

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CITIZENS OF UTICA, N.Y., HONOR
FRED J. PURCELL

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 20, I was privileged to participate in a community tribute to a very distinguished citizen. On that date the citizens of Utica, N.Y., honored Fred J. Purcell for his service to his fellow man.

Those of us who shared in saluting Mr. Purcell did so with mixed emotions. On the one hand we were pleased to evidence our appreciation for all that our honored guest had done for his community, the people with whom he had worked, and the projects with which he was identified. We also were happy for Mr. Purcell, because we knew how much his election as vice president of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers meant to him and his family.

On the other hand, we were admittedly somewhat sad, because we knew that the elevation of Mr. Purcell to new and more important responsibilities within his labor organization would require the Purcells to move on.

The realization that this able, civic-minded, dedicated Utican would no longer be available to assist with local projects had an impact on us all. A Fred J. Purcell does not come along everyday. As we listened to the many tributes to this outstanding individual we knew we were losing someone who had contributed so much to so many. The loss will not be easily overcome.

A review of Mr. Purcell's record of achievements makes it easy to understand why he is held in such high esteem by the people of Utica. The following brief biographical sketch from the souvenir program prepared especially for last Friday's testimonial dinner gives one a glimpse of a man and an indication of why he will be long remembered by those of us who proudly claim him as a friend. We wish him well in his new endeavor and we are confident that he will continue to distinguish himself as a dedicated, faithful, and energetic servant to his fellow man.

The biographical sketch follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF HON.
FRED J. PURCELL

Many who achieve success have a passion for making others aware of their achievements. Somehow each step up the ladder seems to be accompanied by great fanfare.

Fred Purcell is a delightful exception to that rule. While compiling a spectacular record in labor management and community service, his performance has been quiet, modest, and constantly superior.

While many of our distinguished citizens become globe trotters at the drop of an expense account, Fred chose to follow his destiny right here in the Mohawk Valley. His story is overwhelming proof that a man of extraordinary professional talents and a genuine concern for his community need not

concern himself with success. Society brings success to such men by continually tapping them for greater responsibilities.

Fred's list of achievements, offices, and awards, both professional and civic, are a catalog of more than 20 years of service to labor management, which began in 1951 when he was elected Business Representative for District Lodge 157. He has held such key posts as Vice-President, Public Relations Director, and the President of the New York State Council of Machinists, President of the Greater Utica Federation of Labor, President of the Northeastern Conference of Machinists and President of the Greater Utica Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO. The list of his assignments could fill many pages. Suffice it to say that quietly and modestly Fred has emerged as a national leader in the labor movement.

Despite the grueling demands of his many labor posts, Fred somehow managed to find the time when asked to serve, whether the call was from occupation, community, or country. In World War II, Fred again distinguished himself, as he has throughout his career. While serving with the infantry in Italy and France, he was wounded and received the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters. Following the war, he returned to Utica, and through the years he has served his city well.

He has been President of the Greater Utica Community Chest and Planning Council, Chairman of the United Fund Campaign, a member of numerous hospital, philanthropic, and church organizations. His devotion to the cause of labor and his community are inseparable, since Fred joined the ranks of labor while still attending St. Francis de Sales High School. In the American tradition, he sold newspapers, and worked in drug and grocery stores to earn money while still a student.

His wife, Betty, is also a native Utican, and she and their three children have shared the burden placed upon the family of a man in demand. Unfortunately, there are not many gifted with the dedication, the stamina, and the talent to bear the burden of leadership. The few who are, like Fred Purcell, fortunately find it impossible to say "no" when asked to serve.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE
RICHMOND CHAPTER OF THE
MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD
WARS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a resolution adopted on May 15, 1969, by the Richmond Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars.

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

RESOLUTION OF RICHMOND CHAPTER OF THE
MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

Whereas our democratic institutions and way of life can survive only when supported by an educated citizenry, which can be attained only when our universities and colleges maintain ever-growing standards of scholarship; and

Whereas our institutions of learning are being deliberately subverted by revolutionary groups under the guise of "academic freedom" and seek, as does one which assumes the name of The Students for a Democratic Society, "to destroy the myth of American Democracy"; and

Whereas it is vital that these subversives be dealt with promptly and with all the force necessary to end their campaign of sit-ins, lock-outs, armed threats, arson, and numerous acts of vandalism; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the administrative officials of all institutions of learning be governed by the following principles: That students be encouraged to make suggestions and recommendations for the betterment of their colleges and universities and that careful consideration be given them; that the administration discuss such recommendations with the students whenever they are not accompanied by force or the threat of force or other means of coercion; that in those cases where students are guilty of vandalism or other crimes, or persist in sit-ins or lock-outs, that they be criminally prosecuted and expelled permanently from the institution they seek to destroy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the president of each college and university within the United States.

Certified Official:

FRANKLIN R. SIBERT,
Commander.

THE 30TH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE
FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of representing the Judiciary Committee at the 30th session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. Also representing our committee were the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER W. RODINO, JR., the gentleman from Connecticut, THOMAS J. MESKILL, and the gentleman from California, CHARLES E. WIGGINS.

During the meeting, Ambassador Graham A. Martin, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs, announced the United States would contribute half a million dollars for the current year bringing the total American commitment to about \$4 million out of the total \$24 million budget.

Ambassador Martin, in a speech before the committee, described the organization as an effective instrument that serves "both people in need and countries in need of people."

My colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER RODINO, JR., spoke for the entire delegation when he said he was "proud that the United States has given further substance to its interest in ICEM by an additional contribution."

He also stated that ICEM is "an important and indispensable organ of the international community in this ever-changing world."

Senator MATHIAS correctly noted that the organization "manages insurgencies of refugees, moving them expeditiously to new homes; and it locates new opportunities for people in developed countries dissatisfied with their present homes or threatened by diminishing job possibilities."

I commend the speeches of Ambassador Martin, my colleague PETER RODINO, Jr., and Senator MATHIAS to the Members of the House and include them herewith:

STATEMENT BY H. E. MR. GRAHAM MARTIN,
SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF
STATE

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, may I extend to you, the two Vice-Chairmen, and the Rapporteur my congratulations on your respective elections. My Delegation is most pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the Council's deliberations under your able leadership.

I should also like to extend through you, Mr. Chairman, a warm welcome to our new Director, Mr. John Thomas. We listened with keen interest to his statement to the Council and were very favourably impressed with the breadth and depth of his report—all the more so in view of the few short months that Mr. Thomas has held the Directorship. It seems abundantly clear that he tackled the job of directing our Committee in a vigorous and imaginative way and we compliment him on an excellent beginning.

In his report, the Director has referred to ICEM's record of achievements with his customary modesty; he has highlighted the Committee's current problems with frankness and candour, and cited the Committee's new directions and objectives with a note of hope and a note of cautious optimism. His statement, coupled with the Status Report we have reviewed in document MC/914, offer on the 1969 Programme and Budget, which we have reviewed in document MC/914, offer much food for thought and provide an excellent basis for the Council's deliberations.

In this framework, Mr. Chairman, I should like now to comment on those matters of particular interest and concern to my Government.

With the clear and present need so great, it is interesting to speculate on why our response, our collective and individual response, has been so slow.

Proximity etches the anxieties and needs of the displaced and dispossessed in very sharp lines. Where there is direct contact, the awareness of the compelling necessity for an adequate response is very clear. In those instances where our communications media have adequately reported the plight of individuals and groups, we have all seen that the response of the individual citizens of our countries has been prompt, generous and forthcoming.

I venture to suggest that part of our problem may be that documents and bare statistics tend to blur the picture. Perhaps we have become so accustomed to dealing with ICEM's role in the field of refugee resettlement in terms of mere statistics, that we may have lost sight of the wretched human drama behind them. If this is the case with those of us who are supposed to be the professionals of our governments in this field, we can certainly understand a diminishing awareness of the dimensions of the problem on the part of the citizens of our countries, and of our principals in our governments who have the unenviable task of determining the priorities for all too scarce governmental budgetary resources.

So, perhaps, it might be useful if we here today clearly recognize that the problem of refugees in Europe is a very sizeable and a continuing one. At this very moment, Camp Traiskirchen, near Vienna, is filled to ca-

capacity with new refugees from Eastern European countries, as are Camps Latina and Capua in Italy, Camp Zirndorf in Germany, the refugee hostel in Istanbul, and the refugee processing facilities in Beirut. In Spain, the processing pipeline is clogged with Cuban refugees; throughout the asylum areas of Western Europe and the Near East, the offices of the voluntary agencies are teeming with these and other categories of new refugees, including sizeable numbers from among minority groups of certain Eastern European and Arab countries.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe those of us here know that the problem is real, the numbers are great, and the process of resettlement—which offers the best solution to the high majority of refugee cases—is costly. In the current year alone, according to the budget document before us, ICEM will expend over \$9 million on its refugee programme.

But, Mr. Chairman, the problem still remains of how we translate our knowledge of the need into effective action on the part of our governments in providing the resources that ICEM must have to carry out the mission this Council has given it.

During the meeting of the Sub-Committee on Budget and Finance last week, we learned that the \$744,000 deficit in this section of the Budget represented an inability on the part of ICEM to handle 5,000 to 7,000 refugees who will present themselves for movement during the current year. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it would be useful for all of us to remind their governments that this would involve not only suffering on the part of the refugees concerned, but a considerable increase in care and maintenance costs for the asylum governments and for other governments and agencies contributing to such costs, as well as the overcrowding in the refugee camps and processing centres.

We might remind our governments, Mr. Chairman, that history indicates that, if we permit this to happen, the eventual cost in money as well as in stark human misery will be far greater.

We might also remind our governments that there does not presently exist any other international mechanism except ICEM that is qualified to deal with these particular types of problems. We might, therefore, recommend that ICEM's established record of effectiveness deserves the increased financial resources that are now needed to meet the increased load it is called upon to carry.

We have noted that during the first four months of this year, ICEM has moved 16,200 refugees. Taking account of the number of potential refugee migrants in the asylum areas of Western Europe and the Near East at the present time—and I believe a conservative estimate would place the number at 40,000—and to add the current rate of influx of new refugees—running, I understand, approximately at the rate of 4,000 per month—it seems very clear that ICEM will be called upon to move as many, if not more, refugees in 1969 as in 1968—greater numbers than at any time since 1956/1957.

Now, in view of this heavy workload, we can take some comfort from the fact that ICEM is a viable organization, and that it is responding so effectively to the resettlement needs of the continuing heavy flow of new refugees. But, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that realism dictates that as responsible officers of the respective Member Governments, we cannot escape the fact that ICEM's ability to operate effectively in the area of refugee resettlement is in direct ratio to the measure of financial support provided to the Committee for this purpose.

My Government, Mr. Chairman, wishes to leave no doubt of its great concern that the status report before us still shows a deficit for the current year in Section II—Refugee Migration—in the amount of \$744,000.

Now, if we may review for a moment the

position with respect to resources, as we understand it, only 12 of ICEM's 31 Member Governments are making contributions to the refugee area of the Budget in the current year.

The question might well be raised whether the burden of meeting the needs of refugees has ceased to be a responsibility of the entire International Community—or whether the spirit of international solidarity in the face of humanitarian need has been somewhat forsaken. We cannot believe this to be the case. Rather, we are confident that a better appreciation on the part of governments, and of our citizens, of the continuing refugee activity in Europe—a new awareness of the problem facing ICEM—a new awareness of ICEM's uniqueness and proved record of effectiveness—will bring forth the necessary support.

Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to express the confident hope that those Member Governments which are not now contributing to this important area of activity will recognize the dire need and find a way to provide some measure of financial assistance—and that those governments which are already contributing will find it possible to do even more.

Our goal, I suggest, must be 100 per cent participation and 100 percent coverage of our refugee budget. I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, that back in 1960 when the Committee was facing a somewhat similar problem the representative of Switzerland at that time presented to the Fourteenth Special Session of the Executive Committee a formula for the financing of refugee movements, which called for per capita contributions from the country of temporary asylum; per capita contributions from country of final settlement; and contributions from member governments of ICEM.

Mr. Chairman, we suggest that it might now be appropriate to reconsider this or some other imaginative formula to provide for the assured financing of the Committee's refugee resettlement activities. I hope that the other Members of the Council may give us the benefit of their thinking and that perhaps the Council may be able to instruct the Budget Sub-Committee to thoroughly explore this question in the coming months and to report to us the results of their deliberations at the Council meeting in November.

If I may, I shall turn now, Mr. Chairman, to Section III of the Programme and Budget—the Latin American Programme—in which we face a shortfall of \$450,000.

As the Council is well aware, my Government was among those which were instrumental in establishing the Selective Migration Programme for Latin America. We have supported the Programme since its inception in 1964.

Looking back at the difficulties experienced—and the Council will recall that the principal problem was finding suitable skilled and professional workers—it is regrettable, and indeed I may say it is ironic, that this Programme faces curtailment owing to lack of funds just at the time when the Committee's machinery is reaching a high standard of performance, and the Programme is showing favourable growth. According to the Status Report before us, increases are being achieved in nearly all the emigration countries, and there is reason to believe that the target of 2,000 highly skilled and professional movements could be reached in the current year.

The United States believes that ICEM has an important contribution to make to the over-all development of Latin America and we respectfully urge the Administration to review the Selective Migration Programme with each Member nation of the Committee, and particularly so with the Latin American Members, with a view to achieving a broader appreciation of its merits and mutual advantages—and to gain the necessary finan-

cial support to permit its continued operation and favourable growth.

With respect to Section I—National Migration—we note with satisfaction that this area of the Budget, which calls for the movement of 29,200 persons at a cost of \$9,875,000, is in balance. We commend those governments having a particular interest in this part of the Committee's programme for making available the necessary financing. My Government finds it gratifying that the ICEM mechanism is able to assist in this positive way in the very important process of nation-building.

With respect to the Administrative Budget, Mr. Chairman, the United States is prepared to accept adoption of the new assessment scale which calls for an increase in the United States assessment from 29.77 per cent to 33.5 per cent. We note with some concern, however, that the tentative proposed scale before us totals only 98.56 per cent and we hope that measures will be taken to raise it to the necessary 100 per cent level.

We believe it is necessary for the Administration, under its new Director, to thoroughly review its own organizational pattern, its procedures, and its staffing in order to ensure responsiveness to current realities, to ensure the maximum effectiveness for the minimum costs. We believe this needs to be done, Mr. Chairman, and from the Director's statement, we are confident that under his leadership it will be done. We believe that such a review might result in the elimination of staff positions no longer necessary, or those members of the staff whose productivity does not meet the reasonable criteria of performance Member Governments have a right to expect. We do not believe this standard of excellence has been wholly maintained in recent years, but we fully expect that it will be maintained in the future.

On our part, my Government strongly believes that the Council, in insisting on the maximum efficiency and effective performance, automatically accepts the corollary obligation to ensure that the compensation rates for the staff are periodically adjusted to ensure comparability with other international civil servants located in Geneva. This has been the practice of the Council in the past, and it is inconceivable to my Delegation that the Council will fail to recognize that the violation of one of the first principles of effective administration—the necessity for fair, adequate and just compensation—will certainly not assist the new Director in his endeavours to rapidly restore the organization to the peak of effectiveness the situation we face demands and which the Council will demand of him. We, therefore, hope very much that in due course the Council can resolve in justice and equity the question of fair and adequate compensation for the staff.

I have spoken before of measures we might undertake to bring home to our own governments and our own citizens the crucial importance of the current ICEM mission.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, the United States Government commends the intention of the new Director to hold discussions with those Governments which have withdrawn from the Committee, i.e. Canada, France, Sweden, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and Venezuela. The return of some or all of these Governments would be immensely beneficial to the Committee and should in our view be supported by all Member Governments.

Aside from governments, another source of support and co-operation which cannot be overlooked are the voluntary agencies. Since the end of the Second World War, an enormous share of the burden of assisting refugees and migrants has fallen on these privately-supported organizations. The voluntary agencies have been able to respond generously to the needs of refugees because of the contributions of their constituents repre-

sented nationally, religious and other groups. They also have developed a worldwide network for resettlement in other lands. Individual governments and international organizations could duplicate the infrastructure and expert staff of the voluntary agencies only with great effort and expense.

We would like to commend to the Administration the continuation of the close and cordial relationship which already exists between ICEM and the voluntary agencies and we recommend the ICEM consider expanding its use of the voluntary agency facilities. A closer relationship with the voluntary agencies which have constituents in many of the countries that are Members of ICEM may also serve to increase popular understanding and government support for the Committee. We are pleased to note from the Director's statement that he intends to make full use of these resources.

And as a final suggestion to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that all of us exploit to the fullest degree possible the extraordinary talents of advocacy possessed by our new Director. I do not refer to the advocacy of a skilled professional with rare charm and great gifts of lucid exposition, although our new Director possesses these attributes. But he adds a burning personal conviction in the usefulness and the essentiality of the ICEM mission which carries great conviction.

Last November, I informed the Council that President Johnson had personally approved the presentation of Mr. Thomas as a candidate for the ICEM directorship. Our new President had been in office not yet a month, with all the problems of settling in a new American Administration, when Mr. Thomas was ready to leave for Geneva. Yet, President Nixon extended the allotted time four-fold while he and Mr. Thomas discussed ICEM, its mission, its contribution—the contribution it was uniquely equipped to make to meet the challenge before us today. As I listened to them talk on and on, I was certain that if, in the past, there had been concern over American support of ICEM, there need be no such concern for the future. And the presence of several of the most distinguished members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, who have taken the time from their busy schedules to attend this meeting of this Council, gives ample evidence that full support for ICEM is not confined to the Executive Branch but is thoroughly shared by our Legislative Branch as well. Within minutes of that meeting between President Nixon and Mr. Thomas, President Nixon signed a determination order more than doubling the funds available to my office for the current fiscal year. I am, therefore, able to inform the Council of an additional contribution of \$500,000 for ICEM, which will bring the total contribution of my Government to ICEM for the current year to slightly more than \$3.5 million.

As Mr. Thomas continues his normal courtesy calls on Member Governments, I venture to express the hope that he will be of as much assistance to my colleagues on the Council as he was to me.

If there is further deterioration resulting in an increased refugee flow, we are prepared to assist further in helping to cover the costs of ICEM's increasing activities. However, unless more governments respond more generously than has already been indicated, ICEM will not have the funds to move all the presently estimated number of refugees and migrants who will present themselves for resettlement assistance.

In previous years when deficits threatened, there was general agreement that ICEM must find a way not to limit its operations, not to restrict the movement of refugees awaiting resettlement, not to curtail its programme owing to lack of funds. This has been a laudable objective, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that we may now

have reached the point where this policy no longer seems realistic. Unless Member Governments are willing to fund the activities which ICEM can so effectively carry out, there appears to be no other answer except the curtailment of operations.

We would certainly hope that this step will not be necessary. We do not believe it will be necessary if all of us take the measures that are necessary to reawaken our governments and our citizens to the dimensions of the need. I have ventured to suggest a few steps which might be helpful in achieving this objective and I would very much welcome additional suggestions from my colleagues in this Council, many of whom are far more experienced than I am, and from whom I have learned so much in these exchanges.

But I do have one deep, unshakeable conviction. I do know my people, and I do know a bit about yours. Together they constitute the repository of all that is decent, all that is good, and all that is humane. They remain dedicated to the common principles of justice, of mercy, of the necessity for providing asylum for the oppressed and the persecuted. And since our governments are governments of the people, if our people fail in providing sufficient resources to avoid a curtailment in the operations of this organization, I would submit that it will only be because we have failed in our obligation to adequately inform them of the need.

May I conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, with a word of tribute to and confidence in our organization—the ICEM vehicle itself which so effectively serves both people in need—and countries in need of people.

Indeed the ICEM vehicle has already carried more than 1.6 million persons to new homes and new lives. This year it will carry 80,000 more, and who dares to predict how many it will be called upon to carry in the years ahead?

ICEM is an investment in the future—an investment in human lives, in economic stability, and in the prosperity and happiness of the Free World.

Our task is to provide it with the resources to discharge the mission we have given it. I am confident that we will.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

I thank you for offering me this opportunity to address the Council. It has been my privilege to attend these sessions for many years and I always look forward to the pleasure of visiting with old friends who have long been associated with ICEM and to meet with new delegates and with delegates who come to Geneva representing new members of ICEM.

ICEM is a changing organization not only within delegations but with emphasis on programs to meet the changing needs. The past 17 years have abundantly evidenced the fact that emergency situations suddenly crop up and all indications predict that new and perhaps more crucial situations will demand the resources that this organization can offer. ICEM is, in the estimation of the United States Congress, an important and indispensable organ of the International Community in this ever-changing world.

