could. These men kept their word and such was their prominence, their energy, and their followthrough that Congress two years later, in 1872, established Yellowstone as the first national park in the world.

The idea grew and prospered—You know their names: Sequoia (1890), Yosemite (1890), Crater Lake (1902), Grand Canyon (1919), The Everglades (1947), and many others all over the country even in Alaska and Hawaii.

If ever you have camped and visited such places as the Petrified Forest, White Mountain National Park, hiked the Appalachian Trail (from Maine to Georgia) and other such wonderful nature centers, you have a first-hand idea of how much these parks mean to you and will mean to your children.

If you have been to them recently you know how overcrowded they are.

The danger and the urgency are great. As those men planned way back in 1870, on the banks of the Yellowstone, we not only should protect these parks, we must explore new possibilities for the millions of Americans yet unborn.

I return to the Bible:

Psalm 104, Verse 24: "O Lord, how manifold Thy works: In wisdom hast Thou made all: The earth is full of Thy riches.

And Ecclesiastes, Chapter 1, Verse 4: "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh: But the earth abideth for ever."

But does it? Listen to these words.

The speed in which our world is being altered is incredible.

Forests are taken down, hillsides eroded and bulldozed. Waters filled in, and air and water polluted.

The hidden danger, the mistaken assumption is that Man is the Master of Nature.

If we so alter our environment eradicate that so it of ingredients we need for life, then we will surely pass the way of other life forms that have become extinct.

Man needs oxygen to live.

It wasn't until green plants and certain ocean plankton had evolved that the natural process was begun by which oxygen is maintained in the atmosphere. This life-giving process is called photosynthesis.

In the United States alone, oxygen-producing greenery is being paved over at a rate of one million acres per year.

The oceans have become the dumping ground for as many as a half million substances, few of which are tested to see if the plankton we need can survive them.

New factories, new automobiles, new homes, and new jet airplanes have incredibly increased the rate at which combustion takes place which results in oxygen being used and replaced in our atmosphere by carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide.

When and if we reach the point where the rate of combustion exceeds the rate of photosynthesis, the oxygen content of the atmosphere will decrease. Indeed there is evidence that it may already have begun to decline around our largest cities.

U.S. and Russian meteorologists agree that air pollution is already causing colder winters.

Recently, deposits of D.D.T. have been found in human beings all over the world. Its extreme danger is that its residue lasts longer and is more deadly than scientists had previously held.

The evidence has become overwhelming that effective pesticides of much lower general toxicity are now available and that the use of D.D.T. should be outlawed.

No one in the world knows, when we aim at a particular pest, which other organism may be eliminated by a ricochet.

If some pesticide, herbicide or defoliant should by inadvertence kill too many of the nitrogen-living organisms—those organisms that enable living things to make use of the nitrogen in the atmosphere—then life on Earth could end.

It is that simple. It is that dependent. It is that fragile.

What can you as an individual do about all this?

You can write your Congressmen. The most effective way to present your view and concern is to write your Senators and Congressmen in your own words by personal letter.

A couple of weeks ago, our teacher, The Reverend Douglas L. Graham, because he was concerned about the nomination of Alaskan Governor Walter J. Hickel to be Secretary of the Interior, wrote to Massachusetts Senator Edward W. Brooke about his concern.

Mr. Graham received a four-page letter in reply.

You, too, can make known your ideas and each one will be counted.

Ecclesiastes, Chapter 5, Verse 9: "Moreover the profit of the earth is for all: The King himself is served by the field."

Here is one urgent example where you can test your importance, influence, and follow-through.

The Everglades National Park in Florida was established in 1947. Now it is facing extinction. Here is 1½ million acres of the largest sub-tropical wilderness in the U.S., with a tremendous variety of plant, animal and bird life.

The Everglades needs water if it is not to become a dump.

It took thousands of years to create the Everglades. Now men have the ability, the machines, and the will to destroy it quickly.

The draining of land for buildings and now the proposed new Jetport in Florida could kill this wonderful recreation area.

The Lord gave us this world, but what we do with it is up to us.

If the Bible teaches us anything, it points the way to keep ourselves and our world livable.

Let us pray—

Oh Lord, give us the wisdom to plan for the future.

Give us the will, the courage and the follow-through to make our constructive ideas known to the leaders of our country.

And help us to preserve your world and ours.

In Thy Name we ask it—Amen.

THE GREATER SIGNIFICANCE OF THE "PUEBLO" CASE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the awesome scope of the problems involved in the *Pueblo* case is sharply presented by Herbert W. Armstrong writing in "The Plain Truth Issue" of January 1969. I commend the reading of this article to the thoughtful review of Members of Congress and others who are deeply concerned to assure nonrepetition of such disastrous incidents in the future:

WHAT PRICE HONOR?

(By Herbert W. Armstrong)

Of course we all rejoice that the crewmen of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* are back home safe—even if not as sound as they might have been had they not been subjected to almost unbelievable beatings and inhuman torture.

But many are overlooking the other side of the coin. I'm not a military man. I personally do place the value of human life far ahead of the value of matériel, ships, and military equipment. I did not vote to make the United States a military power. But it is a military power—in a world of military powers. And as such it must conduct itself as military powers are conducted—or lose face, lose honor—and, in the end, lose all freedom!

And this poses some serious questions:

To what depths of disgrace is the most powerful nation in the world willing to stoop? The United States stood disgraced before the world when it allowed the U.S.S. *Pueblo* to be captured, or to be in such position that it could be taken.

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE

To maintain honor and prestige in the world the U.S. Navy should have: (1) either protected the *Pueblo* so that it could not have been taken, or (2) sent superior naval forces immediately after it and taken it back at any cost—even to obliterating all North Korean naval forces. This nation had the power to do it. But that power is not worth much when held in disrespect and contempt by even little nations.

The manner of release of the *Pueblo* crewmen after 11 months of torture and inhuman treatment was one of the most disgraceful and bizarre diplomatic episodes in the history of international affairs. Orientals would die before they would lose face.

If they knew the truth, no nation need ever go to war. But they do not know. And they do go to war. If America is going to be part of such a world, participating in its ways and its wars, it cannot continue to endure as a free country if it is willing to cringe and crawl before little pip-squeek nations like North Korea. Do we not suppose North Vietnam, the Kremlin, and the Chinese Communists are watching and now are laughing contemptuously at us?

Yet big, powerful United States, with the mightiest military power any nation ever had, has lost all pride in that power. It signed a document drafted by North Korea meekly apologizing for offenses it says emphatically it did not commit. It is like signing an unconditional surrender to a conqueror in time of war. The very fact that the United States repudiated the contents of the document, branding its statements as lies before signing, dishonors this nation the more.

If this nation has so little honor left that it publicly confesses to signing officially to a lie, it brands itself as a liar! Military men enlist, or are drafted, as men risking their lives for the honor and freedom of their country. When the United States did have honor, it often lost a hundred times as many men to win a single battle. Military men have taught that human lives in certain instances are more expendable than military equipment or ships. Repeatedly in past wars that policy has been acted on.

But now the weak excuse is that they saved the lives of the men. The men who were not required to sacrifice their lives, are home. But the ship is not. The North Koreans still have it.

Had Theodore Roosevelt been President, the ship would have been rescued immediately after capture. Authorities today protest that to have gone in after the ship would have cost the crewmen their lives. *Of course* we don't want to sacrifice those lives! But when a U.S. Naval ship was attacked and captured by an enemy naval force, that was an act of war. And right or wrong, this nation has adopted the means of war—or maintaining and using military force—to protect its honor, its freedom, and its sovereignty as a free nation. And to accept military defeat, when attacked in an act of war, on the excuse that we were saving the lives of our military men, is to surrender in battle rather than fight and risk the lives of soldiers or sailors. To carry that policy out to its ultimate conclusion, in repeated surrenders, is to lose not only honor, but ultimately all freedom.

UPHOLDING NATIONAL HONOR

In previous wars, the United States has sacrificed hundreds of thousands of lives in uniform—for what purpose? Why, officials would answer, to protect the Nation's honor, and its freedom! No military nation can operate a military force, by accepting defeat in an enemy attack, on the excuse we wanted to save the lives of men who had offered those lives to protect our honor and our freedom!

The United States military saved those lives. We are glad they are home. But at what cost? First, they are home in obvious mental and moral exhaustion. They report having suffered inhuman tortures and beatings, prolonged isolation, attempts at brainwashing. But how many more lives will yet be lost in future battles because enemies will now be emboldened by this display of weakness to anticipate easy victories over a United States that is afraid to fight?

Those lives were put on the block when those men donned their uniforms. If men sacrifice their lives for the honor and freedom of their country, then, even at cost of their lives—the way things are done in this world—the nation's honor should have been upheld before the world. It should have been an example that shouted to the world: "Don't tread even lightly on U.S. honor—because any nation who dares to do so will suffer the consequences." Then we should have been respected.

I have mentioned before how I was standing not more than six feet from former President Theodore Roosevelt, during President Wilson's campaign for a second term in early autumn of 1916. President Wilson was running for re-election on the campaign slogan: "He kept us out of war."

Mr. Roosevelt repeated the slogan contemptuously. Mr. Wilson had been sending the Kaiser note after note, protesting the sinking of United States ships by German submarines.

"I was President for seven-and-a-half years," said Mr. Roosevelt. "And if I were President now, I would send the Kaiser just one note—and he would *know* that *I meant it!* I did send the Kaiser a note when I was President. A German battleship was steaming toward Manila Bay to take the Philippines, then a United States possession. I sent a note to the Kaiser demanding that he turn his battleship back immediately! The Kaiser did not act. Immediately I sent a second note. But I did not send the second note to the Kaiser. I sent it to Admiral Dewey, in command of the U.S. Pacific fleet. My note ordered Dewey to steam full speed upon the German battleship, fire once over her, and order her to turn back. 'And if she does not turn back, sink her!' my note said. The Kaiser learned that I meant it!"

Yes, the United States had PRIDE in its power then. Today we have multiple times that power, but we are afraid to use it.

Not only did this country lose face the world around by this incident, that disgraceful release was made to look like a heroic act. What a travesty on honor!

Of course we are glad these men are back and alive. We would also like to have thousands of others back alive who died in battle to protect their country's honor and its freedom.

Many, many centuries ago, the God of our fathers promised unconditionally to Abraham the overwhelming national greatness, wealth and power that has come to the United States and Britain. In Moses' day it was promised to the children of Israel of that day—*IF* they would be ruled by His laws and statutes. Otherwise, penalties would follow naturally for disobedience, and this great promise would be held back for a duration of 2,520 years. That 2,520 years came to its end in 1800–1803. Since the promise to Abraham had been unconditional, God was bound, and such vast national wealth and greatness as no nations had ever enjoyed came quickly—first to the British, then to America.

But if we disobey God's right laws and reject Him, once He has kept His promise by bestowing on us that promise, He foretold multiplied national punishments, and a complete FALL of our nations. Britain already has been reduced to a third-rate world power. Among the punishments was this: "And I will break the pride of your power" (Lev. 26:19).

This nation has rejected God in its schools and institutions of learning. Science has rejected God (though some scientists as individuals still profess Him), and set itself up as the Messiah to lead us out of our troubles. Our morals have hit a toboggan slide. Our homes and family life are breaking down. Our juveniles are delinquent. A tenth of us

are mental cases. We are rapidly becoming a nation with crime running rampant. Our people are taking to stimulants, depressants, drugs, narcotics, in alarming proportions. Respect for law and order is breaking down—and, though we don't seem to know it, our Nation is breaking down!

And here is another example: God has kept His word—He has broken the pride of our power!

HUNGER IN AMERICA

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, following is the fourth installment of the current series of "Hunger in America" which is running in the New York Times:

HUNGER IN AMERICA: MEXICANS AND INDIANS ITS STOICAL VICTIMS

(By Homer Bigart)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—Tacked on the wall of the inner City Apostolate were four new slips from hungry Mexican-American families for food.

The Rev. Ralph H. Ruiz, who runs the mission for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio, glanced at the slips and exclaimed angrily: "The whole welfare system in Texas stinks."

The mission is on the fringe of Alazan-Apache Courts, the city's oldest public housing project, where some 6,000 Mexican-Americans live in wretched poverty and frequent hunger. Of all the nation's ethnic groups—white, black, brown or red—the "Mexicanos" are suspected by nutritionists of being most vulnerable to hunger.

For although there are nearly five million of them scattered through the Southwest, the Mexican-Americans have generally been undemonstrative about their misery, complaining so seldom of empty stomachs that the "Anglos" (the non-Mexican whites) give them scant attention. "Brown Power" has not yet taken to the streets of San Antonio.

Hungrier even than the Mexican-Americans, but less obtrusive because they are smaller in number and confined mainly to isolated wastelands, are the reservation Indians. Of the more than 300,000 Indians living on reservations by far the largest tribe is the Navajo of northeastern Arizona. Altogether, 115,000 Navajos exist on an arid plateau bigger than the whole state of West Virginia.

THE LAST FRONTIER

The western half of this remote region, the state's last frontier, was not opened up by roads until about 13 years ago. Even today there are Navajos who live 50 miles from the nearest improved road. Last year 20 infants were brought in dead at medical stations, according to Dr. George E. Bock, the United States Public Health Service medical director, and 18 of those deaths were attributable to delay in reaching medical aid.

At Tuba City, administrative center for the western half of the reservation, Dr. Jean Van Duzen, chief of pediatrics at the Indian Hospital, reported 27 cases of marasmus (calory starvation) and 17 cases of kwashiorkor (extreme protein deficiency) among Navajo children in the last five years. The high incidence of those two rarely found diseases would be considered fantastic anywhere else in the nation. Dr. Van Duzen said that 15 of the 44 victims died.

Among Mexican-Americans in the slums of San Antonio the ravages of hunger may be less spectacular but more degrading. Father Ruiz said Mexican-Americans found the welfare apparatus unbearably cold and inhuman.

Father Ruiz's irritation with Texas welfare was mainly a recent lowering of the ceiling on monthly welfare payments from $135, for a family of four or more, to $123.

"Texas is the only state, I believe, that requires legislation every time it wants to raise the level of welfare. A referendum to increase the payments was defeated last year. The cut was made because the increasing relief load threatened to exhaust the welfare appropriation. And now there is talk of another cut."

FOOD STAMPS RUN SHORT

He took a visitor on a tour of Alazan-Apache Courts, a sprawling expanse of low, concrete block buildings with small apartments. In one home, sparsely furnished but very clean, Mrs. Joanne Gutierrez told how she and her four children existed on a $123-a-month welfare check.

"I buy no clothes for myself," she said. "I wear castoffs from my mother and sister-in-law."

Each month she paid $54 to get food stamps that bought her $94 worth of commodities. She echoed a familiar complaint about the food stamp program—instead of providing enough food to last a month, the supply ran out in about two weeks. Fortunately two of the children were getting free lunches in school, she said.

The rent was $23 a month, plus $1.20 for extra utilities and 50 cents for "pest control." The baby's diapers required "decent soap", and there were pencils and crayons to be bought for the three daughters of school age. There were only two beds; the three girls, Mrs. Gutierrez explained, "slept crosswise" on one.

In worse plight was a Mrs. Espinosa, found with 10 children in another tiny flat. She, too, was getting the maximum $123 monthly welfare payment, out of which she had to invest $58 to get $128 worth of food stamps and pay $39 rent. That left only $26 for all other expenses. The family subsisted mainly on tortillas and beans. Three of the children had no shoes.

Nothing infuriates a Mexican-American more than to have some Anglo suggest to him that all his troubles would vanish if he would only stop eating beans and tortillas and get on a "balanced diet."

"If you have one dollar," explained Father Ruiz patiently, "and you can buy either one pound of meat or 10 pounds of pinto beans, what are you going to buy? You are going to fill the stomachs of your kids with beans. And they call this ignorance!

"I'd like to meet the home economist who says you can take care of 10 kids on $123 a month! It would take a genius to survive on that amount of money."