It was most gratifying to learn at the Executive Session and this Council Session that some of the old issues, although not forgotten, are no longer a point of serious debate. The three graphic pillars—refugee assistance—national migration—selective migration—so well described several sessions ago by Dr. Kraam of the Netherlands are acknowledged as the foundation of ICEM. Furthermore, the need for continuation of ICEM's programs is unanimously endorsed.

However, an old problem is still evident and continues to plague the otherwise harmonious objectives of the Council. The bud-

et and the financial short-fall are always a serious threat to ICEM's very existence which each Council must face.

There is a negative cloud hovering over any approach to ICEM's financial structure and this dilemma, it seems, has been prevalent throughout ICEM history.

ICEM was conceived in 1951 as a temporary organization to cope with what was viewed at that time as a soon to be solved problem of resettling large numbers of refugees lingering in camps. The tragic circumstances surrounding long tenure in refugee camps were solved through the good offices of ICEM. The organization furthermore geared operations to assist in the movement of migrants who were desirous of finding new lands of opportunity. Once again ICEM proved its value to the free world and the individual.

In retrospect we see that the need for services to both refugees and migrants is as important today as it was during the first 17 years of ICEM's existence. With an acknowledged need for ICEM, why must we face during each Council Session the question of the solvency of this organization?

This issue is the direct result of the failure of member-governments to view ICEM as a permanent organization. The acceptance of permanency must be the fourth pillar to confer the stability with which to give this organization a foundation of strength and durability. Recognition of this need must be developed in the Council and then conveyed to the proper authority in each member Government. It has been stated during the course of this Session that there is a definite lack of appreciation and knowledge about the intricacies of this international organization. The Administration of ICEM as well as the delegates have the obligation of presenting the good works, the value of ICEM in a complex World and the future necessity to all who will listen. We need not hesitate for a moment to realize that so long as men and women are oppressed they will seek freedom and we must make freedom as inexpensive to them as feasibly possible.

Furthermore, I sympathize with the youth of today who no longer feel the need to be tied to the past. They are 20th Century adventurers willing to go to new lands and find for themselves new opportunities. The new world and the old world are no longer distant places and the heritage engrained in young people from the old world will be an infusion of strength in the new world. Whatever assistance ICEM can render to the young people of today, young people who are on the move in every aspect, will undoubtedly benefit all countries.

Let us no longer say that if ICEM did not exist today it would have to be created. But let us say that ICEM does exist today and it must exist tomorrow!

I speak today as a member of a bi-partisan Congressional delegation. In our delegation are Hon. Thomas Meskill of Connecticut, Thomas Rallsback of Illinois, and Charles Wiggins of California. We pledge our support to an old or new or perhaps renewed member of ICEM, your new director, John Thomas. Mr. Thomas has shared the confidence of the Congress for many years and has earned the new respect and trust by his direction of the Cuban Refugee program and the program involving refugees in Vietnam. We have known Mr. Thomas not only as an expert in the field of refugees but as an administrator of the highest caliber. He has had responsibility for millions and millions of dollars when he was serving the United States. Although the budget of ICEM is somewhat less, the objectives are certainly no less important.

I know, and my colleagues from the Congress concur with me, that ICEM is fortunate to have his talent at the helm of the organiza-

tion. I trust that the Council will assure him the tools that any administrator needs in carrying out the objectives of his office. Mr. Thomas has the whole hearted support of the United States Government, the Executive as well as the Legislative Branch, and we look forward to a new era and of new accomplishment of ICEM under his leadership.

I am proud that the United States has given further substance to its interest in ICEM by an additional contribution. We, in the Congressional delegation, compliment Ambassador Martin for his statement yesterday before the Council, and hasten to endorse each of his pointed observations. His reference to "people in need and countries in need of people" is a practical as well as a humane and noble objective of ICEM.

We will return to Washington with renewed fervor and confidence in ICEM.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS

First, I would like to say that it is a great pleasure to return to a meeting of ICEM and that as a member of this delegation representing the United States at this eminent gathering, I feel both honored and challenged.

As a member of the United States Senate, it is a particularly happy opportunity to salute the new Director, Mr. John Thomas, whose experience and talents offer such promise to ICEM's future. It goes without saying that I am glad to have this reunion with the Deputy Director, Walter Besterman, with whom I have been associated in various capacities for a number of years.

This is a formidable time for international organizations, subverted by old nationalist values and ambitions and confronted by nearly convulsive change. And it is a particularly momentous period for ICEM and other groups dealing with international migration.

This Committee faces a turbulent world where waves of disruption often cast adrift large numbers of refugees. In a sense, the organization governs a nation in transit, composed of thousands of migrants, united by a desire for freedom and the will to seek it. In fact, as an organization shaped chiefly by function and purpose rather than by geography or ethnology, it has a greater future than many nations. Certainly ICEM's supranational character accords better with world economic and technological trends than does the world fragmentation by geographic nation-states.

I predict that ICEM and other functional organizations will increase in importance as the years pass. One can envisage a future when world migration among nations will reach the level it already has achieved within highly industrialized countries. In the United States, for example, 20 percent of the population moves every year seeking new opportunities; state lines, once nearly as significant as current national boundaries in Europe, pose a negligible obstacle.

At present, however, movement of people in the world economy lags far behind movement within the largest countries and far behind the expansion of world trade. One can predict that this gap will narrow in the future as artificial national restrictions are reduced to allow freer play of world economic forces. And as this gap narrows, the nation of migrants, the province of ICEM, will grow.

This long-affirmative growth of ICEM in support of world economic solidarity will undoubtedly be accompanied by increasing short-term responsibilities arising from national disruptions. Nationalist habits are strong and will not easily accept the internationalist imperatives. But future trends will not favor countries that recoil from the world economy, whether chiefly for ideological reasons, as in Communist states, or from fear of competition, as in some underdeveloped

lands. Unable to put their growing populations to work productively, economically isolationist governments will face demands from their people to leave for less stagnant and repressive realms. Such patterns are already evident in refugee-generating areas like Cuba, Haiti, East Europe, and China.

ICEM, thus, has two closely related functions: It manages insurgencies of refugees, moving them expeditiously to new homes; and it locates new opportunities for people in developed countries dissatisfied with their present homes or threatened by diminishing job possibilities. ICEM's record of accomplishment is auspicious in regard to both facets of its responsibility.

II

In the early 1950's, as the nations of Europe completed their recovery from World War II, it became clear that displaced persons do not fall into place as easily as disrupted economies. The jigsaw national boundaries, particularly in East Europe, were separating people from both families and opportunities. Existing international organization on the continent, though increasingly efficient in moving goods and capital, seemed to pass by the human casualties of change. Some of the refugees wandered unattended in the bustle of European economic growth. Their hope drying up, others clotted in dismal refugee camps, which challenged the Samaritan conscience of the world.

In 1952, a new organization, which we now know as ICEM, conceived by men who knew that they could not pass by on the other side, stopped by the road of European revival—then rapidly becoming a superhighway—to help these victims of war and international strife. Like its predecessor, the International Refugee Organization, and other agencies concerned with the problem, ICEM's chief motive was humanitarian. Its function was to expedite refugees and other migrants to homes in other countries. In a large measure, the focus was on getting the refugees out of Europe and to such underpopulated areas as Australia, Brazil, and Canada as well as to the United States, which cherishes a long tradition as a haven for the homeless and the persecuted.

ICEM's accomplishments during this period were heroic. In times of special stress the organization rose to the occasion magnificently. During a few weeks after the Hungarian and Suez crises in 1956, ICEM assisted in permanently relocating more than 150,000 Hungarians as well as 10,000 Egyptian Jews and Christians. On a single day, November 30th of that year, the organization moved over 5,400 Hungarians from their Austrian refuge. I know from personal observation how the condition of refugee camps has changed and how those few still now open have the aspect of gateways and not of cells or forgotten corners.

During its lifetime, ICEM has arranged transport for more than 750,000 refugees and changed the prevailing mode of refugee management in Europe from long detention to rapid relocation. As the demoralizing camps gave way to bustling processing centers, hopelessness among refugees gave way to high expectancy. And in clearing the camps, ICEM also relieved the conscience of the world.

Along with the refugees, ICEM has also assisted in transporting almost 900,000 national migrants. These are potential or spiritual refugees, ready to seek better opportunities or flee oppression. ICEM offers them the opportunity. Often usefully skilled, they—even more than the average refugee—represent a world resource. In a sense their movement is a capital flow. More precisely, technical manpower is an indispensable catalyst for the effective investment of existing funds and generation of new capital.

In the early years of ICEM when Western European countries had a major labor sur-

plus, there were large numbers of such migrants. In recent years Common Market countries, particularly Germany, have faced a labor shortage and have tended to import labor. As the boom levels off, however, there are signs that many of these migrants may find their jobs threatened. ICEM will have a new opportunity in aiding less developed countries to meet their manpower needs.

In this realm, ICEM is already making unique contributions, moving skilled Europeans to Latin America at a rate of over 2,000 annually. ICEM confers with governmental authorities in Latin America to help them determine priority needs for personnel; it interviews some 25 candidates for each available place, offers language and cultural training, and transports the migrants. Finally, it aids Latin American immigration officials in receiving them.

Since manpower bottlenecks are a major obstacle to economic growth in the region, this kind of manpower assistance pioneered by ICEM is uniquely valuable. It represents a permanent and dynamic contribution to the recipient economies rather than funds to be repaid at interest or grants that tend to dissolve on contact with the enormous needs of the less developed countries. Its cost of approximately \$800 per skilled worker or professional placed in a new job contrasts strikingly with the \$10-15,000 required to bring technical advisers to the region for short periods under AID. I congratulate ICEM for this effort and hope it can be expanded greatly in the future.

III

I believe, therefore, that ICEM's long experience, together with world trends toward increasing manpower mobility, portend steady growth in the organization's potentialities. Its possible role in alleviating refugee emergencies, such as those in Hong Kong, Czechoslovakia, and Cuba needs no elaboration. I only hope that ICEM succeeds in raising the money to expand its activities in these areas; I pledge my own support to the effort and I am confident of interest and assistance in the Congress transcending any partisan consideration. I also urge that whenever propitious the organization extend overtures of cooperation to Communist countries in order to reduce the complications of migration to the West. As a functional agency, ICEM may be able to negotiate successfully where bilateral initiatives would fail.

Probably the most vital effort of ICEM, because it is virtually unique, is its program of skilled and professional migration to Latin America. In its cost effectiveness in meeting a crucial development need, I believe this approach has few peers in the foreign assistance programs of the wealthier countries. I think the program should go forward as rapidly as possible and again I will do what I can to encourage U.S. funding.

To meet its growing opportunities, I believe ICEM should change complicated consultation procedures that needlessly diminish its resourcefulness and flexibility. One of the organization's greatest assets, repeatedly demonstrated, is its ability to act expeditiously. This potential should not be restricted to its past areas of operation. I think ICEM has amply shown it deserves our trust.

I look forward to a most promising future for this organization. ICEM responds effectively to perhaps the most dangerous long-term world problem—the growing gap between the rich and poor nations. It is supranational and so are what I believe to be the most important trends in the world economy. It is humanitarian, and I believe the conscience of the world is becoming increasingly sensitive to the plight of refugees. I am proud to be associated with this immensely important undertaking.

RHODESIAN INDEPENDENCE— JUNE 20, 1969

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 20, 1969, the voters of Rhodesia approved of the Declaration of Independence from Britain. In so doing, Rhodesia became the first British colony to declare its independence since the U.S. Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776.

In just 11 days—on July 4—we will celebrate our Declaration of Independence from England and from tyranny flowing from taxation without representation.

It is interesting to note that in 1776, the American voters were not given an opportunity at the polls to vote for or against freedom—rather it was handled by elected representatives of the various States. In Rhodesia, to the contrary, all voters had a chance to be counted in taking this final step of no return from British domination.

Today Rhodesia, by the landslide wishes of her people, is a free self-governing nation of laws based upon a constitution and as such is entitled to the full respect of free men the world over.

I join with millions of other free men in extending my congratulations to the sovereign Republic of Rhodesia and wish every success to her as her people strive to move forward in peaceful progress under the rule of law.

A local news clipping follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.)
June 21, 1969]

**BREAK IS FINALIZED: RHODESIA VOTES FOR
REPUBLIC**

SALISBURY, RHODESIA.—Rhodesians finalized their long goodbye with Britain last night by voting overwhelmingly in favor of a republic.

With only scattered boxes out, unofficial figures showed a vote of 50,000 to 11,000 for independence and favored Premier Ian Smith's constitutional proposals to insure white rule by 44,000 to 16,000.

In Salisbury, an ultra-rightwing stronghold, the constitutional vote was 527 to 359 in favor of the government.

"That's the way, to hell with Britain!" shouted a man in the growing crowd in the town center. Cheers went up as the results were posted. A young man raised his beer bottle as the last figures appeared and yelled, "Good old Smithy, show them what we're made of!"

Smith said today he was elated with the decision.

"Maybe it will make the world sit up and say to themselves maybe we should give these people a little bit of recognition," said the 51-year-old Smith. He unilaterally declared Rhodesia independent from Britain on Nov. 11, 1965, rather than give in to eventual black majority rule.

"This is what is needed for the rest of the world—a strong positive message," the premier told newsmen at his party headquarters.

Of 4.2 million blacks in Rhodesia, 9,123 were eligible to vote—about 10 percent of the nation's 90,074 eligible voters. About 36 per-

cent of the nation's 228,000 whites were eligible.

The next step for the Smith government is to present a new constitutional bill to parliament, which begins a new session June 25.

The new constitution set the stage for election of a new government, but government sources said this could be delayed until mid-1970.

Rhodesia's declaration of independence was the first by a British colony since the United States declared itself independent on July 4, 1776.

INFLATION AND FARM PROFITS

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in recent days about the economy and the effect of inflation on various aspects of our society. One seriously affected economic group to suffer from higher prices and tighter money is the American farmer. Remarks addressed to the farm problem in this regard have come from Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin. Mr. Hardin has outlined four administration proposals to help solve the problem of uncontrolled economic expansion. I submit those remarks for the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE
HARDIN ON INFLATION CONTROL

Farm people, perhaps more than any other group in the Nation, have a strong stake in seeing inflation curbed. For that reason—among others—it is crucial that timely action on President Nixon's program if inflation is to be stopped and our economic health restored.

Domestically, the damaging results in inflation are clearly seen. Farmers are special victims because their costs rise while their incomes are held down by heavy production. They are caught in a squeeze between prices paid and prices received.

Once prices of production goods of non-farm origin increase, they seldom decline. For example, prices of farm machinery have risen every year since 1955. Prices of motor vehicles have followed a similar pattern except for a slight dip in 1960 and 1961.

Farm production expenses have been increasing steadily since 1953. It appears that nearly all of the expected increase of \$2 billion in farm production expenses this year will be the result of price increases rather than the result of greater quantities of supplies and equipment purchased.

I have just returned from Europe, where I have had opportunity to see what the American inflation is doing to our agricultural trade. Inflation increases the costs of our products and makes it harder for us to get our farm products into foreign markets. This is a very serious matter for American farmers.

Inflation can be stopped, but only by applying steady fiscal and monetary restraint to pull the economy back to a sustainable growth rate.

The Administration has proposed a budget that will result in a sizeable surplus—a surplus that is essential if we are to curb inflation. To guarantee that surplus—to guard against an inflationary deficit—the President has proposed the following program:

First, he has pared the adjusted January budget by \$4 billion.

Second, he has asked Congress to extend the income tax surcharge. The President is committed to eventual elimination of the surtax. In fact, his proposal includes cutting it in half on January 1, 1970, and ending it on June 30, 1970.

The third Administration proposal is to repeal the seven per cent investment tax credit. This repeal will produce revenue to enable us to cut the surtax in half next January first.

A fourth proposal will postpone for one year the scheduled reduction of excise taxes on automobiles and telephone services. The primary purpose in this case, too, is to produce revenue in an area where demand remains strong.

INDEPENDENCE DAY OF KUWAIT

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to the Amir, Sheikh Sabah Al-Salim Al-Sabah of Kuwait, and Kuwait's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Talat Al-Ghoussein, on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of Kuwait's independence.

On June 19, 1961, the governments of the United Kingdom and the State of Kuwait exchanged notes which recognized the independence of the desert kingdom at the head of the Persian Gulf. Kuwait emerged from under the protective cloak of the British into an aura of crisis, for the nation of Iraq challenged the new status of the Kuwaitis. Diplomacy and reason averted a potential clash between Arab brothers and the nation of Kuwait assumed its place as a sovereign and independent state in the family of nations. On July 21, 1961, the Arab League welcomed its newest member into the regional organization, and on May 14, 1963, Kuwait became the 11th member of the United Nations.

For over two centuries, Kuwait has been ruled by the Al-Sabah family, in the Arab tradition of recognizing the leadership qualities and the sound wisdom of the most able men of the nation. Kuwait has continued to rely on the Al-Sabah rulers, but the Kuwaitis have blended the Arab tradition of the King's council with the modern concepts of democracy. The present Amir of Kuwait, Shaykh Sabah Al-Salim Al-Sabah, is advised by his Council of Ministers who represent the people directly before their leader, and by the National Assembly, an elected legislature. In the nation's second elections, held on January 25, 1967, a new national assembly took office for a term of 4 years.

Kuwait has not remained isolated within its boundaries, but has reached out to help and assist other peoples and other nations in the Middle East through the Kuwaiti Development Fund. Projects supported by the fund range from railroads in Sudan, to an agricultural program in Tunisia, to the improvement of the Suez Canal in the United Arab Re-

public. The Kuwaiti fund is supported from state oil revenues earned by the oil industry, which is operated in cooperation with British and American firms.

The people of Kuwait have been twice blessed, once by Allah for the bounty of the oil beneath their soil and again by the wisdom of the men in the government. Schools, hospitals, universities, clinics, highways, houses, recreation facilities, industries, and water supplies were the first priority of the Kuwaiti Government. The result has been the rapid modernization of the state with the people being the first beneficiaries of the wealth that the oil produced. Today, every Kuwaiti has free medical care and free education supported by the state and the opportunity to earn a dignified living in the profession of his choosing.

The continued success of the nation of Kuwait is assured by the wisdom and good judgment of the Kuwaiti people. On this eighth anniversary of the independence of the state of Kuwait, we extend our most heartfelt congratulations and express the hope that the people of Kuwait will witness many more such happy days.

MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY JAZZ BAND

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to my colleagues in the Congress on the recent successes of the Millikin Jazz Band from Millikin University in Decatur, Ill. The band has just completed a tour to seven countries under the State Department's cultural presentations program. A report from the Portuguese Embassy described their first performance in Lisbon as a "resounding success." The report stated further that "the band made a great impression not only because of their superior musicianship, but for their outstanding representation of American youth, excellent behavior, and appearance." Mr. Frank Shakespeare, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, reports to me that the Embassy was flooded with requests for additional performances. Portuguese student groups pleaded for the band's return visit en route back to the United States.

The parents of one member of the band have advised me that their son reports the same overwhelming requests after all other scheduled appearances. The band drew capacity audiences at every stop. He also stated that newspaper reports as well as advice from the State Department indicated they reached people abroad through the medium of music in a way which might strengthen our hope of peace.

In this era in which some young people of this Nation seem to achieve headline attention through student disruptions, revolt against leadership, and disrespect for authority, I wanted to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House and

the Senate and to the Nation the constructive actions and success of this group. They have truly brought great credit to themselves, to Millikin University, to the State of Illinois, and to the entire Nation.

EVERGLADES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current national concern over the Everglades, I would call attention to a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor:

BATTLE RAGES OVER EVERGLADES PARK

(By Robert Cahn, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—In the afterglow of the Senate Interior Committee's hearings on the environmental threats to Everglades National Park, it is clearly evident that the park's long-term prospects for survival are not encouraging.

But all is not lost, say conservation groups working to save the park, especially if national citizen pressure can turn around forces now at work. Or if the conflicting aims and actions of federal, state, and county government can somehow be coordinated to work on behalf of environmental objectives.

The major problems brought out at the hearings are the lack of an assured water supply to the park which has been severely damaged by drought in past years, the expected air, noise, and water pollution from a new airport being built along the north boundary of the park, the danger of water pollution from agricultural use of insecticides near (and even within) park boundaries, and the presence of large pockets of private landholdings within the park which are subject to commercial development.

A 21-YEAR BATTLE AIRED

The two days of testimony brought into public glare a 21-year battle over water between the National Park Service and the Army Corps of Engineers, and the continued refusal by the engineers to give a guarantee of water to the park for future years.