He said he had been asked to appear on a television show called "Buen Apetito", an educational program intended to get Mexicans off starch. He had told the producers that the idea was preposterous: the poor simply did not have the means to buy the "balanced" foods.

Downtown, Albert A. Pena Jr., a Mexican-American member of the Bexar (San Antonio) County Commission, said he believed there were "100,000 hungry people" in Bexar (pronounced Bear) which has a population of about 800,000 (48 per cent Mexican-American, 40 per cent Anglo, 12 per cent Negro).

They are hungry, he said, because San Antonio is "a cheap-labor town—about one-third of the wage earners earn less than the accepted poverty level of $3,000 a year."

CITES MEXICAN PRIDE

Yet Anglos, he said, cling to the myth best expressed last year by a state welfare official: "You can give a Mexican mother a bushel of money and she'll still feed her children beans and tortillas."

"This is a base canard and he knows it," Commissioner Pena said.

Many Mexican-Americans are too proud to admit they cannot feed their children properly, Father Ruiz explained, and are bruised by the coldness of welfare personnel. So "cells" have been set up in the housing project to detect and report families in trouble. Rummage sales and bingo parties are held to assist the unfortunate.

Texas was the first state to complete a nutrition study of its low-income population for a national survey by the United States Public Health Service.

The findings confirmed the presence of serious malnutrition among the Mexican-American, Anglo-American and Negro poor.

In the lower Rio Grande Valley, the investigators discovered an infant suffering from marasmus and another afflicted with what Dr. William M. McGanity, one of the directors of the survey, called "pre-kwashiorkor."

The findings of malnutrition and of evidence of growth retardation among children gave some substance to an earlier report by Dr. Francis J. Pierce of the eating habits of low-income families in San Antonio.

Dr. Peirce, who is an associate professor at the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake College, directed a staff of students and faculty in interviews with 967 adults and 561 children, most of them Mexican-Americans.

The findings were somber. Of the children studied, 272, or nearly half, were judged as having an inadequate diet. A total of 650, or 67 per cent of the adults, had inadequate food intake in the 24 hours preceding the interview.

Some critics challenged the validity of Dr. Peirce's survey. Dr. Peirce said he had "great conviction" that it was reliable.

He was pleased that the preliminary report of the National Nutrition Survey tended to support his bleak picture of diet inadequacy. But he said he was disturbed by a tendency to "explain away" the exposed malnutrition as the product of "ignorance."

"Let's face it," he said. "People are hungry because they are poor."

On the windswept Navajo reservation, Indians are suffering the traumas of converting from a pastoral living to a cash economy. Traditionally, the Navajos have been sheep and goat herders. But the land is arid ("it takes 10 lousy acres to graze one sheep," Dr. Van Duzen explained) and the population has grown so rapidly that most Indians can no longer live on goats and sheep.

POVERTY SEEMS TO DEEPEN

Efforts to bring industry have had minimal success, providing a few hundred jobs, mostly for women. For most of the population poverty seems to have deepened. The average Navajo sees about $400 in cash a year, including welfare payments. Dr. Van Duzen said there were many families with no visible income who were kept alive by charity from their clan.

"I'm not saying Navajos are dropping dead of starvation," she said, "but there is hunger—and it shouldn't happen in the United States."

In the children's ward, Dr. Van Duzen observed Navajo infants who she feared had suffered irreversible brain damage from undernourishment. The babies were gaining weight, but some still showed growth retardation. Dr. Van Duzen noted a three-month-old baby described as "marasmic," whose flesh hung loose, like an old man's skin, on pathetically thin arms and legs.

She said she was convinced that many were permanently stunted by hunger.

"Some say these are small little kids that won't grow because they are Navajos," she said. "I say these are small little kids that won't grow because they haven't got food."

At Many Farms, Dr. Robert Roessel, Jr., president of Navajo Community College, the

reservation's first junior college, called malnutrition one of the most acute obstacles for Indian children in classrooms.

ATTENTION LIMITED

"They look weak and gaunt to begin with," he said. "Their attention span is abnormally limited."

He charged that some public school superintendents prided themselves on virtually eliminating free lunches for Indian children. They did this, he said, on the mistaken notion that they were "teaching the Navajos responsibility and helping the children adjust to the world in which they live." But they were driving away Indian children unable to pay $1.50 a week for lunches, he said.

The community college is the first reservation school with an all-Indian school board. Six board members have never been to school and the seventh has only a second-grade education. Yet Dr. Roessel said the involvement of Indian parents in the operation of the school had eliminated so many tensions and hostilities that the students were already showing marked improvement in achievement rates.

Impoverished Navajos, he said, received free food under the commodities distribution program. But the commodities available were "woefully inadequate" and "didn't begin to meet the need."

At Window Rock, capital of the Navajo nation, Dr. Bock, the health service director, spoke of some of the difficulties of administering health over the vast reservation with a small, overworked staff.

THIRTY-MILE WALK WITH BABY

He told of a woman who had walked 30 miles from her hogan, the traditional circular hut made of cedar logs and mud, to the nearest traveled road, carrying a sick baby.

He had been urging the training of at least 110 Navajos as local health aides who would teach certain basic health practices and principles to the Indians of their localities. Funds for the project had finally been allocated, he said, but only for the training of 35 to 40 Indians.

Dr. Bock mentioned one promising development—the provision, since Christmas, of supplementary rations for infants and pregnant or lactating mothers who obviously were malnourished. Doctors were authorized to fill out prescriptions for food, he explained, just as though they were issuing prescriptions for medicine.

And the Office of Economic Opportunity has provided $42,000 for the purchase of a special baby formula fortified with Vitamins A, C and D, niacin, riboflavin, thiamin, calcium, phosphorus, and iron to be given to premature babies.

Unfortunately a year's supply of the formula costs $308, so only about 130 infants, or just about half of the 250 to 300 premature babies born each year on the Navajo reservation, will be taken care of.

CHURCH RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ adopted a resolution on Vietnam. The resolution began by expressing general support for the emphasis the President placed on peace in his inaugural address. Then it added four suggestions:

First. Negotiation, "unilaterally if necessary," with the North Vietnamese.

Second. The start of troop withdrawals, "with or without the consent of the Saigon government."

Third. Active participation of divergent groups in South Vietnamese politics.

Fourth. Use of multilateral channels for Vietnam's postwar reconstruction.

All these points, Mr. Speaker, are worth the consideration of our Members. Therefore, I place the full resolution at this point in the RECORD:

We welcome the emphasis which President Nixon placed on the attainment of peace in his inaugural address. We believe he was accurate in stating that because the people want peace and the leaders are afraid of war, "the times are on the side of peace," and that America now has "the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil."

The acclaim given at home and abroad to the President's peace theme shows the widespread support he has to move forward in the "era of negotiation." We join in that support and urge prompt action in the most pressing of the negotiations, namely, those dealing with Vietnam.

While the talks continue in Paris, violence and suffering continue in Vietnam itself. We cry out in anguish over each day of delay. We deplore the continued destruction of the Vietnamese people, their children, their land, their culture as well as the loss of American lives. This level of violence is detrimental to peaceful settlement.

We wish to add to our general support for the President, these specific suggestions:

First. Negotiate, unilaterally if necessary, with the North Vietnamese. It is with Hanoi that agreement must be sought for the withdrawal of troops. We believe our Government has been unduly deterred by the footdragging of the Saigon Government. They are the beneficiaries of tremendous American sacrifices, but it is not for them to decide how and when the U.S. reduces its efforts there. It is important to recognize the self-interest of Saigon officials in the U.S. presence, and realize that the U.S. must make its judgment independently.

Second. Begin troop withdrawal, with or without the consent of the Saigon government. We believe a significant consensus has been reached in this country favoring a de-escalation in Vietnam, and the beginning of withdrawal of U.S. troops. We share this conviction. This means that the U.S. Government should notify the Saigon Government immediately of this intention in order to give it opportunity and time to adjust itself to the new realities, and if it wishes, to make accommodation or arrangements for internal peace with the divergent forces within South Vietnam. Time is short. These arrangements should be concluded without further delay.