The State of Florida was portrayed as keeping the pressure on the engineers not to give the park a priority over the water demands of people and agriculture.

Concerning the threat of a major international "jetport" on the north border of the park, the testimony disclosed conflict between the Departments of Interior and Transportation.

Introduced into the record was a May 29, 1969, memo prepared by Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel's legal department, accusing the Department of Transportation of having (during the Johnson administration) violated an act of Congress in assisting development of the jetport without determining that no feasible and prudent alternatives existed or that the program included all possible planning to minimize harm to the park.

NELSON CHAMPIONS PARK

The State of Florida and the Dade County (Miami) Port Authority were also not in agreement over the jetport, and state witnesses conceded that proper environmental planning had not been done.

On the plus side, the hearings brought forth a congressional champion for the park in Sen. Gaylord Nelson, who had just re-

turned from a personal inspection of conditions in the Everglades National Park. The Wisconsin Senator has become somewhat of an expert on ecology. And he challenged the philosophy accepted by some officials in Washington and in Florida, that nothing can be done except form study groups.

Senator Nelson heatedly announced he would oppose further spending of federal money on southern Florida water projects until the Army engineers and the state can work out an agreement with the park. The Senator brought out that the federal government has spent \$170 million on flood control and irrigation in central and southern Florida over the past 20 years.

FUND FREEZE PROPOSED

"I don't want to give them any more money if they are going to steal water from our park, or won't guarantee it," the Senator said heatedly during a debate with Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Army Chief of Engineers.

"I will do everything I can to stop the appropriations," he continued, "and I think I can get some conservationists to help."

True to his word, Senator Nelson went before the Senate appropriations subcommittee on public works June 12 and proposed that no part of the proposed \$9 million 1970 budget appropriation for the central and southern Florida flood-control project be expended until the Senate and House "are advised that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army have made a mutually satisfactory arrangement to provide water to the park."

AIRPORT STUDY SET

Another plus was the announcement that the Departments of Interior and Transportation are forming a task force to investigate environmental problems of the proposed new airport. Henry M. Jackson, Senate Interior Committee chairman, however, suggested that the Army engineers and appropriate air-pollution authorities from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be brought into the deliberations.

Perhaps the most encouraging sign for park advocates was the strong testimony from conservation groups showing their intention of making a nationwide issue out of saving the Everglades.

Interior Undersecretary Russell E. Train, the leadoff witness, said the park "has the dubious distinction of having the most serious preservation problems, facing the National Park Service today, attracting the concern of informed citizens and ecologists throughout the world."

Mr. Train said he had begun discussions with Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor "which may hopefully lead to a satisfactory agreement" (on a water guarantee).

ENGINEERS' POSITION STATED

However, Mr. Train admitted, the request that former Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall had made to the Attorney General's office for a legal opinion on whether the Corps of Engineers did have power to regulate water in southern Florida, has been withdrawn.

The Corps of Engineers takes the position that it cannot guarantee water supplies without concurrence of the State of Florida. The engineers has "assured" the park of an adequate supply of water for the future. But they are not willing to guarantee in writing the 315,000 acre-feet a year of regulated flow which park experts say is the minimum needed for survival.

The point of difficulty is whether future water shortages will be shared on the basis of demands of 1970, or the demands of the year when they occur.

UNCERTAINTY EXPRESSED

General Cassidy told the committee that the corps' plans could assure water for the

park up to the year 2000. Mr. Train said, "I don't think there is a person in this room who can feel anything but some uncertainty as to rates of growth in southern Florida. They have had a tendency to outstrip all projections. So that while we welcome this assurance, we don't now rest easy as a result of having it."

Nathaniel P. Reed, special assistant to the Governor of Florida for natural resources, outlined the state's priorities.

"Man is priority No. 1, and his activities such as farming and ranching are No. 2," he said. "And somewhere along the line sufficient water will be made available for the park to tide it over the hump until the spring rains begin again."

SIERRA CLUB REPRESENTED

Mr. Reed, who personally is an ardent conservationist and seeks to preserve the park, added shock value to the hearings with his appraisal of the situation:

"A very real question is whether the ecosystem which is the national park can survive. I believe it can. Perhaps not as it was, but as an example of what it was."

Sierra Club spokesman Gary A. Soucie charged that "the U.S. public is unwittingly subsidizing the destruction of Everglades National Park."

Mr. Soucie produced figures which he said showed that in one south Florida water district, the federal government had invested \$2.5 million in a \$5.8 million water project aiding 32,608 acres of watershed. Of the 21,170 acres in sugar cane, 16,000 of them are owned by one company. And except for county taxes and corporate taxes, the company does not pay for the water it uses, Mr. Soucie said.

Senator Nelson, Senator Jackson, and several witnesses were highly critical of what they called the Dade County Port Authority's lack of environment considerations in planning the new airport in a 39-mile-square area alongside the park. Although the jetport is being readied only for training flights now, officials of the port authority have spoken of plans for an airport bigger than Kennedy International, and with a community of more than half a million people near the jetport.

Mr. Soucie quoted from a Dade County Port Authority report which noted that, "the Everglades National Park south of the site at Tamiami Trail assures that no private complaining development will be adjacent on that side."

Commented Mr. Soucie: "The national park was simply viewed as empty space with no one to complain about the noise except the alligators."

PORT OFFICIAL QUOTED

A National Audubon Society spokesman placed into the record the following, part of a newspaper interview with Richard Judy, Dade County Port Authority deputy assistant director.

"Regardless of what the environmental plan might dictate, however, 'we're going to build the jetport,' Judy said. Judy predicted 'the forces that will come to play will destroy the conservationists.'"

The Everglades situation is the type of problem the newly announced Cabinet-level President's Council on Environmental Quality will be concerned with, Mr. Train told Senator Jackson.

The Senate Interior Committee chairman, author of a bill for a national policy on the environment and an independent council of environmental advisers, commented that the disagreement among Cabinet members "points up the need to have some advisers available to the President, like we have in the Council of Economic Advisers, to assist the President in trying to look at the entire structure."

ECUADOR'S CONCILIATORY ACTION IS TO BE COMMENDED

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, June 18, an Associated Press dispatch from Lima, Peru, quoted Peruvian Foreign Minister Adqardo Mercado to the effect that Peru, Chile, Ecuador and the United States might meet and discuss the controversial fishing dispute under which our fishing vessels have been regularly seized during the past 15 years. The ray of hope of resolving this long and unfortunate problem was most encouraging.

However, any optimistic expectations were rudely shattered last Friday morning when news was released that one of the three Latin countries previously named, Ecuador, had made a mass seizure of American tuna boats some 22 miles off the Ecuadorian coast. This report came just as I was preparing to urge President Nixon to ease existing U.S. sanctions against these neighbors to the south as a gesture of our sincere desire to meet and resolve our differences.

The outlook for negotiations appeared bleak, indeed, until later in the day when it was announced that the Ecuadorian Government had ordered our fishing vessels released, and thereby hope of a meeting was restored.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all the members of the House Fish and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee who have been seeking a solution of the long-standing dispute when I say we are highly appreciative of the conciliatory action of Ecuador.

And, Mr. Speaker, in the same spirit of amity, the United States now, it seems to me, must do everything possible to ease the causes of friction and thereby help bring these traditionally friendly neighbors to the conference table. Meanwhile, Ecuador is to be commended for releasing our fishing boats.

In this connection, hereinafter is the text of a letter I have sent to President Nixon:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, there is a possibility that Peru, Chile, Ecuador and the United States may be able to arrange a meeting to discuss and to resolve the long-standing differences over fishing rights which have resulted in seizures of American tuna fishing vessels for many years.

I am writing you this letter as the author of an amendment to the Foreign Arms Sales Act whereby sales are prohibited to any foreign nation that seizes U.S. fishing vessels outside the 12-mile limit.

This amendment provides that the President can suspend this provision and it seems timely and appropriate in view of a possible four-Nation discussion on our long-standing fishing disputes that by Executive Action you suspend this ban on sales in order to ease the friction that has prevented a settlement of the fishing dispute with our Latin American neighbors who claim a 200-mile fishing limit.

It seems to me that the action last week by Ecuador in releasing our fishing vessels which it had seized earlier, indicates a sim-

ilar friendly step on our part might well contribute toward restoration of traditional amiable relations with our Latin American neighbors.

Respectfully,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Representative in Congress.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GI BILL

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 22, was the 25th anniversary of the enactment into law of the GI bill. By enacting this important landmark legislation on June 22, 1944, just 16 days after the D-day invasion, the U.S. Congress pledged to provide funds for homes, education, and business opportunities for American servicemen when the war ended. The Congress acted unanimously in passing this legislation.

America has felt a great obligation to those who have sacrificed for their country. Those who serve in the military are placed at a disadvantage in our competitive society by their having been displaced for a period of time from the social and economic life of our country. No government or people can give back these lost years to these men and women who man our Nation's defenses, but the GI bill and its successors at least partially provided equitable relief, giving the veteran concrete assistance in getting a fresh start on his re-entry into civilian life.

Under the first and the subsequent Korean war and cold war GI bills, more than 10 million American veterans have either gone to college or taken specialized training. This investment provided the Nation with 380,000 new teachers, 84,000 new doctors, 30,000 new dentists, 15,000 new nurses, millions of skilled craftsmen and businessmen, and thousands of leaders on every level of government and enterprise. Perhaps hundreds of the Members of Congress, including myself, would not have had opportunity to have completed their higher education but for the assistance provided by the GI bill.

The GI bill created the biggest housing construction boom in our history. Since enactment of the first GI bill the Veterans' Administration has guaranteed 7 million home loans. These loans not only helped the veteran, but the housing boom which resulted boosted our entire economy, with every economic sector feeling the beneficial impact. The so-called "readjustment" period following World War II became a period of expansion, not retraction.

The veteran has been a direct beneficiary of this legislation, but all America has also benefited with the increased availability of professional men and technicians, higher living standards, better housing, greater revenues from increased incomes. The investment in human beings has been repaid many times over. All three GI bills produced unparalleled

programs and benefits, with unparalleled successes and achievements.

With the passing of the silver anniversary of the World War II GI bill, it is time to take stock and review these GI programs. The problems of the veteran of Vietnam may be entirely different than those of the veteran of World War II. Many returning from Vietnam are not participating in GI bill educational benefits. This is partially explainable through the much higher percentage of those serving in Vietnam who already had completed their higher education before entering the service, and through the fact that unemployment is very low and returning veterans easily find employment without obtaining further training. This does not appear, however, to explain fully the change. President Nixon's Committee on the Vietnam veteran is studying possible improvements in our GI programs to meet problems of readjustment of the present-day veteran, and the committees of Congress should make a similar review. America owes it to these young men and women who have sacrificed so much for their Nation, and for the cause of freedom everywhere.

LET US REASON TOGETHER ON THE GRAPE BOYCOTT ISSUE

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following very interesting editorial from the Bataan News in Sacramento, Calif. This is a publication which has wide circulation among Filipinos in the State of California.

The editorial follows:

LET US REASON TOGETHER ON THE GRAPE BOYCOTT ISSUE

The grape boycott with all its implications and potential danger to the nation, calls for sober thinking. The warring parties . . . the union and the growers . . . are highly aroused, and before they are emotionally carried away, some sober approach to the problem must be made.

The good book, upon which most of our philisophies and social behavior is based, says: "Come let us reason together."

The time for reasoning together has come.

At this stage of the grape boycott struggle, the right of the workers to organize and belong to a union of their own choosing is no longer an issue. The growers have conceded that point. What is left to do is to devise the provision of the law that will define and regulate the conduct and behavior of the growers and the farm workers.

In attempting to solve the problem, we must put above all the welfare of the workers, the growers and the general public. The workers are human beings whose interest and whose efforts must be justly compensated. They are worthy of their labors. The growers are the ones who provide foods for empty stomachs, and because the health and welfare of the nation depends on them, their interest must be carefully safeguarded. The public, who buys the goods produced by the growers and the workers, must be considered too. Let us not forget, he foots the bill.

The greatest and most serious area of disagreement is on the issue of strike. This is the big stick allowed by our present laws to the workers to force the employers into submission. This may be or may not be a good law, but all in all it has seen America become the greatest and wealthiest nation on earth. The growers, at this stage, are no longer objecting to a law allowing a strike clause; they are wanting and insisting that a strike, if it occurs, should not be allowed at the critical time of harvest.

In as much as we are thinking soberly and are reasoning together, let us consider that demand. Is it fair and just?

The union is insisting that its right to strike should not be restricted. It is insisting that it is in our statute books which were freely used in the past. It must be kept that way, it insists.

It is true that the unions have freely used the right to strike without any restriction as to time and place. They've used it in the steel industry, automobile industry, craft industry, etc. Stoppages of work in those industries have occurred time and time again, and when the strikes are over, work resumed as usual without any total loss. Steel is not perishable.

But let us look at the farming industry. Its products are highly perishable. In the growing of crops, *weather and time*, are delicately involved. After tediously culturing the plants, the crops mature at a certain time. When the crops are ripe and ready to be gathered in, they must be harvested right there and then. *Or else they go to rot.*

If the union decided to strike at that particular time of harvest, the crops would not wait till the strike is over. It just wouldn't wait for no man. If it is not harvested and processed at that particular time, the foods are wasted. It is that simple.

We are sure that everybody realizes the importance of agriculture not only to the individual but to the nation. The growers produce foods and fibers, upon which the health and welfare of the nation depends. Agriculture is still our number one economy, and still is the biggest employer in the nation.

Now, then, if we pass a law giving the workers the right to strike at harvest time, we would be hurting our number one economy. We would be endangering the health and welfare of the nation because such strikes will prevent us from harvesting the crops.

After reasoning together we find that it is incumbent that the farm workers should be allowed to belong to a union of their own choosing so that their interest could be protected. They could exercise the right to strike at any time except at the critical time of harvest. The foods should not be allowed to go to waste.

We believe that this is the human and practical thing to do.

JOE McCAFFREY, "VOICE OF CAPITOL HILL"

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying that, "speech is a mirror of the soul; as a man speaks, so is he."

This is an apt description of Joe McCaffrey, well-known Washington radio and TV commentator, for Joe has been "telling it like it is" long before the phrase became popular.

Joe's commentaries, which often reflect his delightful Irish wit, are forth-

right, fair, reliable, and highly professional.

He is not only a great commentator, but a fine gentleman, and on the occasion of his 25th year of broadcasting in the political arena, it is a pleasure to join the many friends of Joe McCaffrey in saying—you are more than a "household word"; you are the voice of Capitol Hill. Keep up the good work.

LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last year the 90th Congress in amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act repealed the annual Federal recreation area permit, known as the Golden Eagle passport. The Federal agencies still have authority to collect recreation fees, but after March 31, 1970, there will be no annual permit which may be used at all Federal recreation fee areas.

The Golden Eagle passport, of which 692,300 were issued between 1965 and 1968 and 403,100 so far in fiscal 1969, permits the bearer and everyone within a private vehicle and attached camper or trailer, to use one or all of the over 3,000 national parks, forests, and refuges, as well as other federally operated recreational areas, with the payment of a single \$7 fee.

I am convinced that the people in my district in Virginia, as well as for the many hundreds of thousands of other Americans, who enjoy the wonders of nature, the national parks, the national forests, and other Federal recreation areas, the Golden Eagle passport is an unsurpassed bargain in outdoor recreation. I think there is no doubt as to the interest in preserving this simple method of collecting this fee, either for the Government or from its user citizens. As personal opinion, if for no other reason than its simplicity, it ought to be maintained as an example that all acts of this Government are not confusing and complicated. Not only does the Golden Eagle passport benefit the hundreds of thousands of our citizens who travel across the breadth of this land in campers and trailers, its users also put revenues into the land and water conservation fund. This revenue helps finance such projects as Federal acquisition of additional authorized areas, multipurpose metropolitan parks, snow-ski areas, campgrounds, swimming pools, and bicycling paths in all the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and our territories.

After a slow start in 1965, when only \$633,600 in fees were collected, ever-increasing acceptance and demand has increased estimated receipts in fiscal 1969 to \$5,200,000. The Golden Eagle passport has proved its value and popularity. We must not let it expire.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I offer for introduction legislation to

extend this program. My bill will establish separate fee programs for entrance to and use of areas administered for outdoor recreation and related purposes by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes. This bill will extend the Golden Eagle passport indefinitely. One small change will be made to the fee now in use; the present fee is to be increased from \$7 annually to \$10. This increase is acceptable to the users as reasonable and the funds collected are to be used directly for the users benefits. I have been told it is still a bargain.

Mr. Speaker, I urge early consideration and action on my bill.

RUSSIA AND THE "PUEBLO"

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, when the U.S. Navy ship *Pueblo* was hijacked by the North Koreans about 18 months ago, there was considerable opinion in some places that Moscow was terribly embarrassed by such a rash act, and that the North Koreans had committed this piracy in spite of Russian efforts to prevent it.

Opinions such as this come from the same people who are flabbergasted when a few months later Russian armies invaded Czechoslovakia. In the view of these people the Soviet Union was supposed to have renounced the use of power.

Insofar as information is available to the public today, there is no certainty that the Soviet Union played a role in seizure of the *Pueblo*.

However, a news item pointing in this direction appeared today, and I include it at this point in my remarks as a development of real interest to those concerned with this issue:

CZECH DEFECTOR SAYS RUSSIA SPARKED SEIZURE OF PUEBLO

A high Czechoslovakian defense official who defected to the United States last year said yesterday that the Soviet Union collaborated with North Korea in the capture of the U.S. intelligence ship *Pueblo*.

The assertion by Gen. Jan Sejna in a copyrighted article in the July issue of Reader's Digest runs counter to the official position in Washington that the Russians had little—if anything—to do with the *Pueblo's* capture.

Sejna based his contention primarily on remarks he said were made by Soviet Defense Minister Andrei Grechko while Grechko was drinking heavily at a party in Prague in May, 1967, and on the words of a Soviet general who announced the *Pueblo's* seizure to the Czechs the day after it happened.

Sejna quoted Grechko as saying: "It is absolutely insolent the way the Americans sail their — ships around as if they owned the water. Their espionage ships come right up to our shores to spy on our communications. But I can tell you this: We have decided to humble the Americans. Just as we humiliated them in the air by shooting down the U-2, we are going to humiliate them at sea by grabbing one of these ships."

Sejna said Grechko did not say when,

where or how this would occur but that he indicated the Pacific area had been chosen because it was considered an "American preserve."

He quoted Grechko as saying: "Our Korean comrades, of course, are not capable of carrying this off without us. But we will guide and protect them."

He heard nothing more, Sejna said, until Jan. 24, 1968, when Soviet Col. Gen. Aleksandr Kushchev, the chief Warsaw Pact representative in Prague, announced the seizure at a meeting at the Czech Defense Ministry.

"During the night we learned that, with the collaboration of our Korean comrades, we have achieved a great success," Kushchev was quoted as saying. He then told—with an air of surprise, Sejna said—how the *Pueblo* had "capitulated" without firing a shot, leaving thousands of undestroyed documents, and how "it took Washington literally hours to pull itself together and even begin to react."

Sejna said other Soviet officers later confirmed Kushchev's account, and subsequent briefings indicated that "the intelligence information the Russians were extracting from the *Pueblo* was immensely valuable."

Until February, 1968, Sejna was the Communist Party official in charge of political control of the Czech Defense Ministry and General Staff, and frequently saw Soviet and Warsaw Pact officials. He flew to the United States when Antonin Novotny lost power in the 1968 Czech political crisis.

REPORT OF SOUTH VIETNAM STUDY TEAM

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, a U.S. study team made up of eight prominent individuals recently visited South Vietnam. The team was sent there by a group of well-known churchmen concerned about the war and by reports of political repression in South Vietnam. The members included our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a noted Jesuit, the Reverend Robert Drinan, S.J., dean of Boston College Law School.

I found the report of the U.S. study team illuminating as well as disturbing. I was, for instance, surprised to learn that although most Catholics in South Vietnam support the Thieu government, a significant segment is critical of the war and of the present Government. The team found Catholics who want a closer tie with the Buddhists, who are actively seeking an early peace. Many of these Catholics are seeking what some call a "third solution"—between communism and militarism. Father Hoang Quynh, for instance, who is an active member of the All-Religion Citizens' Front, has worked with Buddhists in trying to prevent further friction between the Buddhist and Catholic communities. There are other Catholics who are close to Pope Paul's VI's views on negotiations and peace. They have won the confidence of Buddhist leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the study team our colleagues will study its report and I join with others in praising the gentleman from Michigan for his part in this important effort.

NEVADA CHAPARRAL TEA, A POSSIBLE CANCER CURE?

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, with all the talk and debate about cigarettes allegedly causing cancer and with the keen interest this past week in House passage of a cigarette bill, I feel research underway in my State of Nevada and neighboring Utah deserves attention nationwide in regard to the drive of mankind to cure disease.

Therefore, I offer for the RECORD today a report from the Nevada Ranch and Home News about a "tea" made from a Nevada bush which the Indians have apparently been using for years as a sort of cure-all. This Indian habit has drawn the attention of some doctors in Reno and Utah at the respective universities with the thought being that perhaps the so-called "tea" may be a cancer cure.

I submit the news release for inclusion at this point in the RECORD:

DESERT CREOSOTE BUSH SHOWS PROMISE AS CANCER CURE

A little "Chaparral" or "Indian" tea brewed from the leaves of the desert creosote bush just might cure cancer.

Sound like an Indian medicine man talking or maybe a barker for patent remedies? If current research proves fruitful, it could be a highly trained and expert medical doctor.

"I've kidded some of my students that maybe the intricate and sophisticated world of medical science is catching up with the medicine men," said Dr. Ronald Pardini, associate professor of biochemistry at the University of Nevada, who is engaged in research concerning the creosote tea. Dr. Pardini delivered a paper last Friday, June 13 at a regional meeting of the American Chemical Society in which he discussed phases of the research into a derivative of the creosote bush leaves that has indicated some promise as an anti-cancer drug. The meeting was held in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Staff members of the Biochemistry Department, College of Agriculture, at the University of Nevada including Dr. Pardini, Dr. Dean C. Fletcher, chairman of the Department, and James C. Heidker, a graduate student working toward the Ph. D. have now been conducting research on the creosote bush derivative for a number of months.

Dr. Fletcher related an intriguing story about how the research got started. Interest was first generated, he said, at the University of Utah Medical School concerning an elderly patient who was suffering from a melanoma or cancer of the face which had metastasized or spread. Previous surgeries had not helped. A radical surgery was recommended for the removal of a considerable amount of tissue but the person, due to his advanced age, refused. The disease was felt terminal and the old man went back to his home in St. George, Utah to wait. Some months later he returned to the University of Utah and exhibited a miraculous recovery. When questioned the only deviation from his normal routine was the drinking each day of the "Chaparral" tea as recommended by an old Indian friend. At any rate, the man's story intrigued those at the Utah Medical School enough to seriously look into the tea.

Researchers at Utah, according to Dr. Fletcher, were able to isolate the active ingredient in the creosote leaves which appeared to

be the only material which might inhibit cancer growth. This was "Nordihydroguaiartate Acid" or NDGA. When extracted this appears as a white powder that can be chemically synthesized in the laboratory and administered in capsule form.

Dr. Fletcher, who is a member of the clinical faculty of the School of Medicine, Utah University, became acquainted with the drug and decided to experiment with it in Nevada. So far only the University of Utah and Nevada are working with the "tea". The two universities are cooperating in the research.

Dr. Pardini's particular phase of the study, and that which he reported upon at the Salt Lake meeting, is to determine the site of action of the drug or where in the cell it works and how it works. Previous to coming to Nevada, Dr. Pardini had been associated with the Stanford Research Institute where he had worked on screening tests for anti-cancer drugs. Specifically he had researched the phenomenon of mitochondrial functions within the cell. This is the portion of the cell where energy metabolism takes place. He had worked with various drugs which inhibit mitochondrial functions, and in turn inhibit cancer cell growth. Dr. Pardini found NDGA to be a potent inhibitor of mitochondrial enzymes. It also appeared to work specifically on diseased or cancerous cells and not on other cells. His work also showed that the inhibiting action of NDGA was specific to the compound and not a nonspecific antioxidant effect. He also postulated how it can work to inhibit tumor growth.

Meanwhile, Dr. Fletcher has been working with the medical fraternity in Reno in actually administering the drug to patients. Similar work is also being done in Salt Lake. In addition, researchers at Utah are gathering case history studies on Indian people who have traditionally taken the tea to determine how this might have influenced or effected incidence of cancer or certain types of cancer.

"All we can say at this time," said Dr. Fletcher, "is that the drug appears extremely interesting and interesting enough that we are continuing study on it."

In the "Chaparral Tea" derived from *Larrea Divaricata*, one of the creosote bushes of the Southwest and found in Nevada, may be some hope in the fight against cancer. Indians in the country have had faith in it for a long time.

THE ACCOMMODATING ASTRONAUTS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 19, 1969, the Washington Daily News carried an editorial describing the flight of Apollo 10 and the contribution of Astronauts Stafford, Young, and Cernan to the Apollo program and to the future of manned space flight. The key facts of this editorial are that these astronauts place the importance of space exploration above their own aggrandizement. I commend this editorial to your reading:

THE ACCOMMODATING ASTRONAUTS

The trio of astronauts now on their way to the moon in the Apollo 10 spaceship have got to go down as three of the most accommodating men in history.

Their predecessors in Apollo 9, who blazed the trail to the moon two months ago, had

the thrill of looking back across space and seeing Earth as a bright blue ball of life.

And in mid-July of the three astronauts aboard Apollo 11 two will have the incomparable experience of being the first human beings ever to set foot upon another celestial body.

So the three men now flying Apollo 10 are sort of middle men, short on glamor—relatively—but long on the services they are called upon to perform. For their flight is the dress rehearsal for the planned moon landing. They are to make the final checkouts of the lunar landing craft by twice descending to within nine miles of the moon's surface, and they are to take a close look at the landing sites targeted for July's history-making moment.

Yesterday, everything seemed to go off "on the tick"—blastoff from Cape Kennedy, the long rocket "burn" that headed them racing for the moon, and the needle-threading link-up of the command ship with the lunar landing vehicle.

We pray that the rest of the trip will go without a hitch and that the three—Tom Stafford, John Young and Gene Cernan—will return safely from their most obliging service.

HONOR PLEDGE OF FOUNDING FATHERS

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, "Honor Pledge of Founding Fathers" was the title of a very incisive editorial by the Taunton Gazette recently. In a time of considerable confusion concerning the spirit of the more radical members of the younger generation, this editorial speaks to a key issue which has often been overlooked. It addresses itself to the problems of method and mental attitude which are so important in determining the character of any movement for change. I offer the full text of the editorial for consideration by all my colleagues, who share my concern over the crisis of spirit in our society:

HONOR PLEDGE OF FOUNDING FATHERS

The revolts taking place on the nation's campuses are a "symptom of the serious moral duplicity in our history and culture as well as the perversion of values in our society," says a psychiatrist.

The students are wise to the "say one thing and do another" attitude that pervades society, says Dr. Charles de Leon, assistant professor of psychiatry at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio.

"They know that two of our greatest heroes, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, their flowery rhetoric about democracy and justice notwithstanding, were simple slaveowners."

This is, to be sure, fact of history. But before anyone condemns the American experiment as a monumental sham and colossal fraud, perhaps we may be permitted to ask a silly question.

If Presidents Washington and Jefferson were slaveowners, why is not President Richard Nixon a slaveowner?

Perhaps it is because Nixon is a Quaker, as was Benjamin Franklin, who spent the last years of his life vainly petitioning Congress to abolish slavery.

Well, then, why is not former President Lyndon B. Johnson, a southerner, a slaveowner?

Perhaps it is because the Industrial Revolution has simply made slavery impractical today. But slavery was abolished long before farming was mechanized.

The answer is, of course, that eight decades after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, with its "flowery rhetoric," the American people could no longer tolerate the existence of an institution so contrary to the ideals on which the nation was founded. They could solve the contradiction no other way but to fight a Civil War.

"In that war more than 600,000 men died," writes Mary Joan White in the Wall Street Journal. "Legal slavery also died. Whether slavery could have been abolished short of war is questionable, but it is certain that the methods employed by the radicals stirred public passions to the point that leaders who tried to work through to a peaceable, just solution were cut off.

"Nor did the fearful price buy true freedom for the Negro. The nation has not finished with the bitterness, political division and racial injustice that survived the war."

"Instead of sectional lines, racial and generational lines are being drawn today militant blacks and radical youth are attacking the problems of an admittedly imperfect society in terms of moral issues and with any means at hand . . .

"In their attitudes and strategy, the young radicals and black militants are the direct descendants of both the abolitionists and the southern radicals, an uneasy mix surely. Like the abolitionists, they have a rather arrogant assurance that they are so right, that they are above the law in their choice of means to their ends. Like the southern radicals, they are so committed to their own view of the issues that they insist on being allowed to rule or ruin the system. Their attitude and more extreme methods are absolutely totalitarian."

Benjamin Franklin detested the compromise with slavery written into the Constitution, but he believed that one, united nation, even with slavery, held more hope for the future of mankind than a collection of sovereign, bickering states.

Washington and Jefferson, too, had qualms about slavery, but they were products of their environment (the South), even as Franklin was the product of his (the North).

Should we scorn Washington and Jefferson as "simple slaveowners," or should we not bless them and all the others who "brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"—even if that liberty and that equality are still imperfectly realized?

Shall we declare another civil war between the generations and the races, or shall we not grant a measure of good will to all sides and all factions and attempt to reason together?

COMMUNITY PRIDE, INC.

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned of the work being done in the Watts area of Los Angeles by a non-profit community action corporation to improve housing conditions and create job opportunities. Their primary goal is both to rehabilitate old, broken-down homes and to build new ones. By using local unemployed craftsmen, and training the unskilled and unemployed, they are using local people to help in this community improvement effort. With

evidence of their initial success, this organization plans to expand their efforts into other areas such as community shopping centers.

Mr. Speaker, when this group first began their work, there was little assistance from the white community, local business and financial organizations, or from the Government. However, as their projects gained momentum, concerned businessmen in the Los Angeles area took an active interest in the activities of Community Pride, Inc.

The article entitled "Helping an Infant Black Firm" tells the story of Community Pride, Inc. Because I believe that there is a growing interest in the positive efforts of business firms to assist the disadvantaged, I recommend this article to all interested Government officials as it outlines the way in which established business concerns can work together with community action groups to improve our poverty areas, and I include it herewith:

HELPING AN INFANT BLACK FIRM—VOLUNTEER PUBLIC RELATIONS GIVES A HAND TO NEW ENTERPRISE IN THE WATTS AREA

(By Robert B. Wolcott and David Nuffer)

(NOTE.—Robert B. Wolcott is chairman of Wolcott, Carlson & Company, Los Angeles. David Nuffer, formerly senior account executive with Wolcott, Carlson & Company, is now director of public relations at VSI Corporation, Pasadena.)

The talk is loud, the proposals and recommended programs many and varied. Unfortunately, the efforts to alleviate the urban ghetto problem have not been large. Tokenism may be on the way out; we have reached the point where the pat on the back can no longer take the place of the necessary sweat and money.

What can business do to help and, more specifically, what can public relations practitioners do?

Our firm, through one of its clients, the Earle M. Jorgensen Company, learned of a grass roots organization in the South Central—or Watts—area of Los Angeles, dedicated to eradicating two of the area's most persistent problems—poor housing and lack of jobs. Its name is Community Pride, Inc., incorporated in 1966 as a non-profit corporation with the assistance of top Los Angeles business leaders.

Public relations for CPI was taken on by Wolcott, Carlson Company, Inc. as a public service. We prepared the original public relations program; handled the first major press conference, which announced the formation of the organization; helped with subsequent press conferences, and encouraged the involvement of some members of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America. We are continuing to counsel and assist CPI as other Los Angeles business and public relations leaders pitch in with their time and talent.

The results?

To date more than \$100,000 has been loaned, donated or pledged to CPI and a line-of-credit for \$200,000 has been established at the Bank of America. To date CPI has rehabilitated approximately 50 homes and provided jobs for nearly 100 Negroes.

With these initial results in hand, the organization's leaders are looking for new avenues through which to expand their efforts into such ventures as community shopping centers and prefabricated homes. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has approached CPI to enlist its efforts in other projects, such as new dwelling construction (including multi-family units), administration of rent supplement and consumer education programs, and

ple of the area with government and private community-wide efforts to acquaint the people.

CPI is now one of four groups involved in the housing problems of South Central Los Angeles and is the most successful.

How did CPI get started? And what role did public relations play in its growth?

CPI was incorporated as a non-profit corporation in June, 1966. There was little help at first from the white community, from business and financial organizations or from government programs. Then concerned businessmen took an interest in CPI as offering one of the soundest approaches to urban problems.

CPI's primary goal is to rehabilitate homes and build new ones in the blighted area and sell them to deserving, low-income families at prices they can afford (less than \$15,000). By using local unemployed craftsmen, and by training the unskilled in carpentry, electrical wiring, roofing, plumbing and landscaping, etc., CPI is helping to relieve unemployment. In order to meet its goals, CPI originally needed two things:

1. Financial help from HUD under the Federal Housing Administration Act—section 221(h) (Program for Purchase and Rehabilitation of Housing for Resale to Low Income Purchasers); and

2. Financial help from the business community in the form of initial operating capital to put the business enterprise into motion, since 221(h) cannot be used for this purpose.

HUD had already promised its support. Prime need was a working fund of approximately \$250,000. CPI proposed to obtain this amount from industry on a business-like loan basis at a reasonable interest rate with a one to three year maturity date. The premise was that business could get involved on terms it would understand.

The basic public relations objectives for CPI were set down as follows:

1. Generate knowledgeability and credibility on the part of the Los Angeles business public about CPI, its objectives, and its business-like orientation.

2. Establish CPI nationally in the business and government communities as a model program for alleviating housing and employment problems in the ghettos of the country, and thus help provide direction for use of funds.

3. Increase general public knowledge about CPI, its origin, nature, and objectives, and thus attempt to help in lowering the barrier between minority and majority communities.

4. Provide media exposure for business and government organizations that provide assistance to CPI.

5. Provide media exposure of people involved in making CPI work, from administrators to laborers.

6. Help create an identity of a community on the upswing—through CPI as an important contributor—and thus help in creating public and business confidence in the South Central Los Angeles area.

7. Help insure knowledge in the area that CPI would not mean cessation of government monies.

PUBLICS DEFINED

To meet these objectives, we established certain target publics. In order of importance these are: Los Angeles business and financial leaders, firms and institutions; state and national business and financial leaders, firms and institutions; the general public; and the Negro community.

Since this was a strong local story, our primary media targets are: financial and general news sections of Los Angeles metropolitan newspapers; daily and community newspapers; and TV and radio news and documentary programs. Our secondary media targets are: the national business press; financial and general news sections of major

city newspapers; the Negro press; and government publications.

The peg for the first major CPI announcement was a tour of Watts and surrounding areas on February 26, 1968, by more than 30 leading Los Angeles businessmen, virtually all of whom saw Watts and "Charcoal Alley" for the first time. The tour concluded with a box lunch presentation by Bishop George Scott, Jr., executive vice president of CPI, at the Union Baptist Church in Watts.

The story was widely told the following day in the Los Angeles area in both newspapers and the electronic media. Then work began on an information brochure and a 25-minute film for showing on TV and to groups in South Central Los Angeles.

Following the first announcement, CPI leaders could concentrate on raising money for its operating fund. The task wasn't easy, and it soon became apparent that completion of the first major project—rehabilitation of five homes—was essential.

This was achieved in early September, 1968, and plans were made to publicize the move-in of the first family to have a CPI home. By this time, the local chapter of PRSA had been approached for its endorsement and Joseph Roos, executive director of the Jewish Community Center, accepted the chairmanship of a local public relations committee.

The city councilman from the area was invited to speak, standard press kits were prepared and media and business leaders invited. Once again, the story was favorably treated by Los Angeles media.

The next major event was the announcement of the first home in the nation to be built under financing by Section 235 of the new Federal Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. By this time, PRSA member Jack P. Whitehouse had joined the public relations effort.

Whitehouse now heads a special committee that works in conjunction with other advisory and working groups in finance, architecture, building and community relations. Members of Whitehouse's committee include: Ed Coyle, manager of public relations for Western Gear Corp.; Jim Hurley and Ray Burns of the Pacific Lighting Co.; Paul Lewis from the Whitehouse agency and Joe Roos.

The effort thus far for CPI have produced excellent results as community leaders increase their personal involvement in the city's problems.

HOW TO HELP

Admittedly, CPI is not the only answer to the problem of low-income urban living, but it is workable and will help considerably in its alleviation and success of the efforts points to a useful role for public relations in the public service field.

To those wishing to explore this field we recommend the following: 1. find out what's going on; 2. evaluate your findings; 3. recommend an action program; 4. carry it through—whether individually, by group or by PRSA chapter assistance; 5. report your results, and 6. keep the faith!

To those who wish to help, our final advice is: Don't wait for someone to come to you. Black organizations are springing up all over the country and the list will increase as President Nixon's "Black Capitalism" concept gains support. Topnotch public relations counsel and assistance is as vital to these organizations as to any successful company.

GOVERNMENT FISCAL YEAR

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the whole Congress to recognize that

our present fiscal year is an obstacle to good government and public welfare. By having the fiscal year begin on the first of July we are raising the overall level of governmental spending, depriving the underprivileged and the poor of effective and efficient programs, delaying cooperative Federal programs by as much as a year and casting a certain doubt on the credibility of governmental statistics. I strongly urge immediate consideration of my proposal for a calendar fiscal year, which would cure these present deficiencies. Although change of a long-established custom is difficult to achieve in Government, my proposal would not cause hardship on any governmental body or agency and would, on the contrary, alleviate or even eradicate difficulties and hardships now suffered by both Government and the public. Early passage of this proposal would greatly facilitate the minor technical changes needed for the Government and the public to adapt to the calendar fiscal year.

It has been a long-recognized fact that appropriations bills are seldom finalized by the first of July, which is the present legal beginning of the fiscal year. The Congress has, by a continuing resolution each year, authorized each program to continue spending at a level which would not exceed the lower of either the budget or the previous year's appropriations. Once a department or agency has begun spending money at this artificial level, it would experience difficulties in readjusting to a substantial decrease in appropriations from the artificial level set by the continuing resolution. Naturally, "Parkinson's Law" would take care of any increase and the additional money would be spent—even if not wisely or efficiently. In either case tax dollars would be wasted in inefficient spending caused by inadequate or no advance planning. Efficient administration is clearly the key to seeing that every dollar spent on social programs will benefit the poor and the underprivileged to the greatest degree possible rather than being lost in a cumbersome bureaucracy due to lack of direction.

Let us take a hypothetical case to show just how failure to finalize appropriations bills before the beginning of the fiscal year would raise the overall level of governmental spending. Suppose that program A had been appropriated \$1 million one year and the budget called for the same amount for the next year. However, although the Congress had indicated no particular controversy with respect to the program, the final appropriations passed in December was for only \$500,000, that is, 50 percent of the spending level authorized by the continuing resolution. One can readily see that the administrators of program A, counting on at least a continuance of the appropriations level of \$1 million, would have spent by the end of December almost all of the \$500,000 appropriated.

Even if the administrators eventually saw the possibility of a cut in appropriations they might choose to discount an appropriations cut and continue to spend on the basis of the continuing resolution, counting on a supplemental appropriation if there is a cut. In a case of this type the administrators would have a

clear case for a supplemental appropriation on the grounds that the Congress itself—by its failure to finalize the appropriations bill by the beginning of the fiscal year—caused the program to spend all its money with the fiscal year only half gone. If the Congress then wishes the program to continue, it will be forced to pass a supplemental appropriation for the remainder of the fiscal year, thus raising the overall spending level higher than the Congress originally intended. If the Congress is trying to keep to a budget ceiling, as it now is, some other program may then have to suffer in order to furnish funds for the supplemental appropriation. In this way and to this degree the Congress loses its control over executive spending and may exceed its own self-imposed fiscal limitations.

My proposal for a calendar fiscal year would eliminate this problem forever, because the fiscal year would begin on the first of January after all the appropriations bills have been finalized prior to adjournment in December—or earlier. More importantly, with advance notice of the final appropriations each department or agency would have an opportunity to plan ahead efficiently for the increase or reduction of a program; and the tax dollar, being utilized more efficiently, will then produce the greatest actual benefit to those individuals the program was intended to reach.