Third. Work for the active participation of all divergent groups in the South Vietnamese political arena. We believe our government should strongly recommend to the Saigon Government that political prisoners be released from jail. Many persons in South Vietnam are represented by neither the National Liberation Front nor the Thieu Government. It is quite likely that only these people in a "third force" can bring stability to that unhappy country by providing a catalyst around which the divergent elements in the population can form a viable government. And it is quite possible that any future economic aid the U.S. might give would be wasted unless a broad national government can be established which should include representation of diverse interests, not excluding the National Liberation Front.

Fourth. Use multi-lateral channels for the post-war reconstruction of all Vietnam. We dare not forget that when the killing has stopped and the immediate suffering has been mitigated, the road to reconciliation is long and the task of reconstruction is massive. We urge the President and Congress to offer ample resources, working through multi-lateral channels, to press forward with haste to bind up the wounds of all the peoples of Vietnam.

With this statement of support and recommendation, we wish the President Godspeed in his quest for peace.

CANAL ZONE WINNER OF VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars sponsors a Voice of Democracy contest. This year's theme was "Freedom's Challenge" and over 400,000 students participated in the contest.

The winner from each State and the Canal Zone is brought to Washington for the final competition and will attend the congressional dinner to be held on March 4.

It is my privilege to include in the Extensions of Remarks, the speech of the winner from the Canal Zone, Miss Leslie Marek, which presents some thought-provoking facts:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE: THE FIELDS

One bright April morning I set out to explore my surroundings. After an exhausting walk, I reached the crest of a hill. Looking down, I marveled at what I saw. Below me were three fields. The first field was parched and looked as though it had been subjected to drought for several months. Nothing was growing on it but a few weeds which needed little moisture to survive. Crows were hovering over this area in search of the tiniest morsel of food, and, although only a minority were finding something to satisfy their hunger, all of the birds still remained. I couldn't understand this and wondered why they did not seek greener pastures. It was as if there was something present which was preventing them from searching elsewhere. A few of the crows were quarreling over a seed with the smaller bird. Moments later, the little bird, his hunger still with him, flew away. Turning my head, I gazed upon the second field. It had a crop of golden wheat growing on it. At first glance, it appeared to be a very healthy crop. Upon closer observation, however, I noted that each stalk of wheat was surrounded by weeds which were interfering with the growth of the grain. Already some of the wheat was drooping and withered. The thin stalks with so little strength and defense against the weeds, held themselves proudly until they could no longer fight and sadly surrendered to their victors. It was almost high noon, time for me to return home. I faced the third field. Its soil was a rich brown and freshly plowed. Sprouts of wheat were pushing up from the soil. I pondered, "Will this field be faced with drought, invasion by a large population of crows, or destroyed by aggressive weeds?" Slowly walking down the hill, I realized that each person in his own way is a farmer. His crop is freedom, and he must work for this crop and the field on which it is grown if he desires a bountiful harvest year after year. He must first "plow the fields" to prepare himself for freedom and then plant the seeds. How well the farmer cultivates these

seeds depends on his character. If he is willing to risk things dear to him and weather the droughts even though the disappointments be great, then his harvest will be rewarding. The two greatest threats to the crop of the freedom farmer are:

(1) Communist aggression, and

(2) The increasing poverty all over the world which has created bitter feelings between those who have and those who have not, and served as a breeding ground for widespread disease and illiteracy.

I returned to the hill some weeks later only to find that the crows still hovered over the drought stricken land and the weeds still choked the wheat stalks of the second field. The green sprouts of the third field were now stalks of wheat. It was a very still day and the sun was beating down on the wheat. As I departed, I noticed a stalk of wheat entangled with a weed and drooping, and heard the caw of an approaching crow.

FLIGHT 1969

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege during the month of January to attend a district meeting of the American Legion Auxiliary and there listen to a prayer in the nature of an invocation, by Mrs. Scott Wilson, of Kansas City, Mo. This invocation impressed me so much at the time that I requested a copy be forwarded to our office in order that I might share it with my colleagues and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The weather has been so bad in Missouri that the next district meeting was canceled. For that reason, the exact wording of the invocation did not reach my office until a few days ago.

Yet even in the middle of February, the consideration of thoughts on the good human characteristics as well as human frailties, such as procrastination, prejudices, excess mental baggage, chips on the shoulder, and an attitude of humility, all of which are contained in this prayer, deserve to be printed regardless of date. After all, if New Year's resolutions are worth anything in January they should be worth just as much in February. The invocation follows:

FLIGHT 1969

The airport terminal was crowded. It was my annual flight. Often as I had made it, the thrill of adventure, of expectancy was still there in spite of a half-bored anxiety as to how it would come out. I always felt a little afraid. What did this flight hold for me? With mixed emotions I waited for my luggage to be weighed. "Your bags are very much overweight." The extremely courteous voice was apologetic, almost as if he felt sorry for me. "That's all right," I smiled at him. "I'm used to overweight, I'll pay the charges." "I'm sorry," he said, "this time you cannot pay. The flight is crowded. You'll have to reduce your luggage." "That is impossible. It contains only the things with which I always travel." "It will have to be done," he said, and shoved it towards me. "The stewardess will help you." Already my bags were being opened and a hand was rummaging through them. "This is quite heavy," the stewardess said, taking out a big bundle. "These old prejudices have outlived their usefulness. We will throw them away." Into a large receptacle marked "useless" went my prejudices of other days which through the years I had so carefully hoarded. "What ever can this be?" The stewardess was drawing out a big package from the bottom of the bag. "I do declare," she said as she untied the bows of ribbon that I had tried to make attractive, "it is full of 'put-offs.'" "'Put-offs?'" I said, quite puzzled. "Yes, 'put-offs,' all the things you meant to do, letters to write, friends to call, cheery words to speak, and thoughtful attention to bestow. My, my, how did you ever accumulate so much?" Without waiting for my answer, she tossed the whole package, ribbon and all, into a basket marked "too late" and picked up another bundle. "This rattles," she said. "Must be chips you have carried on your shoulder for a long time." She tossed them into the open fire, and up in smoke went by pet grievances. "This is heavy." The stewardess was holding a brightly colored bottle, filled with a dark, heavy liquid. "That," I said with dignity, "is my precious bottle of pride. It perfumes my personality. I'll keep it, please." I held out my hand. "No." The voice was stern. "Its odor is obnoxious. I shall break it." The bottle crashed to the floor, and through my tears I saw its contents ooze away. "Come," the voice was kind again, "your flight is almost ready. I will help you repack. Here, where you had prejudices we will tuck in opportunity. It doesn't weigh anything and fresh supplies are always at hand. New ideas are so wonderful with which to experiment. At the bottom of your bag where you had 'put-offs' we will pack a whole tray of kindness and put them on top for convenience. We'll not bother with fancy bows of excuses, they only add to the weight. In place of shoulder chips, which must have been very uncomfortable to wear, we will put pads of love and understanding. They give perfect contour to the shoulders. Garments worn over them have a beauty that can never be surpassed." Over the loud speaker came a voice, "light 1-9-6-9 Now Loading." I snapped my bag shut. "I am sorry about the bottle of pride," the stewardess said. "It was quite necessary to break it. In its place I have given you the golden bottle of humility, let its mist surround you and you will walk in the aroma of loveliness." "Flight 1-9-6-9, All Passengers Aboard."

The plane lifted and I was away on my flight of 365 days. Old inhibitions dropped away as the ground receded. I settled into my seat and smiled at my fellow passengers. It was going to be a good flight. The flight of 1969. I was going into it with no excess baggage.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA MARKS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the University of Nebraska, which has contributed much to Nebraska and the American way of life, celebrated its 100th birthday on February 15.

As the university moved toward the close of its 100th year, there was a flurry of activity highlighted by selection of its chancellor, Clifford M. Hardin, to be Secretary of Agriculture, and establishment of the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Though the December appointment of Chancellor Hardin by President Nixon provided exciting moments in the university's continuing history, perhaps no date will be more important than July 1, 1968. It was on that date that the former Municipal University of Omaha, my alma mater, became the University of Nebraska at Omaha in an impressive ceremony on a midsummer morning.

This added more than 10,000 students and new vistas of academic and service opportunities to the University. As classes began last fall, one of every two students attending college in Nebraska was enrolled at the University. Total enrollment reached 29,812 with 19,024 on the Lincoln campuses and at the Medical Center in Omaha and 10,788 at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the University of Nebraska and its accomplishment in its first 100 years. I am certain the next century will find it contributing even more to Nebraska and this Nation of ours.

I commend the following article on the University of Nebraska, which appeared in the February 9 issue of the Omaha World-Herald Magazine of the Midlands to the attention of my colleagues:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA: MANY THINGS TO MANY PEOPLE

On a crisp autumn Saturday afternoon, many people may think of the University of Nebraska in terms of a group of healthy young men in scarlet and cream uniforms upholding the prestige of the state before 66 thousand screaming football fans.

But for a housewife, the university is a place to write seeking information on how to bake a better cherry pie.

For the farmer, N.U. offers an opportunity to learn more about the performance of a certain make of tractor in the field under conditions of stress.

And for a small boy with an inquisitive mind, Nebraska's major institution of higher learning may open the door to a world of physics or engineering.

The University of Nebraska means many things to many people. But just how did the "home of the Cornhuskers" become what it is today—an institution where some 30 thousand young people are savoring the fruits of knowledge?

The university is celebrating its one-hundredth birthday next Saturday, but in the minds of the pioneer settlers—men and women who were thinking of education almost as they sought food and shelter—the university goes back even farther. It was in the mid-1800's—while Nebraska was still a territory—that talk about a state university first began.

In 1855, in his first speech to the first Territorial Legislature, meeting in Omaha, Acting Gov. T. W. Cuming made an impassioned plea for higher education.

At Cuming's urging, the Legislature chartered Nebraska University at Fontanelle and two other institutions in Omaha City and Nebraska City.

Bitten by the education bug, the lawmakers in the next few years approved no less than 24 universities and colleges. One was approved without designation of a site, which led a state senator to declare: "The Nebraska University system apparently is on wheels."

Although nothing came of these early decisions, they were the opening wedge that led Senator Cunningham of Richardson County to introduce a bill on February 11, 1869, which called for the creation of what today still is THE University of Nebraska.

After discussion in both Senate and House—Nebraska until 1937 had a two-house Legislature—the legislation passed on February 15, 1869—the final day of the session. It was sent to Gov. David Butler, who im-

mediately signed the bill into law. Thus next Saturday, February 15, 1969, will mark the Centennial of the signing.

As approved, the act provided: "That there shall be established in this state an institution under the name and style of 'The University of Nebraska.' The object of such institution shall be to afford to the inhabitants of the state the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of literature, science and the arts."

The university's charter provided for these departments or colleges: ancient and modern languages, mathematics and natural science, agriculture, law, medicine, practical science, mechanics and civil engineering. A College of Fine Arts was to be established when the annual income of the university reached 100 thousand dollars.

At first, there were 12 regents—nine selected by the Legislature, plus the Chancellor, the Governor and the superintendent of public instruction. In 1875, when a new State Constitution was written, the size of the Board of Regents was reduced to six, all elected by direct vote. Last fall, a Constitutional amendment was approved which authorizes the Legislature to increase the board's size and to provide for redistricting.

The act establishing Lincoln as the site for the State Capitol also provided for the location of the university in Lincoln.

Some 12 acres on the northern part of the city plot were selected. As one editor of the day put it: "The site must have been selected blindfolded. No angel whispered to them of seats of learning set upon hills. The gentle slopes of this Antelope Creek valley (now southeast Lincoln) were ignored and a site bordering the Salt Creek valley and inevitably in the path of railroads (then imminent) was chosen."

The Legislature authorized 100 thousand dollars, a princely sum, for the first university building. From the very start of construction this structure was the center of a fight involving politicians, architects and educators.

First, a contract calling for an expenditure of $128,480 was approved—more than 25 per cent higher than had been authorized. This brought editorial criticism. Next, before any student was authorized to set foot inside the doors of University Hall, the cry was raised that the building was unsafe.

Repairs were made and, finally, on September 7, 1871, the university opened with an enrollment of 20 collegiate students and one hundred in the Latin School. The state of Nebraska had a university! But rumors continued that the building was insecure. More architects were called to examine the foundations.

Finally, a new foundation was ordered. Foundation walls, as they were torn out, were scrutinized by an architect under the direction of Attorney General J. R. Webster, who reported that the foundation, indeed, had not been built in accordance with the specifications.

But controversy over the safety of the university's one and only building wasn't the sole problem confronting the first Chancellor, A. R. Benton, who came to Lincoln from Alliance, O., where he had served as president of Butler College. There was the matter of his salary. The agreed-upon sum was five thousand dollars, but shortly after he reported for duty it was reduced to four thousand.

Chancellor Benton, in his inaugural address, told Nebraskans: "You have a right to expect constant progress, enlargement, improvement; but we cannot spring into being with the prestige and accumulated resources of some of the other universities at the waving of any magic wand, however potent."

What brought the biggest trouble to Chancellor Benton was not U-Hall or his pay, but his demand for compulsory attendance by students at the daily chapel and Sunday church services. This was the start of difficulties that resulted in his decision in 1876 to leave Nebraska.

Oddly, in view of the heat of the church-vs.-state arguments, the regents chose another churchman to succeed Dr. Benton. He was Dr. Edmund B. Fairfield, who served six years.

Like Dr. Benton, he was caught in the middle between those faculty members who wanted the university to be free of religious influence and, on the other side, the strong moralists. Dr. Fairfield and four of the liberal professors resigned in protest.

Despite its early setbacks, the university was growing and making progress. A graduate program, first west of the Mississippi, was started in 1885, and the Graduate School was established in 1896. Four years later, as the Twentieth Century dawned, Nebraska had granted 131 Masters' Degrees and nine Doctor of Philosophy Degrees.

By 1905 it was apparent that a bigger campus was needed. There was talk of abandoning the "town campus," or what is known today as the Lincoln City Campus, and consolidating all functions of the university at the College of Agriculture campus—identified today as East Campus.

At about the same time there arose talk that an effort would be made to move the university to Omaha. This created fears among Lincoln business men that their No. 1 industry would be lost forever to the state's fastest growing and largest city. This move was squelched.

In 1913, the Legislature asked Nebraska voters to decide whether to move everything to the Ag Campus (except the College of Medicine, which had finally re-opened in 1902 in Omaha), or to maintain two campuses in Lincoln.

Voters approved the dual-campus system, and also okayed a six-year special mill levy for construction, thereby setting the stage for development under a system that remained unchanged until the former Municipal University of Omaha was merged with the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

In the years preceding the 1913 vote, the university was fortunate to have one of its most effective leaders. He was Chancellor E. Benjamin Andrews, a former history professor at Brown University, who served from 1900 to 1908. During his eight years, enrollment increased from 22 hundred to 36 hundred. The faculty increased from fewer than one hundred to more than 350, and legislation appropriations rose from 450 thousand dollars in his first biennium to more than $1,300,000 in his last.

Despite his ability to increase financial support for the university, Chancellor Andrews refused to seek money for himself. The regents offered to raise his salary. He turned it down, explaining: "As the university is compelled to the rigid economy it now exercises, so must I turn down this offer."

The next Chancellor, Dr. Samuel Avery, held the post longer than any other—19 years, from 1908 to 1927. It was during his tenure that the present physical appearance of the university took shape: Teachers College, Social Sciences, Andrews and Bessey Halls, the Coliseum and Memorial Stadium went up.

Dr Avery started the university's Extension Service, which now circles the globe. He was an ardent sports fan, and football during his tenure became big time and attracted new support to the university's functions.

In the depression years of the 1930's, the University of Nebraska, like all institutions—private as well as public—experienced lean days. Serving during this period of economic strife was Dr. E. A. Burnett.

One thing about Dr. Burnett, noted a Lincoln attorney, "He looks like a chancellor!"

History scholar C. S. Boucher succeeded Burnett, and one of his first assignments was to complete the conversion of the old privately-operated university School of Music to a university department and put it on a sound academic footing. He succeeded in the transition, but some of the music teachers and alumni of the old conservatory never forgave him.