Now we all surely want the greatest portion of each dollar appropriated for social programs to benefit the poor and underprivileged directly. However, we deprive the underprivileged of the maximum benefit of these programs—and thus raise the administrative costs of social programs—when we allow the whole poverty program to go without direction. The present authorization expires in about 2 weeks, a new authorization bill is not yet ready and funds cannot be appropriated to administrative agencies that no longer exist. What greater chaos could exist? Even with stopgap legislation, to continue the programs at their present level cannot restore the proper order or enough direction for efficient administration. With the fiscal year beginning on the first of July, it is almost impossible for the Congress to complete hearings and make appropriate changes in the bill for this most complex and vital program. When all of this is allowed to occur, the one to suffer the most is the one who most needs help: the poor and the underprivileged.

In most of the national social and public works projects, the nature of the legislation requires funding jointly from Federal, State, and even local sources. Sometimes the State has to match Federal funds in a certain ratio or the Federal Government has to reimburse the State for certain types of expenditures. In either case the particular project will probably be delayed. Detailed planning cannot be accomplished in the first case until the State or local community knows just how much money it needs for the project, while in the second case, the State or local community may not state the project until there are appropriated funds out of which they can be reimbursed.

Vocational schools thought that they had found a way out of the latter situa-

tion by budgeting grants to students under the vocational education—work-study program at the beginning of each fiscal year. Naturally, they expected to be reimbursed from funds for that purpose which had been appropriated regularly each year. In fiscal year 1968 such funds were given to the Neighborhood Youth Corps in the Department of Labor and earmarked for distribution by the Office of Education. However, in fiscal year 1969, although sufficient funds were appropriated to the Department of Labor for use in the vocational education—work-study program, the funds were not earmarked and were to be administered by the Neighborhood Youth Corps itself under an administrative reorganization. The vocational schools could not get the funds from the Office of Education as before and were left with the idea that no such funds existed. Only recently—and after most of the funds had been expended—were some schools able to determine the true facts and obtain partial reimbursement. The primary cause of this problem can be laid to the July 1 fiscal year and the inability of Congress to finalize appropriations bills by this deadline. Otherwise the schools would not have had to anticipate the Federal funds in their own budgets each year and make themselves subject to possible loss of their operating funds if funds for the program were not available.

Having the fiscal year begin on the first of July also makes programs subject to certain physical environmental factors which can cause delay in the execution of the program. Construction projects, particularly in the Northern States, cannot be started in the winter months—which may last as long as from October to April. Some of these projects, such as road construction and buildings, require a substantial part of the primary construction to be completed before the winter months if the whole project is not to be started anew in the spring. In fact, they may not be started until the following spring even if the appropriations were finalized by the first of July, since considerable advance planning is needed and sometimes the primary construction itself cannot be completed in 4 months. However, in all of these cooperative efforts there would be adequate time for advance planning to be completed and for construction to be started if the funds were made available for a calendar fiscal year. Seasonal problems and delays could then be avoided.

While upsetting basic economic and social planning, the July 1 fiscal year also casts doubt on the credibility of Government statistics. Most of the Government is geared to the fiscal year and has a tendency to collect figures which pertain to the fiscal year and not to the calendar year. Individuals and private concerns rarely put out facts and figures for public consumption unless they cover a calendar year. Corporate annual reports, for instance, are required by law to cover the calendar year. When faced with the need to correlate and make sense out of all the thousand types of figures available, even an expert may throw up his hands in dismay. Even in the Government itself the Department of Agriculture generally uses the July 1

fiscal year for its foreign trade statistics while the Commerce Department employs the calendar year for the same statistics. Who is truly able to reconcile these two sets of figures or even determine whether they are in agreement? A calendar fiscal year would solve most of this problem and help avoid costly duplication of fiscal year versus calendar year figures.

My proposal, Mr. Speaker, for a calendar fiscal year would not only lead us out of the difficulties I have just described, but would also save the Federal Government millions of dollars. The types of difficulties are not hypothetical, but represent very real problems which face our Government each year. Much money could be saved by the orderly administration and clear direction which a calendar fiscal year would bring, and the Congress would have more time for deliberations on the complexities of fiscal matters and on administrative regulation. Most legislation is far too complicated to be started and finished within 6 months. The plain fact of the matter is that when the congressional leadership provided for an August recess, it tacitly said that it did not expect to finish conducting its business before August. Nevertheless, almost all pressing business is completed prior to adjournment—be it in October, November, December, or earlier. The money saved and the efficiency gained by giving just those 6 months is so valuable and so important that we cannot afford to wait to pass this legislation.

Do we want our programs to accomplish all that they were originally intended to do? Do we want to save millions of dollars in efficient administration? If we do, then now is the time to give all governmental bodies the fiscal certainty which is necessary for sound planning and for orderly, effective, and efficient administration.

ESSAY ON THE TROUBLED TIMES BESETTING OUR NATION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently a young man from my district was one of the winners of the Dwight D. Eisenhower summer intern contest sponsored by the Illinois Republican State Central Committee. Carl Hawkinson, 21, a graduate of Galesburg High School and a junior at North Park College of Chicago, won the contest by writing an incisive and in-depth essay on the troubled times besetting our Nation.

Mr. Hawkinson, who submitted his piece anonymously along with other contestants, is the son of John Hawkinson, Republican chairman of Knox County.

Young Hawkinson rightly states in his essay:

America is not on the verge of collapse. It has the resources, both physically and spiritually, to meet the demands of the late twentieth century. We need men in politics

who see the promise in America. They must see the wrongs and try to correct them, but they must keep an eye on the great traditions of the United States.

I commend this well written and clearly thought out essay, which follows, to my colleagues:

ESSAY BY MR. HAWKINSON

The last decade has been a turbulent one for America and the world. War in Vietnam and the Middle East have been near to the hearts of all concerned citizens. Years of discrimination have resulted in the pressure which we feel in all of our major cities. Violence in the streets and the increasing activities of organized crime make the appeal for law and order a most popular one. The voices of dissent are feeling alienated from what they call the establishment. Radical use of street tactics are repulsive to most of us. The lines are being drawn in America. Even our college campuses are the scenes of armed confrontations. There is no communication between the followers of George Wallace and the followers of Tom Hayden.

But communication has never been open between the radicals in ours or any society. Our problem is threatening to expand in scope. Blacks feel alienated from the establishment and our cities explode on an expanding scale. Many young people are dropping out, rather than trying to fulfill their lives in our increasingly technological society. The national spirit is being sapped by war, riots, and assassinations. The radicals say that the revolution is at our doorstep. Is America really in peril of violent revolution?

A year ago that question would have seemed ridiculous to me. The events of 1968 have made it a serious question. Serious thinking and concerned individuals are pondering the crisis of America. The United States is not historically immune. We think of ourselves as a young nation, and yet we are the oldest continuous republic in the world. We must seriously analyze our institutions and our beloved traditions. Our fear for security must not cause us to cling adamantly to the status quo. Change is a fact of the human experience and we must channel it rather than hide from it.

Although I see wrongs in America and am working to improve her, there is much in her essence and her tradition that causes me to love her. To some it seems outdated, but the playing of the national anthem causes a tingling in me. America needs her patriots and it needs her dissenters. It needs changes and it deserves our efforts to make her great. Neither revolution nor the status quo will answer her needs.

We start our journey with the duty of preserving the good things about America and with the obligation to change the things which adversely affect the lives of her citizens. The scope of our journey is outside the realm of any individual or small group of citizens. We don't look for a political messiah in the United States. In fact, we have built-in precautions against one. We can't allow a small minority to rule the lives of 200 million citizens. Whether it be the political or the economic arena, competition and cooperation have always been the vital forces in our struggle for greatness.

Some of our problems arise when groups forget the principles of competition and cooperation. They think that they have the whole truth. Only they know how society should operate. Members of the John Birch Society and Students for a Democratic Society both feel that they should be running this country. They mistakenly think that their way would be the best way for all of the people. Their motives are not selfish, but they are born in an intellectual pride. This is the kind of pride which doesn't recognize the rights of other citizens to successfully create their own version of how

things ought to be done. It is the kind of pride which thumbs its nose at the thought of compromise.

Although men must live with principles, they must also live with each other. Men must learn when to compromise and when to stand behind their principles. The common good must not be the conception of a small group, but a program arrived at by the interaction of all the people. Our system of government is the best way yet discovered to fulfill the common good. It is not a perfect system, and this we cannot afford to forget. When we idolize the system we tend to ignore the wrongs in our society. Clinging to the system can be a shield used to fend off change. When we use it thusly, we are inviting revolution.

One problem with compromise is that it sometimes ignores minorities. Minorities deserve the same rights in spite of their lack of political power. These rights are not limited to the rights of opportunity. Opportunity always means that some will not succeed. We have taken some important steps in safeguarding the welfare of those who are unable to take advantage of opportunity, but we have not solved the whole problem. Hunger, inadequate housing and medical care, and a general lack of necessities are present along with the great abundance produced by our expanding economy. America is rich enough to feed, clothe, and give medical care and adequate housing to all of her citizens.

Our enemies have given plenty of cause for concern for our defense. We must not answer fear with hatred. We must answer our enemies by remaining strong and yet pursuing peace. We have enough missile strength to destroy Russia many times over. We should show a willingness to end the arms race, rather than a hatred which causes us to speed it up. We think nothing of spending billions for defense, and yet we drop poverty programs which are wasting only a couple hundred thousand dollars. Our priorities must be rearranged.

America is not on the verge of collapse. It has the resources, both physically and spiritually, to meet the demands of the late twentieth century. We need men in politics who see the promise in America. They must see the wrongs and try to correct them, but they must keep an eye on the great traditions of the United States. Our leaders must not be afraid to mold opinion, and they must also represent the views of their constituents. Our representatives are not solely responsible for the welfare of our society. In the final analysis, we as citizens are responsible for her greatness. We must be concerned, not apathetic. We must be understanding, not filled with hate. We must show charity, not greed. We must seek change and love our heritage. We must not be afraid to step forward into a wonderful new American era. The United States can go forward, only if we go forward together, armed with tradition, hope of change, and love for our brothers.

APOLLO—AND AFTER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an editorial of Tuesday, May 20, 1969, in the Birmingham News asks the question of where our national space program is going following the lunar landing, and points to the contribution our astronauts have made in making this Nation pre-eminent in science and technology. Be-

cause of the significance of this editorial, I commend it to the reading of my colleagues and to the general public:

APOLLO—AND AFTER

Three more brave men are en route on another leg of the most exciting voyage in human history. Thomas Stafford, Eugene Cernan, John Young, crewmen of Apollo 10, are taking the penultimate step toward the moon. In July, if all goes well, man will set foot on the moon's surface.

While Apollo 10 so far has been as spectacularly successful as earlier missions in this sequence, the most dangerous part of the flight is still to come—orbiting of the moon, low-level scouting of landing areas in the weird Lunar Excursion Module of the type which will be used to make a touchdown in Apollo 11, and return home.

As did the three astronauts who preceded them in lunar orbit, Stafford, Cernan and Young go not only on the thrust of the magnificent machine designed and built by Dr. Werner von Braun's Saturn team at Huntsville, but also on the wings of the prayers of millions of countrymen and other well-wishers around the world.

As the climatic moment of America's manned space program approaches—thought has turned more and more toward the post-Apollo era.

Will the space program be continued? At what level? Toward what new goals?

These are not easy questions, for beyond the scientific and other factors involved there is the matter of money—many billions of tax dollars. Should space research and exploration continue to rate high priority? Or should the space program be cut back so more funds could be diverted to other needs?

The News understands that considerable rethinking of the U.S. space effort will be in order, and that some cutback in the level of spending, at least for awhile, is probable. But we believe that a drastic reduction in the program would be a mistake.

We are only on the beaches of the universe beyond our own small planet. There are more space seas to sail, more worlds to explore.

We cannot neglect our earthly problems and responsibilities. But neither should we lower our eyes from the stars.

Shepard, Glenn, Grissom, White, Lovell, Borman, Anders, Stafford, Cernan, Young—they are names on a roster with Columbus and Magellan and Lindbergh and thousands of famous and anonymous men and women who dared the unknown, who blazed historic trails.

Stop now? We have barely begun.

ABOLISH THE DRAFT?

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Claude N. Swanson, contributing editor of the Fairmont, Minn., Sentinel, is one of the finest conservative editorial voices in our district. He has kindly provided me with a recent editorial in which he argues that so long as the U.S. Armed Forces are restrained from military victory in Vietnam, the draft cannot be replaced with a volunteer army. I include his thought-provoking analysis at this point in my remarks:

ABOLISH THE DRAFT?

(By Claude N. Swanson)

There is talk of abolishing the draft, depending on voluntary enlistments for a fight-

ing force to defend our country. The draft has never been popular. It was because of compulsory military service that our fathers, grandfathers and others before them left Europe. But, we have it here.

If the "experts" think that we could recruit a volunteer fighting force of sufficient size to protect this country, they have another "think" coming. Not under present and past conditions could this be accomplished.

Is any young man in his right mind going to volunteer to serve in a fighting force that is not permitted to win? As happened in Korea when President Truman fired General MacArthur as he was about to administer the coup de grace to North Korea. Or, as our fighting forces have been forbidden (by our non-military experts in the Pentagon) to bomb enemy shipyard docks, to set up "sanctuaries" in Cambodia and elsewhere, from which the enemy is free to attack, but which our men mustn't touch?

No, our young men are not crazy. Far from it. And they are (those who survive) the very ones that will have to pay for the mistakes of our politicians and so-called "experts."

More than 60,000 of our sons, husbands, brothers have been killed in Korea and Vietnam; a quarter of a million more have been wounded. Isn't it about time we turned our fighting men loose and let them fight to win? If not, let's call them home.

THE SHORTSIGHTED ATTITUDE OF THE ADMINISTRATION ON STUDENT FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on what I believe is an extremely naive and shortsighted attitude on the part of the administration with respect to its budget requests for the various programs which provide assistance to students who seek a higher education, but whose families cannot afford the full expense involved in such an undertaking. I refer especially to the educational opportunity grants program, the national defense student loan program, the college work-study program, the guaranteed student loan program, and the health professions student loan program.

A summary recently prepared by the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reveals that for the 1969-70 school year there will be only \$461 million available for three major Federal student loan programs—the educational opportunity grants program, the national defense student loan program, and the college work-study program. For these same three programs, institutions have expressed a need for \$814 million and regional panels have approved \$682 million. I would like to insert in the Record at this point a table which gives a State-by-State breakdown of institutional requests for these programs, the amount approved by panels, the amount of funds which are available, and the percentage of approved requests which can be granted:

fense education loan program funds which were available during the last school year. If the program is funded at the level which has been proposed by the administration, participation will be down to 398,000. This is a significantly lesser number than the 442,000 who were supported under the program for the past school year. This situation is made even more serious in view of the tremendous enrollment increases which are expected at our colleges and universities. I believe that full funding of this program is critical, because it is this program which can be used to offset some of the dislocations which could result from the inadequate funding of the educational opportunity grants program. In my home State of Pennsylvania the funding level which the administration has requested for this program will mean that only 65 percent of the panel approved loans can be made. In 15 of the 50 States, the funds available will meet less than 50 percent of the approved requests, the lowest figures being 34 and 37 percent for South Dakota and North Dakota respectively. Utah is the only State in which the full amount of needed funds will be available.

THE COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

The college work-study program helps students finance their educations by providing grants to colleges and universities which support projects for student employment on and off campus up to an average of 15 hours per week during regular academic periods and up to 40 hours per week during vacation periods. All employment must be with their public or nonprofit agencies including the school itself. Federal matching funds pay 80 percent of the cost of the work-study program. The participating colleges and universities provide the other 20 percent. College work-study programs are designed to both combine with and supplement other student financial assistance programs such as scholarships, the educational opportunity grants program and student loans. Under this program, job preference must be given to students who come from families which are unable to support the full cost of a higher education for their children.

This year, the college work-study program, with carryover funds, will spend about \$162 million. The administration's budget request for the program is \$161.2 million. On the surface this seems to be a modest cut, but to understand its full impact two factors must be considered. First, wages paid to students participating in this program increase each year in line with the prevailing minimum wage rates. Second, the number of institutions participating in the program has recently increased by some 20 percent. As a result, on a national basis, about 20,000 fewer students will be able to participate.

THE GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

The guaranteed student loan program makes loans available to undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in eligible institutions ranging from vocational schools to degree-granting institutions. Students with adjusted gross family incomes of less than \$15,000 are eligible to participate and receive Federal payments of interest charges up to 7 percent on their loans, during school years prior to the repayment period and during au-

thorized periods of deferment. Deferment of payment may be granted during any period which the borrower is attending an eligible institution on a full-time basis, serving in the Armed Forces, Peace Corps, the Teacher Corps or VISTA. Applications for loans under this program are obtained from and submitted to lenders who are participating in the program, the schools themselves or the State guarantee agency. To participate a student needs a certification of enrollment and a statement of his family's income.

The deficiencies in the educational opportunity grants program, the national defense student loan program, and the college work study program leave a very great shortage to be met and the guaranteed student loan program is the only remaining source. This source will be further strained by the action which the administration has taken with respect to the health professions loan program. The appropriations level for this program for the 1969 fiscal year was \$15 million. The same amount has been requested by the administration for the upcoming fiscal year. However, the administration has ignored the fact that there will be \$15 million less for the program this year, because a \$15 million revolving fund which was used for the program last year, in addition to the regular appropriation, has all but been exhausted. Since the Government is no longer selling participation sales certificates, this money will not be replenished.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare advises me that they expect the guaranteed student loan program to take up the slack. The idea of the administration that the health professions loan program slack will be taken up by the guaranteed student loan program is idealistic at best. This is pointed up by a report I have just reviewed on the operation of the guaranteed student loan program for this year through January 31. I was most surprised to find that 85 percent of the families whose loans are insured by the program and 93 percent of those receiving loans under the State program had incomes of less than \$12,000. Even more surprising, in view of the fact that the guaranteed student loan program was designed to provide assistance to families in the middle-income brackets, is the fact that 36 percent of the federally insured loans and 57 percent of the State program loans were made to families with incomes of under \$6,000. I would like at this point to include in the RECORD a table which gives the status of the program in this regard. This table points up the fact that the program is not serving that clientele for which the Congress intended it. As a result many thousands of middle-income youngsters are facing the prospect of not being able to seek a higher education:

TABLE 2.—GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM
ANNUAL LOAN VOLUME

Fiscal year:	Amount
1966	\$77,000,000
1967	248,000,000
1968	436,000,000
1969 (1st 6 months)	450,000,000+

TABLE 2.—GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM—Con.
DISTRIBUTION OF LOANS

	Percent	
	State guaranteed	Federally insured
By adjusted family income:		
0 to \$2,999	29.55	14.97
\$3,000 to \$5,999	27.15	21.38
\$6,000 to \$8,999	22.46	25.33
\$9,000 to \$11,999	13.88	23.10
\$12,000 to \$14,999		14.10
\$15,000 and over		1.12
Distribution by sex:		
Male		63.96
Female		34.88
No response		1.16
Distribution by race:		
White		87.52
Negro and other		6.54
No response		5.94

LENDER PARTICIPATION

Type of lender	Percent of lenders	Percent of loans
National banks	40.2	46.8
State banks	45.8	40.5
Mutual savings bank	1.5	2.7
Savings and loans	4.6	5.4
Credit unions	7.8	2.6
Other	.1	2.1
Total	100.0	100.0

Two things stand out in the report which I referred to above. The first is that—contrary to the fear of many colleges—the banks have really been giving priority on loans to students from low-income families. The second is that if there is a shortage of guaranteed loan funds for the next year, it is primarily needy students who will be deprived of the assistance which the program provides and not those students for whom the program was intended since they have not been participating in the numbers we anticipated when we enacted the program. Since the operating results of the program indicate it has not provided the relief of middle- and upper-income families that was intended when the legislation authorizing the program was passed, there seems to be little reason for not adopting my bill which provides for a tax credit for educational expenditures by parents. I am particularly alarmed by the fact that the guaranteed student loan program has not been helping the students it was designed to, because it is this program which my constituents must rely on to send their sons and daughters to college. The people of the Fourth Congressional District are not wealthy and the overwhelming proportion of their incomes are below \$15,000, but not as low as those families, whose children have received the advantages of the program. I think that the administration is being penny-wise and pound foolish if it thinks that the programs providing aid to students seeking a higher education are doing the job as is. It is obvious that we cannot afford anything but full funding of all these programs.

When the Higher Education Act of 1965 was passed, the prime rate of interest was 5 percent or lower. However, the credit shortage of 1966 cut sharply into the amount of funds which were available for loans under the guaranteed student loan program. Now, with the prime rate recently increased to 8½ percent, hundreds of banks and other

money lenders are telling the Government that they may have to curtail sharply or end guaranteed student loans in expectation of a real loan crunch. At stake is more than \$640 million in Government guaranteed loans to about 750,000 students.