World War II came just as the university was recovering from the double blows of drought and depression. Enrollment in 1945 dropped to a low of 3,262 students, of whom 2,045 were women.

During the war, the brand new Love Library served as a barracks for members of the Army Specialized Training Corps, just as the then-new Social Science Building had doubled as a mustering-out station for World War I soldiers in 1918.

In 1946, the regents selected as Chancellor Dr. R. G. Gustavson, a nationally-known chemist from the University of Chicago and Colorado U. Big, burly Gustavson (he didn't look like a chancellor) helped the institution through a trying experience—the educating of World War II veterans who flooded the campus financed by the G.I. Bill of Rights.

During this period, the university's physical plant was overcrowded, its faculty too small for the number of students seeking an education, and yet, some observers call this the university's finest hour. Certainly the veterans were serious students who knew what they wanted and were willing to work to achieve their goals. It was at this time that the married student—heretofore a relative rarity—became commonplace.

Dr. Clifford M. Hardin was hired away from Michigan State University, where he was dean of the College of Agriculture. He assumed the chancellorship on July 1, 1954, and departed last month under a year's leave of absence to become Secretary of Agriculture in the Nixon Administration. During his absence, Dr. Merk Hobson is serving as acting chancellor.

In Dr. Hardin's 14½ years, the University of Nebraska has experienced its largest building drive and enrollment increase in its history.

Last year, a new campus was added to the system when voters in Omaha approved the NU–OU merger.

Since its founding, the University of Nebraska has granted degrees to 82,837 students. Its physical plant is valued at $134,900,000, excluding the UN–O campus, which is valued at $11,025,000.

It is the thirtieth largest university system in the nation in enrollment, serving not only residents of Nebraska but of the other 49 states and many foreign countries. Its full-time faculty, exclusive of medicine, dentistry and UN–O, is 940.

Working with Federal funds, the university helped establish Ataturk University in Turkey and is currently helping the Government of Columbia set up a new program of agricultural education and development.

Looking back on the University of Nebraska after its first one hundred years, it would seem that the prediction of J. Sterling Morton of Nebraska City has more than come true. Morton, a leading citizen of the state who served in President Grover Cleveland's Administration as Secretary of Agriculture, prophesied:

"To graduate from the University of Nebraska shall be an honor among her people even now, and the day is not distant when her diploma shall be set at par with those of Yale, Union, Harvard and other great universities all over the world of art and literature."

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI

The musical strains of "Dear Old Nebraska U." bring to their feet more than 70 thousand alumni, the great majority of whom have made their homes and built their careers in the Cornhusker state.

On its rolls of persons who received degrees from the University of Nebraska or

qualify as alumni because of attendance for two or more semesters, the Nebraska Alumni Association lists more than 41 thousand current residents of the state, engaged in the events of every Nebraska county and community.

With these statistics in mind, it should be noted that the university is engaged in a three-fold mission: to teach, to conduct research in quest of additional knowledge and to serve the state by disseminating information and making available its unique facilities for the benefit of all citizens.

And by fulfilling this mission, the university has been carrying out, over many years, its most important function, developing people—people educated and trained in the skills that sustain and enhance the lives of all.

Since its founding a century ago, the University of Nebraska has awarded 82,837 degrees, and thousands of other men and women who haven't sought degrees have taken varying amounts of academic work on the N.U. campuses and in their home communities.

The impact of these people, whose lives have been touched and influenced by this university, is felt throughout Nebraska and the nation.

In Nebraska particularly, the impact of N.U. alumni is noticeable on the professions. For instance, 937 of the state's approximately 17 hundred physicians are graduates of the university's College of Medicine. More than half of these Nebraska-trained doctors practice in cities and towns outside Lincoln and Omaha.

Official directories of the legal profession list 1,264 attorneys in Nebraska, and three-fourths of them are graduates of the University of Nebraska College of Law. In addition to private practice, these law graduates serve as judges, county and city attorneys and fill many voluntary civic positions. Five of the seven justices of the Nebraska Supreme Court are university alumni.

The College of Dentistry has supplied more than half of the state's 750 practicing dentists, and the College of Pharmacy about 450 of the state's 1,181 registered pharmacists.

A large portion of Nebraska's leaders in the vital fields of agriculture, agri-business, agricultural sciences and services have received their training at N.U. Three-fourths of the county and area agricultural and home economics extension agents who work directly with Nebraska's farmers and homemakers are alumni.

Ten of Nebraska's Governors—George L. Sheldon, Adam McMullen, Arthur J. Weaver, Robert Leroy Cochran, Dwight Griswold, Val Peterson, Victor E. Anderson, Ralph G. Brooks, Frank B. Morrison and Norbert T. Tiemann—are counted among university alumni.

Twenty-three of the 49 members of the current Legislature are also Nebraska alumni.

Through the years the university has produced men and women of national prominence. Great alumni of the past have included Roscoe Pound, a world renowned authority on jurisprudence, and his sister, Louise Pound, an author; Willa Cather and Mari Sandoz, whose writings reflected Nebraska pioneer spirit; Dwight Griswold, Governor, Senator and chief of a post-war American Aid Mission to Greece, and the late Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the giant General Electric Corporation.

More familiar today are national figures as Herbert Brownell, former United States Attorney General; entertainer Johnny Carson; Senator Carl T. Curtis, Dr. Walter Judd, former Congressman, missionary, physician and lecturer; Mick Tingelhoff, all-star center for the professional football Minnesota Vikings; Ted Sorensen, former aid to President John F. Kennedy, and Wyoming Governor Stanley Hathaway.

And there are hundreds of others who may not have received such wide national public notice but who have accomplished great things, such as Myers Bud Cather, president of Bristol-Myers; Dr. George Beadle, former president of the University of Chicago and Nobel Prize winner in chemistry; Air Force Lieut. Gen. Earl Hedlund; Dr. Carruth J. Wagner, assistant surgeon general of the United States; Wayne Reed, associate commissioner of the United States Office of Education; Harold Edgerton, professor at MIT and developer of stroboscopic light, and Howard Hansen, composer, conductor and teacher at Eastman School of Music.

In addition, there are thousands of university alumni who fill positions at all levels throughout the society of this state.

Such men as Edward Lyman of Omaha, president of the United States National Bank; Thomas C. Woods of Lincoln, president of the Lincoln Telephone and Telegraph Company; George B. Cook of Lincoln, president of Bankers Life of Nebraska; Carl Olson of Lincoln, president of Olson Construction Company; William Gangel of Columbus, manager of Becton-Dickinson plants in the state, and his brother, Robert Gangel of Nebraska City, head of a tire and recapping company, and Harold W. Andersen of Omaha, president of the World Publishing Company, which publishes The World-Herald. They are a few among the many major leaders in Nebraska's growing business and industrial community.

Nebraska alumni like Dr. Frank H. Tanner of Lincoln, president of the Nebraska State Medical Association; Dr. Harold Helweg of Lincoln, president-elect of the Nebraska Dental Association; Charles S. Adams of Aurora, president of the Nebraska State Bar Association, and Merle Jansen of Columbus, president-elect of the Professional Engineers of Nebraska, are leaders among professionals in this state.

N.U. graduates hold the top administrative post in more than 60 per cent of Nebraska's school districts, including the largest, Omaha, where Dr. Owen Knutzen is superintendent.

Agricultural and agri-business leaders include Don Magdanz of Omaha, executive secretary of the National Livestock Feeders Association; Roland Nelson of Mead, president of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation; Albert Ebers of Seward, master of the Nebraska Grange, and Howard Elm of Lincoln, president of the Nebraska Fertilizer Institute and executive secretary of the Nebraska Grain and Feed Dealers Association.

Certainly not all University of Nebraska graduates are company presidents, community leaders, physicians, bankers, lawyers or engineers.

Thousands fill less exhalted roles as accountants, farmers, teachers, nurses, journalists, salesmen, clerks, secretaries, social workers, housewives and many others.

Despite the differences in opportunity or accomplishment, they have much in common—excellent training in the field they chose, an opportunity to make continuing contributions to the society of Nebraska and the nation and they all rise at the playing of "Dear Old Nebraska U."

HUNGER IN AMERICA—PART IV

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the fourth article in a series on "Hunger in America" by Homer Bigart appeared in the February 19 issue of the New York Times. In the article Mr. Bigart vividly portrays the wretched living conditions of many Mexican-American and Indian citizens in the Southwest.

He draws attention to the need to increase food stamp programs to levels that will adequately provide for a family's nutritional needs, a need to which I hope those responsible for this program in the Department of Agriculture will respond. The conditions Mr. Bigart describes makes it clear that present food programs must be expanded if relief is to be provided to those millions of citizens who continue to suffer from the plague of hunger and malnutrition.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1969]

HUNGER IN AMERICA: MEXICANS AND INDIANS ITS STOICAL VICTIMS—IV

(By Homer Bigart)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—Tacked on the wall of the Inner City Apostolate were four new slips from hungry Mexican-American families asking for food.

The Rev. Ralph H. Ruiz, who runs the mission for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio, glanced at the slips and exclaimed angrily: "The whole welfare system in Texas stinks."

The mission is on the fringe of Alazan-Apache Courts, the city's oldest public housing project, where some 6,000 Mexican-Americans live in wretched poverty and frequent hunger. Of all the nation's ethnic groups—white, black, brown or red—the "Mexicanos" are suspected by nutritionists of being most vulnerable to hunger.

For although there are nearly five million of them scattered through the Southwest, the Mexican-Americans have generally been undemonstrative about their misery, complaining so seldom of empty stomachs that the "Anglos" (the non-Mexican whites) give them scant attention. "Brown Power" has not yet taken to the streets of San Antonio.

Hungrier even than the Mexican-Americans, but less obtrusive because they are smaller in number and confined mainly to isolated wastelands, are the reservation Indians. Of the more than 300,000 Indians living on reservations by far the largest tribe is the Navajo of northeastern Arizona. Altogether, 115,000 Navajos exist on an arid plateau bigger than the whole state of West Virginia.

THE LAST FRONTIER

The western half of this remote region, the state's last frontier, was not opened up by roads until about 13 years ago. Even today there are Navajos who live 50 miles from the nearest improved road. Last year 20 infants were brought in dead at medical stations, according to Dr. George E. Bock, the United States Public Health Service medical director, and 18 of those deaths were attributable to delay in reaching medical aid.

At Tuba City, administrative center for the western half of the reservation, Dr. Jean Van Duzen, chief of pediatrics at the Indian Hospital, reported 27 cases of marasmus (calory starvation) and 17 cases of kwashiorkor (extreme protein deficiency) among Navajo children in the last five years. The high incidence of those two rarely found diseases would be considered fantastic anywhere else in the nation. Dr. Van Duzen said that 15 of the 44 victims died.

Among Mexican-Americans in the slums of San Antonio the ravages of hunger may be less spectacular but more degrading. Father Ruiz said Mexican-Americans found the welfare apparatus unbearably cold and inhuman.

Father Ruiz's irritation with Texas welfare was mainly a recent lowering of the ceiling on monthly welfare payments from $135, for a family of four or more, to $123.

"Texas is the only state, I believe, that requires legislation every time it wants to raise the level of welfare. A referendum to increase the payments was defeated last year. The cut was made because the increasing relief load threatened to exhaust the welfare appropriation. And now there is talk of another cut."

FOOD STAMPS RUN SHORT

He took a visitor on a tour of Alazan-Apache Courts, a sprawling expanse of low, concrete block buildings with small apartments. In one home, sparsely furnished but very clean, Mrs. Joanne Gutierrez told how she and her four children existed on $123-a-month welfare check.

"I buy no clothes for myself," she said. "I wear castoffs from my mother and sister-in-law."

Each month she paid $54 to get food stamps that bought her $94 worth of commodities. She echoed a familiar complaint about the food stamp program—instead of providing enough food to last a month, the supply ran out in about two weeks. Fortunately two of the children were getting free lunches in school, she said.

The rent was $23 a month, plus $1.20 for extra utilities and 50 cents for "pest control." The baby's diapers required "decent soap", and there were pencils and crayons to be bought for the three daughters of school age. There were only two beds; the three girls, Mrs. Gutierrez explained, "slept crosswise" on one.

In worse plight was a Mrs. Espinosa, found with 10 children in another tiny flat. She, too, was getting the maximum $123 monthly welfare payment, out of which she had to invest $58 to get $128 worth of food stamps and pay $39 rent. That left only $26 for all other expenses. The family subsisted mainly on tortillas and beans. Three of the children had no shoes.

Nothing infuriates a Mexican-American more than to have some Anglo suggest to him that all his troubles would vanish if he would only stop eating beans and tortillas and get on a "balanced diet."

"If you have one dollar," explained Father Ruiz patiently, "and you can buy either one pound of meat or 10 pounds of pinto beans, what are you going to buy? You are going to fill the stomachs of your kids with beans. And they call this ignorance!

"I'd like to meet the home economist who says you can take care of 10 kids on $123 a month! It would take a genius to survive on that amount of money."

He said he had been asked to appear on a television show called "Buen Apetito", an educational program intended to get Mexicans off starch. He had told the producers that the idea was preposterous: the poor simply did not have the means to buy the "balanced" foods.

Downtown, Albert A. Pena Jr., a Mexican-American member of the Bexar (San Antonio) County Commission, said he believed there were "100,000 hungry people" in Bexar (pronounced Bear) which has a population of about 800,000 (48 per cent Mexican-American, 40 per cent Anglo, 12 per cent Negro).

They are hungry, he said, because San Antonio is a "a cheap-labor town—about one-third of the wage earners earn less than the accepted poverty level of $3,000 a year."

CITES MEXICAN PRIDE

Yet Anglos, he said, cling to the myth best expressed last year by a state welfare official: "You can give a Mexican mother a bushel of money and she'll still feed her children beans and tortillas."

"This is a base canard and he knows it," Commissioner Pena said.

Many Mexican-Americans are too proud to admit they cannot feed their children properly. Father Ruiz explained, and are bruised by the coldness of welfare personnel. So "cells" have been set up in the housing project to detect and report families in trouble. Rummage sales and bingo parties are held to assist the unfortunate.

Texas was the first state to complete a nutrition study of its low-income population for a national survey by the United States Public Health Service.

The findings confirmed the presence of serious malnutrition among the Mexican-American, Anglo-American and Negro poor.

In the lower Rio Grande Valley, the investigators discovered an infant suffering from marasmus and another afflicted with what Dr. William M. McGanity, one of the directors of the survey, called "pre-kwashiorkor."

The findings of malnutrition and of evidence of growth retardation among children gave some substance to an earlier report by Dr. Francis J. Peirce of the eating habits of low-income families in San Antonio.

Dr. Peirce, who is an associate professor at the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake College, directed a staff of students and faculty in interviews with 967 adults and 561 children, most of them Mexican-Americans.

The findings were somber. Of the children studied, 272, or nearly half, were judged as having an inadequate diet. A total of 650, or 67 per cent of the adults, had inadequate food intake in the 24 hours preceding the interview.

Some critics challenged the validity of Dr. Peirce's survey. Dr. Peirce said he had "great conviction" that it was reliable.

He was pleased that the preliminary report of the National Nutrition Survey tended to support his bleak picture of diet inadequacy. But he said he was disturbed by a tendency to "explain away" the exposed malnutrition as the product of "ignorance."

"Let's face it," he said. "People are hungry because they are poor."

On the windswept Navajo reservation, Indians are suffering the traumas of converting from a pastoral living to a cash economy. Traditionally, the Navajos have been sheep and goat herders. But the land is arid ("It takes 10 lousy acres to graze one sheep," Dr. Van Duzen explained) and the population has grown so rapidly that most Indians can no longer live on goats and sheep.

POVERTY SEEMS TO DEEPEN

Efforts to bring industry have had minimal success, providing a few hundred jobs, mostly for women. For most of the population poverty seems to have deepened. The average Navajo sees about $400 in cash a year, including welfare payments. Dr. Van Duzen said there were many families with no visible income who were kept alive by charity from their clan.