Colleges have been aware of this serious situation for some time but they are only now learning of their specific situations as they receive their notices of allocations for the various programs. Students, on the other hand, will not receive information about their requests for loans for several weeks. If as expected, the money for guaranteed loans begins to dry up, it is quite probable that a great number of students will be forced to give up their plans for a higher education. This would truly create a national emergency in higher education.

Colleges already feel that the Federal Government is guilty of a breach of faith in the management of the educational opportunity grant program and there is a very real danger that other programs will suffer the same fate if action is not taken soon by the administration. There is clearly no cheap or easy solution to the problem. One step would be an increase in national defense education loan program money of \$160 million up to the full appropriations authorization of \$275 million and to increase the educational opportunity grant program up to the limit for initial awards. I believe about \$15 million would be needed for this. I realize only too well that \$130 million cannot be added slightly to the budget but I believe that some nonessential defense spending cuts might provide the funds needed with ease. The human cost in terms of frustrated students and their parents just is not worth the price of any other approach.

On the guaranteed loan program, it appears to me that this program is at the crossroads. Some years ago a determination was made that the Government should no longer make loans directly to the students, but that the private sector should be relied upon to implement the program. We cannot expect banks and other lending institutions to make student loans on a charitable basis and get the statutory limit of 7 percent interest when they could use their increasingly limited reserves to get returns of at least 8½ percent. We must decide if we want the Government to reassume its role in making these student loans. If not, we must move to make the program more attractive for the banks without increasing the cost to the student. There are several alternative ways in which this could be achieved. First perhaps the idea of a Federal student loan bank should be explored. Second, thought should be given to legislation authorizing the Office of Education to pay the banks who make loans an interest subsidy in an amount ranging from 1 to 3 percent above the 7-percent statutory figure approved by the Congress last year. By utilizing this approach, banks could afford to make the loans without losing money, the Government would be able to vary the interest subsidy depending on the market interest rates, and the cost to the student would remain

at 7 percent. As an added inducement to the banks and other lending institutions to participate in the guaranteed student loan program, States might take action to provide that banks which have State money on deposit must make a specified dollar amount of loans or lose these deposits.

I believe further that the Office of Education should explore the possibility of State trust funds participating in the program as lenders and that some serious thought should be given to the issuance of an education bond which would be sold to the public at a 6- or 7-percent interest rate. These bonds could carry a longer maturity so that they would not compete with savings bonds. Not only would this approach make millions of dollars available for student loans, but it would no longer make it necessary for banks to make student loans at a loss or with virtually no profit.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House should consider the interest subsidy approach, which I have outlined briefly, as a stopgap measure until such time as it becomes apparent whether the best approach to assure the continuing availability of student financial assistance is through the private sector or with the Government making the loans directly.

Also, I encourage all my colleagues to carefully review the administration's education budget before they are faced with the appropriations bill on the floor. I believe you will be as alarmed as I am about where cuts are proposed.

MEMORIAL DAY TRIBUTE

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has recently paid tribute to those who have given their lives so that we here in America may continue to enjoy the blessings of freedom.

On Memorial Day, May 30, 1969, a particularly inspiring message was delivered by Erie County executive, B. John Tutuska, at the veterans' section of Forest Lawn Cemetery, Buffalo, N.Y. Mr. Tutuska, former Erie County sheriff, has recently assumed the responsible and challenging duties as Erie County executive.

I commend his message to the reading of my colleagues in the Congress and include it herewith:

REMARKS BY MR. B. JOHN TUTUSKA

We stand here today in reverent tribute to the memory of those who gave their lives for America, so that Americans could live on in the traditions of American liberty and freedom.

Memorial Day in some respects is somewhat of a paradox:

It is a significant occasion—a beautiful occasion.

But it also is a sad occasion—a sacred occasion.

Why is Memorial Day a significant and beautiful occasion?

Because it personifies the sentiment of the American people for the patriots who gave

their lives for the greatest cause in the whole world—our country!

Memorial Day teaches an unforgettable lesson in patriotism. It exemplifies the deep feeling that is held by young and old alike for those who died for our country—who made the supreme sacrifice in the great struggles in which America has been involved.

Memorial Day unveils a tenderness without parallel on the part of those among us here who participated in World War I or World War II—or the Korean conflict or the present Vietnam conflict. It also reveals a tenderness on the part of young people who simply know of the two world wars and possibly the Korean struggle as history—or, as in the case of Vietnam, history-in-the-making.

Yes, those are the sentiments that make Memorial Day a significant and beautiful occasion.

Why is Memorial Day also a sad and sacred occasion?

Because it brings with it sad and sacred memories—as we recall anew the great and tragic events that led to the establishment of Memorial Day—a day for solemn and reverent tribute to those who gave their all for their country.

Time marches on inexorably—and in its rapid flight, time has borne us on its wings till we are half a century removed from the end of World War One—a quarter of a century since the close of World War Two. In the meantime, we have gone through a bloody Korean conflict—and are now engaged in a cruel conflict in Vietnam—a conflict which we fervently pray will be ended before another Memorial Day rolls around.

Since the end of World War I fifty years ago—and there may be some among us here today who served in what was heralded at the time as the war to end all wars—since the first World War ended half a century ago, America has been thrust into World War II—acclaimed as the war to save the world from Hitler—and then into the Korean conflict and now the Vietnam Struggle. As was the case with Korea, we are in Vietnam for the avowed purpose of protecting the liberty and freedom of people in oppressed nations—to save them from the clutches of communism.

And so it is in keeping with our American conscience that we observe Memorial Day—a day on which we remember and honor those who sacrificed and died in the wars of the last fifty years, and in the earlier wars—and also those who sacrificed and have since died. We remember them for the invaluable service they performed in defense of their country, and for humanity.

We honor our heroic and patriotic dead by being true men—and true women—by faithfully fighting the battles of our day, even as they fought, and are fighting, the battles of yesterday, and those of today. We pay to them this honor on this specific day—Memorial Day—so proclaimed originally after the Civil War and observed by North and South alike.

Memorial Day was officially proclaimed in 1868—and set for May 30th—by Civil War General John A. Logan. In doing so, General Logan in whom burned a deep love for his country and for his comrades in arms, spoke these words:

"If other eyes grow dull and other hands shake, and other hearts grow cold in the solemn trust, ours shall keep it well so long as the light of warmth, the warmth of life, remain to us."

So for more than a hundred years—since three years after the end of America's bloody Civil War—Memorial Day has been observed on May 30th each year with impressive ceremonies and patriotic parades.

Nothing I can say or do here can add to the lustre of those who in defense of their country have fallen in America's wars.

Nothing any of us can do or say anywhere at any time can make shine brighter the memory of those patriots who gave everything, even life itself, so that our nation might live, and so that right and justice might prevail.

There is no word, no action, that can speak as eloquently as the deeds of the fallen heroes that gave true meaning to the spirit of service and sacrifice.

And so we stand here today, in the veterans' section of this beautiful cemetery—under auspices of fourteen different veterans' organizations joined together for this occasion as the United Veterans Memorial Day Committee—paying humble homage to those who fought and died to preserve our American heritage, and to help freedom-loving people in other lands to gain their liberty.

Americans—and dedicated citizens of other countries—are making history these days with amazing, hitherto undreamed of journeys into space—to the moon now, to other planets, eventually.

But no matter what the future holds for mankind—no matter what new fields and new areas are developed and conquered—we shall always observe Memorial Day each year, a day consecrated to our fighting men and women who laid down their lives for their cherished America. Yes, we shall always observe Memorial Day as a special day dedicated to patriotism.

These graves around us, in this quiet and peaceful sector of this beautiful cemetery, constitute a public shrine—a mecca to which we come, as patriots, to renew our devotion to the cause for which these patriots died—our country.

Their valor preserved America—made possible a bigger and a better America—painted America indelibly on the world's landscape as the land of individual freedom and liberty. Perpetuation of our American traditions was purchased with their blood—blood that was spilled not only on American soil but on ground thousands of miles distant.

We pray to God that in the not too far distant future, the day will come when it no longer is necessary for American boys to be sent to far-away lands to fight for freedom and liberty of strange peoples.

We pray that some day it will no longer be necessary for nations to engage in war at all.

But until that day comes—we must ever remain alert and on guard against the forces that would crush our American way of life—that would deprive our people of the liberty and freedom which were earned at such heavy cost in blood and treasure. We must dedicate ourselves everlastingly to the task of maintaining the sacred heritage that we proudly call America—a sacred heritage for which those whose memories we honor today laid down their lives.

U.S. FOOTWEAR PROMOTION URGED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge U.S. businessmen to undertake a massive selling campaign on behalf of American-made footwear. A real promotional effort is needed because foreign shoe imports are ruining the American footwear industry, and hurting U.S. leather suppliers and farm income in the process.

Shoe imports have shot up 600 percent since 1960, and more than 100

percent between 1967 and 1968. Foreign leather shoe imports were 36 percent greater last year than the year before.

As a result, U.S. footwear production is off nearly 10 percent for the first quarter of 1969, at least seven shoe factories have closed down, and growth in the domestic industry has been halted.

The American shoe industry is being jeopardized and its farm suppliers right along with it. We need to promote an American shoe-in.

FORD FOUNDATION FUNDS AN- OTHER COMMUNIST OPERATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks last Thursday, June 19, at page 16682, I commented on the fraud called Afro-American studies. I had discussed the utter absurdity of Herbert Aptheker, the Communist Party theoretician, now employed as a professor at Bryn Mawr College as an expert in Afro-American studies.

To any who study the documentation on Comrade Aptheker, it must be obvious that the reason he, a white man, is the leading expert in Afro-American history is that he is the author, originator, and promoter of the entire scheme devised to further exploit unstable Negroes. Their resentment is whipped up in order to place Aptheker's indoctrinated troops on campuses. Now he, as an educational expert, will continue to promote racism and division of our people.

Any thinking American knows there is no such thing as Afro-American history. There is American history with a contribution played by individual Negroes.

Now with a 10 percent surtax extension facing the hard-working American people, we find that the tax-dodging Ford Foundation announces a \$1 million gift to expand Afro-American studies. In reality, a subsidy to a Communist indoctrination and infiltration front.

Mr. Speaker, I include a clipping from the Washington Post for June 22 and an editorial from the Main Line Chronicle, Ardmore, Pa.:

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1969]
HOWARD GETS \$143,500 TO AID IN BLACK STUDIES

Howard University has received a \$143,500 grant from the Ford Foundation to finance a new Afro-American studies department, permitting students to major in Afro-American studies for the first time in the 102-year history of the college.

The grant to Howard was part of \$1 million in gifts announced by the Ford Foundation today to expand Afro-American studies.

Other schools receiving grants are Yale, Princeton, Rutgers, Morgan State College in Maryland, and Lincoln University in Pennsylvania.

The new department at Howard was authorized by the faculty and university trustees this spring. It was one of the prime demands made by students in a protracted series of protest at the school.

Vincent J. Browne, dean of Howard's College of Liberal Arts, said the Afro-American

studies department would "pull together and coordinate" about 30 existing courses dealing with American Negroes. It will also develop new interdisciplinary courses, he said, cutting across the traditional fields of history, economics, sociology and government.

The department will have full-time faculty members of its own, Browne said, as well as sharing faculty members with other departments.

Students will be able to major in Afro-American studies, he said, after completing the regular general education requirements in their freshman year.

"It will be operated just as the other departments are in the college," Browne said.

The foundation's \$150,000 grant to Morgan State College will be used to update and revise materials used in the school's present courses dealing with American Negroes and to prepare study guides for new courses. The materials will be printed and distributed throughout the country.

The Ford Foundation also contributed \$200,000 to the National Endowment for the Humanities to help support 15 summer institutes for nearly 1000 faculty members who will teach Afro-American studies courses this fall.

[From the Main Line Chronicle, June 19, 1969]

EDUCATION OR INDOCTRINATION?

Bryn Mawr College is a free-loading guest in the community. It pays no taxes but shares our municipal services. If a college administration assumes that the community will accept academic arrogance as academic freedom, it had better be set straight.

It has become increasingly noticeable of late that the college has lowered its standards and is going in more for indoctrination than higher education. You see it in the product.

None of the faculty will admit he is a Communist—which is, by the way, a libelous word, unless party membership can be documented. But too many members of the faculty are Marxist in effect and, as we have often said, equals to the same or equal things are equal to each other.

We have had to live with this, and there is nothing the Township can do but to accept the fact that we are playing host to an institution that is corrupting the minds of young people and working with the enemies of our government.

The administration now feels bold enough to appoint one of the leading Communist Party activists to its lecturing staff. This is an affront to the community, and to the alumnae of Bryn Mawr College as well.

The real significance of the appointment is what this means to the Red Party. Dr. Herbert Aptheker, the appointee, expressed it in the following words: "It is thrilling, with wide national significance for the Communist Party." And noting that the request for his appointment was made by black and white militants, he added: "It also reflects something of what the student movement is all about, which many people have failed to understand."

The meaning we are to take from this is that the "student movement" is aiming for a Communist takeover. Non-Communists have been saying that all along.

Dr. Aptheker's life has been devoted to the spread of Communism by indoctrination of students. He is a member of the party's National Committee and a director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies.

He successfully indoctrinated his own daughter who, with Mario Savio, started all the trouble at Berkeley.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has a whole dossier on the man, going back more than 30 years.

His call to Bryn Mawr must not be taken lightly. It has given his whole party a lift,

and its members are saying that it now puts them on a level of acceptance with the Republican and Democratic parties.

Residents of the community should let the college administration know what they think of this affront, this show of contempt for decent American opinion.

Resentment should be shown, first of all, by the alumnae, either by voice or—what is more expressive—by holding back on gifts.

Alumnae tell us that when they are solicited for gifts and when they mention with dismay the pink hue the college has acquired, they are told: "Oh, yes, but this can be changed by continued loyalty." Oh, yes? The appointment of Dr. Aptheker proves that the administration values what transient black commies want above what the public thinks of the college.

They may go in for "intellectualism" at Bryn Mawr, but they don't show much intelligence.

WHAT'S HAPPENING AT BLUE EARTH?

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting experiment involving Federal, State, and food processing industry interests has been in progress in my congressional district. This experiment, a pilot study in self-certification conducted at the Green Giant Co.'s plant in Blue Earth, Minn., is designed to assure quality control and indicates, perhaps, the direction that will prove least costly yet most effective for consumers, producers, and guardians of the public interest. The initial findings are reported in an article, "What's Happening at Blue Earth?" appearing in the April issue of FDA Papers. I include the article at this point in my remarks for the particular benefit of colleagues in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who also have responsibilities in this area:

WHAT'S HAPPENING AT BLUE EARTH?

(NOTE.—Will self-certification work in the food processing industry? Will it work as a practical matter in all food processing plants? What do working level FDA officials think of the concept in these early stages? How receptive are State officials responsible in the pertinent areas? What reservations does industry have or may it be expected to have about self-certification as a way of life? What room is there for improvement in self-certification for quality assurance as it has developed so far?

(Early in 1968 the Green Giant Co. decided that it couldn't afford to ignore the implications in a concept that had been under study by the FDA for some time and was already undergoing limited pilot testing in an arrangement between FDA and another large food processing firm, General Foods. Green Giant's next step was to see how self-certification might work in its own backyard. Whereupon the company, despite reservations about some features and a little uneasiness about the whole new concept of an industry-Government partnership in quality assurance, let FDA know it was willing to give self-certification a fair try for a limited number of products at its plant in Blue Earth, Minn.

(The agreement that resulted included the Minnesota Department of Agriculture as an active participant, since MDA under State law is responsible for covering canning

plants. The three-way pilot plan, agreed upon in June 1968, has been under way ever since, and the participants—Green Giant, MDA, and FDA's Minneapolis District—have gained some definite impressions and reached some tentative conclusions from their separate points of view about self-certification as a working tool and how it has affected their interests or responsibilities so far. These remarks, passed on in informal narrative to Nathaniel L. Geary, Special Assistant for Quality Assurance in FDA's Bureau of Compliance, are recounted on the following pages.)

THE INDUSTRY VIEWPOINT

(By C. B. Way)

When we first heard about the Self-Certification Program, many of us had doubts about any such cooperation with a regulatory agency. The food industry had always resisted FDA attempts to get at its records. The attitudes prevailing between inspectors and inspected have been standoffish, to put it mildly. The Self-Certification Program goes against all this; thus, most of the food industry looked askance at such a program.

However, we cannot really be for or against something with which we are unacquainted. Since one company with a proven quality assurance program had, at least tentatively, accepted a Self-Certification Program, it made sense to us to investigate it. This was all we had in mind when we visited FDA in January 1968. Just to find out what it was all about.

Soon after, we tried setting up a model program for a peas and corn plant just to see how it might look. There were no definite plans by either party to implement it at that time. However, one thing led to another, and by June of 1968 we had an agreement, all duly signed, to proceed with a pilot program.

One of the philosophies we developed during this "investigation" of the program was that we thought FDA ought to know more about our business insofar as its operation affected the consumers' health. The old business of "let them do it the hard way" changed to "let us show you." It was not necessary to disclose any classified information, or to give away the keys to the vault, so to speak. We felt that if FDA were to know more about our business, it could write more realistic laws and regulations, and, more importantly, be in a better position to determine the need for various laws and regulations; or so we reasoned. To put it another way, voluntary compliance is one way to keep from being legislated or regulated out of business. Thus, while we were quite reserved about giving out information at first, these reservations soon disappeared.

During the course of this investigation, some differences had to be overcome. One was a "language barrier" or divergence of terminology. To a canner, "raw product" is the green produce as it is harvested. To an FDA'er, it is any product fed into the system, such as tin cans, salt, water, etc. Other differences of opinion as to which areas were "critical" or potentially hazardous had to be settled.

Early in the planning it was suggested that the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA) be a part of this program and, thereafter, the planning meetings became three-way sessions. The agreement was signed in June 1968 by Dr. Goddard of FDA, Mr. Schwandt of MDA, and Mr. Cosgrove of Green Giant. It covered one plant, canning only peas and whole kernel corn.

Basically, the agreement provides that Green Giant will (1) make certain pertinent quality control records available to MDA and FDA, (2) submit monthly reports listing any deviations from the agreed-on specifications, (3) give to FDA and MDA a copy of all corporate quality assurance inspection reports, and (4) submit to FDA and MDA copies of any complaints received from any source

about products covered by the agreement. It also says that FDA and MDA will give to Green Giant copies of their full inspection reports and complaints they receive from any source on the products covered by the agreement.

The specifications which go with the agreement are not public information. What they do is establish preventative courses of action to be taken in such areas as fill of container, pesticide residue, foreign objects, etc. They also set up courses of action to be taken when a deviation occurs or is suspected. These courses of action are all part of the company standard operating practices, and no changes were made as a result of this program. It should be noted that the program concerns itself only with product safety, not product elegance.

A very important part of the agreement is that a deviation from the agreed-on specifications does not necessarily constitute a violation of the law.

One of the things we pressed for, and which we still feel is important in selling this program to the food industry, is the complete absence of publicity, if it is ever found necessary to recall a product from the market. Normally seizures, detentions, and the like are a matter of public record. Our theory was that we were giving FDA and MDA otherwise confidential information which they would not normally have and therefore we ought to be able to recall a product from the market, if necessary, without it being a matter of public record. At this writing, no basic laws have been changed, but a change along these lines is under consideration.

Some results of the self-certification trial program have been that there is an open channel of communications between MDA, FDA, and Green Giant; there has been no increase in quality costs to the company; inspection costs to the taxpayer will ultimately be reduced; concentration of regulatory agencies' resources can be placed in areas where serious health hazards exist; and an air of mutual trust and respect among the participating groups has developed.

THE STATE VIEWPOINT

(By G. H. Steele)

Minnesota Department of Agriculture has been working with Minnesota canners in both a regulatory and service manner since 1921 when our cannery license law was first enacted.

Services rendered include quality grading, incubation for keeping quality, bacteriological and chemical analyses of ingredients and finished products, and periodic inspections of plants for sanitation compliance.

When we first learned of FDA's intention to inaugurate a pilot study for Self-Certification in Minnesota, we speculated as to what effect this might have on our cannery program and whether or not this might be Federal intervention or creative federalism.

We were invited to participate in the study by contributing to the limit of our resources and capabilities. As a result, we performed in our usual manner, leaving to FDA whatever laboratory and inspection work we were not able to perform.

Our philosophy always has been that every processor must carry out quality and sanitation control to the utmost of his ability to assure the best possible product for the consumer. To this end, the Minnesota Department of Agriculture should interfere only to assist and advise the processor or to take regulatory action when necessary.