"I'm not saying Navajos are dropping dead of starvation," she said, "but there is hunger—and it shouldn't happen in the United States."

In the children's ward, Dr. Van Duzen observed Navajo infants who she feared had suffered irreversible brain damage from undernourishment. The babies were gaining weight, but some still showed growth retardation. Dr. Van Duzen noted a three-month-old-baby described as "marasmic," whose flesh hung loose, like an old man's skin, on pathetically thin arms and legs.

She said she was convinced that many were permanently stunted by hunger.

"Some say there are small little kids that won't grow because they are Navajos," she said. "I say these are small little kids that won't grow because they haven't got food."

At Many Farms, Dr. Robert Roessel, Jr., president of Navajo Community College, the reservation's first junior college, called malnutrition one of the most acute obstacles for Indian children in classrooms.

ATTENTION LIMITED

"They look weak and gaunt to begin with," he said. "Their attention span is abnormally limited."

He charged that some public school superintendents prided themselves on virtually eliminating free lunches for Indian children. They did this, he said, on the mistaken notion that they were "teaching the Navajos responsibility and helping the children adjust to the world in which they live." But they were driving away Indian children unable to pay $1.50 a week for lunches, he said.

The community college is the first reservation school with an all-Indian school board. Six board members have never been to school and the seventh has only a second-grade education. Yet Dr. Roessel said the involvement of Indian parents in the operation of the school had eliminated so many tensions and hostilities that the students were already showing marked improvement in achievement rates.

Impoverished Navajos, he said, received free food under the commodities distribution program. But the commodities available were "woefully inadequate" and "didn't begin to meet the need."

At Window Rock, capital of the Navajo nation, Dr. Bock, the health service director, spoke of some of the difficulties of administering health over the vast reservation with a small, overworked staff.

THIRTY-MILE WALK WITH BABY

He told of a woman who had walked 30 miles from her hogan, the traditional circular hut made of cedar logs and mud, to the nearest traveled road, carrying a sick baby.

He had been urging the training of at least 110 Navajos as local health aides who would teach certain basic health practices and principles to the Indians of their localities. Funds for the project had finally been allocated, he said, but only for the training of 35 to 40 Indians.

Dr. Bock mentioned one promising development—the provision, since Christmas, of supplementary rations for infants and pregnant or lactating mothers who obviously were malnourished. Doctors were authorized to fill out prescriptions for food, he explained, just as though they were issuing prescriptions for medicine.

And the Office of Economic Opportunity has provided $42,000 for the purchase of a special baby formula fortified with Vitamins A, C and D, niacin, riboflavin, thiamin, calcium, phosphorous and iron to be given to premature babies.

Unfortunately a year's supply of the formula costs $308, so only about 130 infants, or just about half of the 250 to 300 premature babies born each year on the Navajo reservation, will be taken care of.

CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a Department of Consumer Affairs should be created to give the consumer permanent representation and protection.

As one of the cosponsors of legislation that would establish such a department on a Cabinet-level, and as a consumer, I believe that the rights of consumers have been long ignored. Unless a department is created, consumers will continue to be exploited. A separate department, however, would enable the Federal Government to concentrate on consumer problems and provide solutions through legislative action.

Until a Department of Consumer Affairs becomes a reality, I strongly believe that a consumer affairs consultant should serve the President on a full-time basis and should also be in a position to be completely independent of influence by firms that make consumer products.

Great progress was made in the 90th Congress under the vigorous and effective leadership of Miss Betty Furness, who was President Johnson's full-time consultant in consumer affairs. I hope

that such progress continues during the administration of President Nixon.

The remarkable consumer protection record achieved under the leadership of President Johnson and Miss Furness, will help millions of people because of:

Truth-in-lending; National Commission on Product Safety; fire research and safety; natural gas pipeline safety; flammable fabric improvements; wholesome meat; wholesome poultry; radiation control; an auto insurance study; and others.

Despite this notable record of accomplishment, much more remains to be done. Some of the areas include the providing of reliable electric power; wholesome fish; recreational boat safety; safe drinking water; and several others.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have been active—and still are—in providing the American people with the consumer protection they deserve. I believe, however, that one Member of this House deserves a special commendation for his deep interest, outstanding ability and strong leadership in the consumer protection field—the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

The consumers of America are grateful to him.

REDUCED FARES FOR PERSONS OVER 65

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my good friend and colleague, my neighbor from across the Hudson River (Mr. SCHEUER) in cosponsoring legislation to permit reduced fare for persons over 65 years of age.

This would permit seniors to receive the same reduced fares which are offered to servicemen and students.

Mr. Speaker, today the ravages of inflation have hit our senior citizens hard. Too many among this group live on small fixed incomes. Equally tragic is the fact that many older people live alone with their children married and raising their own children. And we are such a mobile society that often great distances separate parents from their children.

If we could make it just a little easier for parents to see their children and grandchildren would not this be a worthwhile endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, among our senior citizens the difference of a few dollars could mean a lot and a small discount might mean the reunion of loved ones. Could there be a more worthy cause than this? It is in our power, Mr. Speaker.

I commend the gentleman from New York who has been one of the most enthusiastic supporters of legislation to benefit senior citizens. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee and as principal sponsor of the Older Americans Act, I have become well aware of his interest in those Americans who have passed their 65th birthday. I hope all Members of this House will join with us in obtaining approval of this bill.

SENATE—*Friday, February 21, 1969*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick J. Ryan, major general, U.S. Army, retired, and former Chief of Chaplains, of Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Bless us, O Lord, as we assemble here today to honor the Father of our Country.

May the spirit of dedication, wisdom, courage, and statesmanship with which he was blessed continue with our beloved country.

He was brave in battle, humble in dealing with his fellowmen, opposed to tyranny, strong in his convictions, prudent in judgment, steadfast in danger, and patient in adversity.

His was a vigilant heart. He loved his country with a love second only to his love for God.

May this nobleness of spirit so completely demonstrated in the Father of our Country remain with us and inspire us to the ideals he so completely exemplified. Amen.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) to attend the Plenipotentiary Conference on Definitive Arrangements for the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium, to be held at Washington, D.C., from February 24 to March 21, 1969.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT—MESSAGES RECEIVED FROM THE PRESIDENT AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate sundry messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives, received on February 20, 1969, during the adjournment of the Senate, under the order of Wednesday, February 19, 1969, which, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

REPORT ON STUDY OF HEADSTART PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-75)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received on February 20, 1969, under authority of the order of the Senate of February 19, 1969, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 309 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the President to make a special study of whether responsibility for administering the Head Start program should be left with the Office of Economic Opportunity, or whether it should be delegated or transferred to another agency. Congress asked that a report of this study be submitted by March 1, 1969.

I am submitting the report herewith.

This report has been prepared in consultation with the heads of the Executive departments and agencies concerned.

The study concludes that Head Start should be delegated to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It leaves for later determination the question of whether the program should eventually be transferred. As I have indicated in a message to Congress today, I will present a set of recommendations before the end of the current fiscal year on a permanent status and organizational structure for the Office of Economic Opportunity. At that time, I will make a recommendation on whether Head Start should be transferred, or whether it should remain a delegated program.

Section 308 of the same Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the Commissioner of Education to make a special study of the means by which the existing Job Corps facilities and programs might, if determined feasible, be transferred to State or joint Federal-state operation. The Commissioner was directed to report his findings to Congress by March 1, 1969.

As my message today indicated, responsibility for administering the Job Corps will be delegated to the Department of Labor effective July 1. The question of State or joint Federal-state operation is a complex one which may well be affected by the over-all manpower-development proposals now being prepared by the Secretary of Labor. In light of these developments, and in order to comply with the intent of Congress, I have asked the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare, along with the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, and the Director of OEO, to work with the Acting Commissioner of Education in preparing a report responsive to the Congressional directive to be submitted at the earliest possible time. As directed by Congress, the Acting Commissioner will also consult with other Federal officials, with State officials and with concerned individuals.

In its request for these studies, I recognize the interest of Congress in a constant evaluation and review of the way in which new, experimental programs are being administered, and in the measurement of their results. I welcome that interest, I share it, and I will attempt to be responsive to it.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1969.*