The Self-Certification pilot study supplied for the first time the opportunity for FDA, MDA, and Green Giant Co. each to examine his capabilities and to evaluate procedures and methodology in use to determine if they should be continued or discarded.

At the same time, open discussion of our philosophies and programs gave each par-

participant a more intimate knowledge of the others and made working together much more meaningful.

For the most part, the study program as originally initiated was continued, procedures being discontinued only when they appeared to serve no useful purpose. This was done only after open discussion at monthly meetings or by notification from one of the participants.

What has this study accomplished?

It resulted in mutual trust and respect for each other, thus providing a good climate for further cooperation.

It revealed to each participant what the other was attempting to accomplish.

Certain procedures were found to have little or no value and a need for others became apparent.

Each participant saw his ideas and program evaluated by the others and for the State at least this will guide us in updating our cannery program.

The format of the agreement had to be simplified and the language of the specifications had to be given in layman's terms (the layman often being the regulatory official).

As more experience was gained in the pilot study, it became apparent that not every canner can take part in Self-Certification to the same degree as others who have greater quality control resources. Consequently, some means must be developed to supply such canners, as well as other food processors having limited control resources, with services from qualified agencies, so they can install adequate Self-Certification Programs.

From our experience, we feel that every food processor needs his own Self-Certification Program so he can give assurance from day to day that his products will retain their position in the market. Nothing short of resident inspection would accomplish this end if it were to be supplied by Government. Therefore, a processor must perform quality and sanitation control of his own products if he is to assure the best possible products for the consumer.

The Self-Certification Program appears to be the most desirable and efficient way to meet this need.

THE FDA DISTRICT VIEWPOINT

(By Horace A. Allen and James A. Davis)

Minneapolis District became involved in a self-certification program after Green Giant made preliminary inquiries of FDA in Washington early in 1968.

Most of the groundwork in setting up the agreement was handled by FDA in Washington, and in April the District made a pre-certification evaluation of the plant and facilities at Blue Earth, Minn. At about this time it became apparent that any agreement entered into by Green Giant and FDA should include the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, since this department is required by State law to cover the State's canneries. The self-certification concept was discussed with the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, and a three-way agreement was signed on June 26, 1968. This agreement covered a pilot study of self-certification at Green Giant's Blue Earth plant involving the production of canned peas and whole kernel corn.

The general requirements by FDA to protect the consumer by insisting on approved processing steps are, of course, public information. But the specific action taken by industry to put these general requirements into effect may constitute or involve trade secrets. Also available to the public is information about products recalled by industry after they leave the processor's warehouses and enter the normal distribution system to wholesalers and other distributors.

Initially the pilot study required more FDA manpower than would be given to any one plant during a normal canning season. However, we felt this was necessary to become thoroughly familiar with the plant and its

operation and to be in a position to evaluate reports and information the firm would be expected to furnish when the pilot study was extended into an operational program.

As the program progressed, all parties to the agreement developed greater respect for each other's problems and abilities, and a freedom of communication evolved that has not historically characterized Industry-Government relations. During some of our early meetings, occasional reservations developed, but these were quickly allayed by the frankness of our discussions. We learned that industry, because of its familiarity with a plant, was in a position to give us knowledge and information that could never be obtained through our unilateral inspections.

Our experience during this pilot study has shown us that as a regulatory agency, we can have a greater degree of confidence in the quality of the firm's product by evaluating its in-plant controls than by routine regulatory inspections and collection of samples.

THE FALLACY OF "FREEDOM" IN GREECE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last September 29 the Greek people voted, by a 92-percent majority, in favor of a new constitution proposed by the military junta that has ruled Greece since a coup in April 1967. Contrary to what the junta would have us believe, the election was not conducted in an atmosphere of freedom. Opposition to the constitution was ruthlessly stifled, and dissenters faced the prospect of a jail sentence.

Nine days before the referendum an American professor, George Anastaplo, spoke directly to the point of this repression at a banquet in Athens attended by about 30 Greeks. Dr. Anastaplo is lecturer in the liberal arts at the University of Chicago and chairman of the Political Science Department at Rosary College in Illinois. The dinner at which he spoke was given for 26 members of a group from the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, who were visiting Greece under his direction. The banquet host was the Foreign Press Division of the Office of the Greek Prime Minister.

Following is a reconstruction of Dr. Anastaplo's extemporaneous remarks at the dinner as they were printed in the May issue of the Chicago Council's publication, "Notes on World Events":

DISSENT IN ATHENS

It may seem ungracious of me, after we Americans have just been treated to a meal which it is impossible to consider in any way blameworthy, to dissent as I am now obliged to do from what has been said to us tonight in defense of the way the present Greek government conducts itself.

It should be evident to all of you by now that I would have preferred on this occasion only to listen, and thus to learn. But I cannot completely ignore the challenge we have just heard from our official host in his determined effort to induce me to say something to this gathering. An American, he complains, should not wait to say in Washington what he dare not say in Athens. I therefore consent to comment on various of the things said to us this evening, as they now occur to me.

NO FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION

We have been reminded that Greece and the United States have long been allies in defense of the free world. I need not dispute our host's observation that one form of freedom is that in which discussion appears. There is no doubt that we had an opportunity tonight to exchange opinions, to ask questions, and for our host and his colleagues to give the answers of their government. But I must challenge his suggestion that this is proof that there is freedom of discussion in Greece today. For the fact of the matter is that such a discussion as ours tonight is not now generally permitted in Greece. The only people who dare speak as freely in public as we have here are some members of the present government, a few other men with the famous names of old families, and visitors who hold foreign passports. Most Greeks dare not speak as we have, except in the privacy of their homes and even there only with relatives and friends whom they can trust. All of you Greeks here tonight must know this. It cannot be forgotten that thousands of "enemies of the regime"—men and women of the Left, Center and Right—are still held in Greek prisons without trial and without any prospect of trial.

We have been reminded that the American Constitution also followed upon a revolution. This is certainly true. But I hardly think that justifies the manner in which the constitution to be voted on in Greece next week has been brought forth. The Constitution of the United States was written by fifty-five men freely selected by the American people to represent them. Who these men were, why they were selected and by whom was known to everyone. This is not the case here. What those men produced in 1787 was discussed publicly and freely for a year and more in circumstances where no man was afraid of being officially penalized for the position he took in public. That is not the case here. Rather, we know that the most distinguished opponents of your proposed constitution—the politicians who we know have had large popular followings for years—have been for some time under house arrest and will not be released before next Monday, and only then in order to be able to vote the following Sunday on the proposed constitution. It has been made clear to them that they are not to speak publicly against the constitution. How can it be said in such circumstances that a genuinely free referendum is being held, irrespective of how the balloting itself is conducted or comes out? How can an ordinary citizen be sure that he will not be regarded an "enemy of the regime" if he should be detected voting against the constitution proposed by his insistent government?

A FREE REFERENDUM?

Yet, we have been told several times this evening that we are about to witness free balloting, that this is confirmed by the fact that some newspaper criticism of specific articles in the proposed constitution has been permitted. But we Americans know what a free election is. We know this from our own experience. We know what a free election feels like. We know what it sounds like. We know what it looks like. And we know this is not it.

Several of my fellow-citizens have this evening remarked on the fact that there are only NAI (YES) signs on display in Greece these days. Nowhere can one see OXI (NO) signs. In fact, I have the past week seen only one OXI chalked on a wall—and even this had been almost rubbed out. It has been suggested to us tonight that such signs are not significant, that Greeks will freely vote for what they "believe in." But does the government really believe that its monopoly of propaganda is inconsequential? Considerable money has been spent by the government on these signs, as well as on the press, radio and

film. They are intended to shape the opinions of many who can be moved by such things, and they constantly remind everyone of who is in control here and of what is expected of them. We Americans do know what to think when we see government resources and government personnel marshaled as they have been here in a massive (and no doubt successful) campaign to produce the desired result. This is no more a free referendum than similar exercises are free either in Spain or in Russia.

And yet our host and his government have tried hard to persuade us that we are witnessing a genuinely free expression of the will of the Greek people. It seems important to them that Americans believe this. We Americans may not be informed enough about or familiar enough with Greek history and Greek affairs to be able to judge other claims of this government. But, as I have said, we do have the experience and the ability and the information to judge whether an election is truly free. And when we can see that this government claim about a free referendum, of which we have heard so much, is simply without foundation, what are we to think of all the other claims that we hear from the same government about what it has done for Greece, about what its motives are, about its innocence of deliberate torture of political prisoners, and about the imminent Communist danger from which it saved Greece by seizing power last year? Are we not entitled to judge what we may not know by what we can and do know?

THE AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE

We have been told several times this evening that Greek affairs of recent years required drastic medicine, that a doctor must sometimes prescribe harsh measures in order to save the life of the patient. But do we not all believe that an adult is entitled to select his own doctor, and to discharge him when he chooses? By what authority does the presiding doctor prescribe what is necessary for Greece? How can the Greeks be said to have selected him, when they did not even know who he was? What diploma does he have as a doctor? What proof of his qualifications is there aside from his self-serving testimony about himself? Certainly, we cannot accept as indicative of public approval of his regimen the fact that an unarmed people does not resist a determined government which is heavily armed.

The republican precedent of the Roman dictatorship has been cited to us in justification of what has happened here since April 1967. But it should be remembered that the Roman dictator (usually a citizen of recognized merit) was given his authority pursuant to the constitutional processes of the Roman Republic—and this was done only after debate and deliberation. It should also be remembered that the Roman dictator held his power for a fixed term, a term clearly stated in advance of his appointment. We have also been cited, in justification of the suspension of civil liberties in times of emergency, the experiences of Great Britain and the United States during the Second World War. But it should be remembered that Mr. Churchill was repeatedly obliged during that war to submit himself to the will of an elected parliament. The Americans present tonight remember the difficulties President Roosevelt had with the American Congress, even in time of war. And in both cases, these wartime leaders were chosen pursuant to the constitutional processes of free people, despite the existence then of emergencies far more threatening than anything confronting Greece today.

I feel honor-bound to address myself, before I close, to the remarks made by our host about Eleni Vlachou, a lady whom he knows, from our conversation during dinner, that I respect. Every Greek here tonight knows that before the coup of April 1967 Mrs.

Vlachou published the most respected newspaper in Greece. You Greeks know that hers was a newspaper of the Right, that she was strongly anti-Communist (indeed, to my mind, too much so), and that she has repudiated the claims of the army officers who made the coup about the danger of Communism from which they saved Greece. You know that hers was the newspaper that most of you, and most of the supporters of the present government, once looked up to as the best in Greece. You know that your government made serious efforts for six months after the April 1967 coup to induce Mrs. Vlachou to resume publication of the newspaper she had immediately suspended upon being confronted by your press censorship, censorship which continues to this day. To disparage her as has been done tonight is simply unrealistic and even unbecoming. To honor her for the stand she has taken and the sacrifices she has made is to honor and to nourish and perhaps even to help revive the best in the Greek spirit. We will know that a significant measure of liberty has indeed returned to Greece when Mrs. Vlachou again publishes her newspaper freely, a newspaper in which I am sure there will be things with which I would be obliged to disagree. In any event, Mrs. Vlachou's exile, like that of your King, serves as a constant reminder that things are not right in Greece at this time.

I have directed my remarks this evening to the question of liberty, to the question of whether liberty exists in Greece today. This is not the occasion to examine the advantages and the excesses of liberty, to examine its conditions and its preservation—all matters about which much needs to be said in Greece as well as in the United States. I must also reserve for another occasion my discussion of what has been happening under the present government to the Greek economy, of what has already happened to the effectiveness of the army that a handful of junior officers has usurped, of what Greece is supposed to have been saved from and saved for by this unconstitutional usurpation, of what has happened to Greek relations with its friends and allies in the West since April 1967, and of what has been happening the past seventeen months to the civil services, to the functioning of government and to the quality of life in this country.

We have been speaking tonight of liberty. Liberty is what we Americans do know something about. And when an American visitor, who respects both the truth and Greece, is confronted as we have been at such length, not only tonight but ever since our arrival in Athens, by the insistence that liberty is to be found in Greece today, he is obliged to dissent, if he presumes to speak at all.

If what Greek citizens have now is what you mean by "liberty", then we should all reconsider what we mean by "the free world."

THE DAY THE EARTH WAS LOST

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an editorial of Tuesday, May 20, 1969, in the Kansas City Times catches the significance and the exhilaration felt by all Americans and people throughout the world in the successful flight of Apollo 10. As the editorial points out the Apollo program is truly a journey of man into a new and unknown environment. Yet this undertaking has been done with the

skill and initiative inherent in the American heritage. This editorial is an articulate statement of the importance of continued support of our Nation's quest for new knowledge and capability. I commend it to your reading, and include it herewith:

THE DAY THE EARTH WAS LOST

Early in their journey to the moon, one of the astronauts—during the first TV color spectacular from space—said somewhat wistfully:

"We're looking for earth right now. We'd like to show it to you but we can't find it."

The problem, of course, was one of the spacecraft's orientation. In time—after televising the docking with the lunar lander, which appeared much easier than parking on most city streets—the astronauts found the earth. And presented the show of shows as they sped moonward. But for a moment, the words of the astronaut seemed to capture the mixed feelings that the earthbound themselves have, in this mixed-up age we live in.

But the earth was found, and the astronauts will—if all goes according to schedule—find the moon. There is, we suppose, a bit of philosophy to be derived from this, but the philosophers and poets have not yet arrived in space. They will, in due time, the trail having been blazed for them by brave technicians and pilots, by the daring who prove that even a moment of human confusion means nothing.

For now, however, the course belongs to the astronauts, and no man could question the magnificence of their performance. The television cameras recorded the sheer beauty of the takeoff, of the maneuver in space and of the earth itself receding in the background. The astronauts routinely went about their business, apparently with that flawlessness which is the essence of their life. Men below watched in awe at this thing which their fellow men had wrought.

They—the earthbound—had been found by the space-borne camera, and there they were on camera. It was reassuring. Then the astronauts sped onward, toward the moon, lonesome, yet not alone. Earth, gorgeous and mysterious, had been displayed to its residents as it had never been displayed before. What a fantastic start on another of man's incredible journeys into the unknown! Sunday, the earth. Tomorrow, the moon. In time the poets and philosophers will have much to say about that.

DR. JOHN F. McHUGH DEFINES "FREEDOM" IN MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend a speech entitled "Footsteps for Freedom" which was delivered at West Park in Allentown, Pa., by Dr. John M. McHugh, who is principal of the Roosevelt Elementary School in Allentown, on Memorial Day 1969 to the reading of those who look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This speech was recently called to my attention, and I believe there are points of considerable merit contained within it. I invite particular attention to the definitions of "freedom" in Dr. McHugh's remarks.

The text of his statement of May 30, 1969, follows:

FOOTSTEPS FOR FREEDOM

(By Dr. John F. McHugh)

Memorial Day, for me, has always been a special day. Perhaps it has been special because during my childhood I loved to watch the two parades in Allentown on each May 30th. I remember getting up early and trotting to Center Square to see the soldiers, to listen to the taps, and to gaze in wonder at the volley of shots fired and heard in center city. Then, I would sit on the curb and wait for the big parade to move up Hamilton Street toward West Park. I always loved a parade . . . and on Memorial Day I had a double joy of excitement because after the ceremonies in the park were completed, the parade formed again—on Turner street and proceeded back to the Square for the concluding ceremonies. On several Memorial Days I marched in these parades—always carrying the flag.

As I think back over these thirty years, I can still hear the footsteps of the units of soldiers, sailors, and marines as they marched proudly to the cadence of America's traditional marching songs. Perhaps it was these first footsteps that I heard which gave me some idea of what freedom was all about. I may have been too young to know the meaning of freedom, but I was taught in Allentown about the greatness of my country and a respect for her brave men.

What I did not know as a young child was that footsteps for freedom were heard all around the world in the name of our country. What I did not comprehend as a child was that some of these footsteps were now silenced because men gave their lives on battlefields to protect the land they loved and where I, an American, had the grand opportunity to live and to enjoy life.

I emphasize the memories of a young person to render a suggestion that the young of today listen to the footsteps for freedom.

And so today, I want to have a heart-to-heart talk with the young people of our community, and through them, with the young people of our nation.

Young Americans and Young Allentonians: Memorial Day is a day of reverence, remembrance, and respect. It is a day of reverence to Almighty God; a remembrance of the dead; a respect for the brave. But, my young friends, Memorial Day is a day for the living as well. It is a day for you and for me, for all of us, to look inside ourselves to find out personally how we feel about our God, our Country, and our respect for freedom.

Being the educator that I am, I want to ask you some questions; and while I wait and listen for your answers, I want to share some feelings that might help bridge the so-called generation gap which some people say exists in our community and nation today.

Young Americans and Young Allentonians: How do you feel about the American flag? Do you know its history? Do you know what it stands for? Does your heart swell with pride when you see it pass by? Do you give it the respect it rightfully deserves? Do you realize the symbolism of our flag, carried into battle, rallied the forces of men toward victories because men loved their flag because it represented for them the greatness of their country and their love for their nation? Do you realize that for millions of enslaved people around the globe, your flag has become the symbol of hope? The flag of America is a symbol of freedom because men died so that freedom might prevail. The footsteps for freedom have been led by the Stars and Stripes!

Young Americans and Young Allentonians: How do you feel about the Liberty Bell? Do you know its history? Do you realize that men and women were rallied by the tone of

its peal during the dark days of a revolution—that the bell represents for us our independence. Have you been to Independence Hall or our own Liberty Bell Shrine to catch the feeling of what America is about—what her struggles have been, her promise kept, her greatness maintained? The Liberty Bell is a symbol and her tolling has guided the footsteps to freedom.

Young Americans and Young Allentonians: Have you met Abraham Lincoln? Do you know the story of his life? Have you learned from the lessons he taught? Are we truly brothers? Do you have malice for none and charity for all? Do you know he said that our nation was dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal . . . that this nation shall have a new birth of freedom . . . that we are a government of the people, by the people, for the people . . . and that this nation shall not perish from the Earth! Did you know that Lincoln prayed, had faith in God, and was moved by the spirit of the Almighty during the dark days of civil strife in our nation when brother fought brother on American soil? In the parade of American Heroes, Lincoln's footsteps were for freedom!

Young Americans and Young Allentonians: Do you know our nation has been called a melting pot? Do you understand and appreciate that the greatness of our nation came into being because all races, men of all colors, and faiths in many religions contributed their worth, their culture, their traditions, and their individual dignity? Together they had a common purpose: to build a united states, and to set the course of history with America as a giant among nations. They came from different countries but they became Americans. A poem says it better:

"Just today we chanced to meet—
Down upon the crowded street,
And I wondered whence he came,
What was once his nation's name?
So I asked him, 'Tell me true—
Are you Pole or Russian Jew,
English, Irish, German, Prussian,
Belgian, Spanish, Swiss, Maravian,
Dutch, Greek or Scandinavian?'
Then he raised his head on high
as he gave me this reply:

" 'What I was is naught to me
In this land of liberty.
In my soul as man to man
I am just American! ' "

The footsteps to freedom have been trod by men from many nations—now united as free-loving Americans.

Young Americans and Young Allentonians: Do you want to help your community? Your Nation? Yes, let your voices be heard. But, my young Americans, *let your deeds be respected!* Don't tear down that which took many years, hard work, and dedicated lives to build. And, don't build something in its stead for which someday you will be shameful. Dedicate your lives toward strengthening America—do not destroy her; for in destroying her, you will only destroy yourselves.

Now, my young Americans, I believe there is something which some of us, who are a generation or two older and perhaps a little more formally educated and experienced can share with you. It is this. You and all of us are living through a series of crises. Your age is different because you have known only the curse of crisis and never the fullest pursuits of peace. But we are in these crises together and I am afraid they will be with us for generations to come. What we need to do is adjust to crises, weather the storms, and hope that the lessons of greatness from our past history will endure our determinations to build greatnesses for the future.

Young Americans and Young Allentonians: Let's hope that our passions and our angers—grown out of our frustrations will turn into compassions and understandings—grown out

of mutual respects one for the other. You need to understand that we are living in an interregnum period. One foot's in a world that's going, one's in a world that's coming. What we are going through is the price we have to pay for a new freedom. And the kind of footsteps you make will determine the kind of freedom we will have in the future.

Finally, remember that every right you have has a corresponding responsibility. Learn the history of your country well, remember the words of her heroes, and try to catch the feeling of pride exemplified by her many symbols.

Remember, too, of what America is about. She has problems to solve and she has progress to make. In trying to solve her problems, do not create problems, but determine the progress to be gained.

Young Americans and Young Allentonians: Your turn will come to lead us on. May your footsteps guide us toward that new freedom—a greater America, rich in traditions, and God grant, maybe you can bring us to an era of peace among men. In saluting you, we also challenge you. God Bless You in your endeavors!

CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, during his tenure as Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren has consistently stood as a force for fairness and as a champion of equal justice under the law. A former district attorney, attorney general, and three-time Governor of California, Earl Warren brought to the Court a knowledge, not only of law, but also of public administration, which enabled him to understand the basic cross-currents and moral conscience of this Nation. Thus, the Court promoted true equality, while discarding hollow rhetoric and legal technicalities as contrary to the original meaning of the Constitution.

Under Justice Warren's leadership, the Supreme Court has vitalized the constitutional law of human rights. In the past 10 years, the Court has extended most of the important sections of the Bill of Rights to cover the States, thus protecting for all people those basic liberties which our Founding Fathers meant to be safeguarded from governmental interference. Specifically, the Court has strengthened the constitutional right to a fair trial by ruling that every man, rich or poor, has the right to counsel in a felony prosecution. The integrity of the electoral process has been strengthened by the Court's "one-man, one-vote" ruling, which declared that legislators represent people, "not trees or acres."

Warren demanded that true opportunity be provided for all Americans, when he wrote for the Court, in Brown against Board of Education, possibly his most famous decision, that segregation in the schools was unconstitutional, because a separate education imposed psychological burdens upon the Negro child which denied him an education equal to the one of his white counterpart. This decision made possible Supreme Court

consideration of a broad range of civil rights cases, reaching into other areas of segregated activity such as public accommodations, transportation, restaurants, and housing.

Because of his insight and integrity, Justice Warren helped open the doors which alerted the country to its responsibility for meeting the unfulfilled promises of equality for all. Associate Justice William Douglas asserts that Justice Warren "will be classified with Marshall and Hughes, who also saw the United States in large dimensions and recognized that the quality of justice is the measure of a nation's worth."

On this day of his retirement, I am honored to join in paying tribute to this man of concern and compassion, whose leadership has helped bring this country closer to realizing the ideal of a just society.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the New York Times published a very fine editorial tribute to the Chief Justice which expresses very well the views of many citizens. I am pleased to include it in my remarks:

THE CHIEF STEPS DOWN

With the retirement of Earl Warren as Chief Justice, the nation loses a man of personal courage, progressive conviction and humane understanding who has led the Supreme Court through one of the most decisive periods in the 180 years of its history.

Only three of Chief Justice Warren's predecessors—John Marshall, Roger Taney and Melville Fuller—served longer than his sixteen years and only under the early leadership of Marshall and Taney has the Supreme Court had more critical impact on the law and life of the nation. The Warren Court's school desegregation and other civil rights cases are surpassed in importance in their sphere only by the Taney Court's *Dred Scott* decision, while its reapportionment, redistricting and criminal due process decisions have consequences for the Federal system almost as great as the fundamental interpretations of the Marshall Court.

When President Eisenhower appointed Mr. Warren in 1953, there was little in his record in public life to foretell the kind of Chief Justice he would become. The school desegregation cases which were pending when he took his seat plunged Chief Justice Warren into racial and regional controversy during his very first year on the Court. But *Brown v. Board of Education* was a unanimous decision which evolved naturally out of several previous cases concerning racial discrimination. While the Warren Court has divided sharply on other issues, it has consistently been unanimous, or very nearly so, in striking down barriers to voting rights and forbidding public and private discrimination.

Chief Justice Warren struck a more distinctive personal note in his sensitivity to individual rights and due process. A concern for fair play, which is a synonym for due process, animated the Chief Justice and a majority of his colleagues in 1957 and subsequently in curbing the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Subversive Activities Control Board and the State Department's passport authority.

Because the apportionment of state legislatures and the districting of seats in the House of Representatives had long been considered a "political thicket" too dangerous for the Court to penetrate, grave abuses had developed in the American form of government. Beginning with *Baker v. Carr* in 1963, the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Warren came to the rescue of the underrepresented millions in the cities and the suburbs. If American federalism successfully masters

the social crises of the coming decade, much credit will go to the Warren Court's rulings in favor of "one man, one vote" and equal districts.

These rulings were not without risk to the Court's authority and prestige because they did carry the Court into that ill-defined border zone where the judicial and the legislative powers meet and mingle. With good reason, critics of the Court contended that the justices had usurped some legislative authority. But defenders of the Warren Court replied that in the reapportionment cases as in the long stalemated issue of school segregation, years of Congressional evasion and irresponsibility made judicial intervention inevitable.

The rights of criminal offenders evoke little sympathy when rising crime rates have become a matter of national concern, but the Warren Court has moved against the tide of popular feeling. The Court has insisted that to have a lawyer, to remain silent, and to avoid being browbeaten into a confession are rights of every citizen. Future court decisions may perhaps reshape the particular definitions of this right as the unending task of judging continues, but the fundamental affirmations of the Warren Court in the field of criminal jurisprudence are in the best American tradition.

In meeting the issues of his Court service, Chief Justice Warren did not have the legal erudition of a Frankfurter or a Cardozo; the brilliant advocacy of a Hughes, or the thoroughly developed philosophy of a Holmes. He has depended instead upon an unblinking integrity, a firm common sense, and a deep feeling for the liberal and egalitarian values which moved Thomas Jefferson and the other founders of this nation. Those values must be brought to bear on the problems of each generation in live and relevant ways if the American ideal of self-government is to survive and flourish. It is to the lasting honor of Earl Warren that he contributed so effectively to that liveliness and relevance in his time.

DRAFT REFORM THROUGH RATIONAL PROCESS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's May 13 message to Congress on draft reform carried a message of greater import than perhaps first meets the eye. While the excellent proposals to improve the Selective Service System are of great significance in their purpose, the derivation of these proposals should give heart to those concerned with the notorious disregard of political action through rational, democratic process. The message here is how young people saw a problem, analyzed it, and made presentations and recommendations through established procedures to treat the problem.

This sequence is described in the following letter to the President from Mr. Jack McDonald, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, which I commend to my colleagues:

MAY 27, 1969.

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

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: I recently received from Mr. Klein a copy of your May 13th message to Congress concerning draft reform.

Let me, on behalf of young people of all political persuasions, express appreciation to

you for forthrightly proposing these much needed reforms. Your proposals, if accepted by Congress, would allow the approximately 11,000,000 American men between 18 and 26 to plan their lives with a degree of certainty which has not been available to them in the past. You will thus remove from their lives—and from the lives of their families—one of the greatest frustrations which has been thrust upon young Americans in recent years. We congratulate you on your proposals.

Let me also add our encouragement for your longer-term goal of an all-volunteer Armed Forces. While this objective may be unattainable at the present time due to the Vietnam conflict, it is a worthy goal for which our Nation should continue to strive.

You may recall in July of 1968 that the Young Republican National Federation held hearings on draft reform in Washington in preparation for the presentation of the "Youth Plank" in our Party's 1968 Platform. We received testimony from General Hershey, Senators Tower, Brooke and Dominick, numerous Congressmen, as well as leaders of youth organizations and specialists in military manpower procurement. Our recommendations, which were presented to the Platform Committee and eventually became part of our Platform, were in strong agreement with both your May 13 proposals and your search for an all-volunteer army. We are therefore indeed proud to see our recommendations for change in America move toward reality.

Maybe there is some message here for the young people of America in that we, as young citizens, saw a problem; quietly and thoroughly analyzed it; worked through the established procedures available for bringing orderly change; and now, to some extent, that change has been accomplished. In short, the young people of our Nation can accomplish change through legitimate channels rather than by riots and revolution.

A copy of this letter is being sent to all Republican members of Congress so that they may know of our strong support of your May 13 proposals. We pledge to you our continued support both as the leader of our Party and our Nation.

Sincerely,

JACK McDONALD,
Chairman.

MARTIN LUTHER KING—SECURITY VIOLATION BY ROWAN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, what started out as an effort to canonize Martin Luther King, Jr., has now degenerated to vitriolic attacks on J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. In fact, several left-wing extremists including a gossip columnist even demanded the resignation of Mr. Hoover, because he told the truth.

Carl Rowan claims that through one of his sinecures in the repudiated Kennedy-Johnson administration he was enabled to eavesdrop on some of the King surveillance. Now, writing a column for his own profit, he talks about just what he wants to talk about and dismisses the balance as "barnyard gossip." This cavalier breach of security deserves attention on at least two grounds.

Should individuals who come into possession of classified security information under color of legitimacy be encouraged to peddle it in bits and pieces for their

own profit? Is not this still a crime? Should not Rowan have the opportunity to appear before an appropriate body—perhaps a committee of the Congress or even a grand jury—so that he can testify under oath as to what it was that he heard—that the American people, having no security clearance, must not be told?

Obviously Rowan can now tell the American people what caused Martin Luther King's decision to sidestep the civil rights movement and suddenly become a pro-Red leader in the peace agitation movement march in New York City. Expressly, was King's decision based on orders, because he was under party discipline?

If Rowan knows the answer, so does Ramsey Clark, and so does Nicholas Katzenbach. Can this be the reason that they are now demanding Mr. Hoover's resignation, so that this record can be destroyed and the true facts of the matter forever hidden from the American people?

If Rowan and company want to rehabilitate Martin Luther King, then it would seem that their activities would be dedicated to calling for the President to release the FBI files—not to destroy them.

In a test of credibility, J. Edgar Hoover needs no assistance—even against Rowan, Clark, and Katzenbach, and a bevy of leftwing college professors all at once. Against Robert Kennedy, under similar circumstances, the contest ended suddenly when it was realized that Hoover had the signature of the then Attorney General on the disclaimed authorization.

So that our colleagues may keep abreast of the ridiculous defense and disgusting confusion being created by people who know better, I include an assortment of news clippings over the past few days:

[From the Evening Star, June 19, 1969]

KING WIRETAP CALLED RPK'S IDEA: HOOVER REVEALS MEMO TO FBI CITED CONCERN OVER MARXISM

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover today disclosed that wiretapping of the Rev. Martin Luther King's telephone was proposed by then Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy to FBI officials in June 1963 and authorized over Kennedy's signature a few months later.

Hoover said the FBI has in its files two memorandums which make it clear that Kennedy conceived the idea of the wiretap on King and subsequently authorized the bureau to proceed with the wiretapping on Oct. 10, 1963.

The monitoring was discontinued on April 30, 1965, Hoover said.

Kennedy initiated the idea for the tap in a conversation with Courtney Evans, then assistant director of the FBI and liaison officer between the agency and the Justice Department, Hoover told The Star today.

MEMORANDUM CITED

Hoover said the FBI has a memorandum in its files from Evans to Hoover, dated in June, 1963. Evans reported that Kennedy said he was concerned about allegations that King was a student and believer in Marxism. Kennedy, according to the Evans memorandum, expressed concern that Marxism might infiltrate the race issue in the United States because of King's leadership of Negroes through his Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Evans reported in the memo to the FBI director, Hoover said, that the attorney general was alarmed by alleged associations between King and a New Yorker with Marxist connections. Kennedy asked Evans, the memorandum said, whether it would be feasible to install electronic devices to monitor King's conversations in an effort to discover the extent of a possible threat to national security.

According to Evans' memo, the liaison man told Kennedy there were technical difficulties in installing such devices in the case of the Negro leader because he was a man who was almost constantly traveling.

Hoover told The Star that the FBI also told Kennedy at the time that they questioned the advisability of undertaking the electronic surveillance because of possible political repercussions.

On October 7, 1963, however, following subsequent discussion Hoover said he sent a memorandum to the Attorney General in which he reported that it was now technically feasible to apply telephone wire taps to King's telephone at SCLC headquarters in Atlanta, Ga., and at an unnamed address in New York City. This was, in effect, a request for authorization to proceed, the director said.

That Hoover memorandum bears the signature of "Robert F. Kennedy" in the lower left-hand corner over the handwritten date "10-10-63."

Aides to Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., said today he would have no comment on Hoover's disclosure.

Hoover made the bombshell disclosure today as the climax to a long series of charges and counter-charges involving Justice Department officials, the FBI and Star columnist Carl Rowan over the manner in which the conversations of King were intercepted by the Bureau.

Rowan charged in a column Sunday that the FBI had no authority to wiretap Dr. King's conversations and quoted former Attorney General Ramsey Clark as saying the implication that people thought Dr. King was a security threat is outrageous.

The following day, Associate FBI Director Clyde A. Tolson wrote a letter to Rowan in which he stated that the official wiretapping on King had the advance approval of Kennedy.

[From the Evening Star, June 20, 1969]

FBI WON'T TALK ABOUT ADDITIONAL WIRETAPPINGS

(By Carl T. Rowan)

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has refused to say whether it has ever tapped the telephones of any members of Congress as part of its job of "protecting internal security."

Clyde A. Tolson, the FBI associate director who disclosed in a letter to me that the telephone of the late Dr. Martin Luther King was tapped "strictly in the field of internal security," has also refused to say whether the FBI has tapped the telephones or bugged the homes of other civil rights leaders such as Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, Whitney Young of the National Urban League, the Rev. Ralph Abernathy of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, or James Farmer, formerly of the Committee on Racial Equality and now an assistant secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

In a curt exchange of letters with this reporter, Tolson takes the view that in revealing that the wiretap on King was authorized by the late Robert F. Kennedy, the FBI's purpose has "been accomplished" and "there is no need to continue this correspondence."

Thus the FBI seeks to evade the thrust of my recent column that Tolson labeled "scurrilous" by resting its case on an assortment of allegations against two dead men who cannot talk back.

First, in an all-out effort to protect the reputation of J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI has alleged that the wiretap on King was both suggested and approved by the late Senator Kennedy.

Check of records I kept on the King affair during my government days, including discussions of the matter with FBI officials, suggests that Kennedy did approve the wiretap, but that the FBI lies in stating that it was Kennedy's idea originally.

A significant point that was central to my column has been obscured by the "Hoover or Kennedy?" controversy. That is my point that the FBI can, does and will tap the phone or bug the dwelling of just about any American in the name of "internal security."

Rather than meet this point, the FBI wants the wiretapping-bugging controversy to focus on King because it possesses tape recordings and photographs that it thinks will blacken King's reputation.

(Tolson has carefully neglected to comment on my report that for years the FBI has had a small army of agents and allies roaming the country whispering the dirt about King.)

FBI strategy is based on the assumption that some of the public already hates King, others automatically despise heroes who turn out to have feet of clay, and still others are quick to adopt a holler-than-thou posture and throw the first stone. The assumption seems to be that if the FBI leaks enough degrading details about King the American people will forget the central charge in my column that the FBI found so wounding it finally decided to tell the American people part of the truth.

That charge, I repeat, is that we are a lot closer to becoming a police state than most Americans realize. Nothing illustrates this more than the current FBI campaign.

But the issue is not whether King was a saint—and perhaps this is the time for me to reveal that I have read the FBI reports based on electronic surveillance of the late Nobel prize-winner. I know how much dirt the FBI has dug up, and 90 percent of it is barnyard gossip that has nothing to do with "internal security" or "Marxist influences."

The question is: Should a powerful, police-investigative agency be permitted to tap an American's telephone, bug his home, sneak electronic devices into his hotel rooms, just because someone in the Justice Department (Hoover, Kennedy or whoever) thinks he has "Communist associates"? Ought not there be the safeguard of some court concluding that some "Clear and present danger" justifies such an invasion of a free man's privacy?

Was there a "clear and present danger" that King would endanger the nation's security. If so, why did the danger disappear on April 30, 1965, when the FBI claims it discontinued the wiretap? King was seeing the same "dangerous" people for almost three years after that.

The answer is that certain buggings and other surveillance of King did not end in April 1965. As a top government official, I read FBI surveillance reports on King long after the date when Hoover says the wiretaps were ended.

The answer is that the FBI will not admit to this later surveillance because it cannot claim that it was authorized by Attorneys General Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach and Ramsey Clark, both of whom are alive to defend themselves.

There is a fundamental point about the King affair that is valid no matter who authorized the wiretap and buggings. If the FBI had information that King was an enemy and menace to his country, we have courts and other proper channels in which to make whatever charges the FBI felt it could prove. This affords the accused a chance to face his accuser, to reply.

But the most frightful aspect of this whole business is to have FBI officials waging a campaign to destroy a man by rumor, by stealth, by whispers, by flashing dirty pictures in smoke-filled bars.

These are the legal and moral issues that the American public must face. And we must not be blinded to the reality by a shrewd campaign to make the late Robert F. Kennedy and the late Martin Luther King the villains.

[From the Evening Star, June 20, 1969]

KING WIRETAPPING DISPUTE WIDENS

(By Lyle Denniston)

Two former U.S. attorneys general, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and President Nixon have all entered the growing controversy over federal wiretapping on the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

The new issue that last night divided Hoover and former Attorneys General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and Ramsey Clark is whether the tap on King's telephone was the original idea of the late Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy.

President Nixon, apparently rejecting the advice of a key aide, also stepped into the dispute to declare "complete confidence" in Hoover.

KEY POINT NOT DISCUSSED

However, Nixon did not discuss the question of whether it was Kennedy's idea to tap King's telephone.

The President, instead, commented only on the issue of basic authority for installing the device. He said he had "checked personally" and had found Hoover was correct in saying that no wiretaps were ever used without an attorney general's authority.

Hoover told The Evening Star yesterday that the FBI has in its files a June 1963 memorandum which—according to Hoover—showed that Kennedy had asked about the feasibility of using electronic devices to monitor King.

COUNTERATTACK

Hoover revealed the existence of two memorandums, in one of which he said Kennedy expressed concern about possible Marxist involvement with the late Negro leader.

Katzenbach, who was Kennedy's top aide, issued a statement last night saying that it is "false" to "say or imply that this tap was the original conception of Robert Kennedy."

Clark issued a separate statement describing Hoover's comments as "unfair and deceptive." He said Hoover repeatedly requested authorization for the wiretap.

Neither Katzenbach nor Clark disputed the suggestion that Kennedy had given the FBI permission to install the wiretap on King's telephone. Katzenbach said flatly that "there has never been an issue as to the fact that . . . Kennedy personally authorized each telephone wiretap—as had his predecessors and successors."

This had been the issue earlier this week, and it was the only issue on which the President commented at his press conference.

On Monday, Hoover's associate director, Clyde A. Tolson, said in a letter to Star columnist Carl T. Rowan that the device on King's telephone had been approved in writing in advance by Kennedy.

Yesterday, in another letter to Rowan, Tolson said that he had written to the columnist to "refute" a column in last Sunday's Star criticizing Hoover over the wiretapping incident. His Monday letter, Tolson said, had been written because of "your unwarranted charge that the wiretap . . . was unauthorized and illegal."

Having given his reply, the associate director said, "there is no need to continue this correspondence." This apparently

amounted to a refusal to answer a series of other questions about wiretapping which Rowan had submitted to Tolson this week.

Appearing on television last night, Rowan said he had asked Tolson "how many other civil rights leaders" had been the subject of FBI wiretapping—including James Farmer, Floyd McKissick, Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young.

The question of whether an attorney general gave the FBI authority to install any wiretaps, on King or anyone else, has come up in recent years when the legality of electronic surveillance was contested in court.

For years, every administration has followed the practice that a "national security" wiretap is legal if it has been expressly authorized by the attorney general.

Tolson's letter Monday said the device used on King's telephone was used only for "national security" purposes.

But Hoover's discussion on the King wiretap with The Star yesterday switched the central question in the controversy away from the legality of the monitoring.

He discussed with Star representatives two memorandums he said the FBI had in its possession. The first of these, Hoover said, was a memo to him from Courtney A. Evans, who in 1963 was assistant director of the FBI and was the bureau's liaison man with Kennedy.

The Evans memo, Hoover said, reported on a conversation between Kennedy and Evans in which the attorney general was said to have asked about the technical feasibility of monitoring King.

The FBI chief said the Evans' memo related that Kennedy was concerned about reports that King had ties with a New York attorney with "known Communist connections," that King was a student of Marxism, but that he did not openly espouse Marxism because of his religious beliefs.

The purpose of the inquiry about electronic surveillance, Hoover's comments indicated, was to prove or disprove these reports.

Hoover also discussed a second document, in which the director said he advised Kennedy that it was technically feasible to apply wiretaps to King's telephones at two places—one on King's phones in Atlanta, Ga., and the other at an unnamed location in New York City. This memo, Hoover said, was dated Oct. 7, 1963, and contained Kennedy's signature and the date Oct. 10, 1963, at the bottom.

As a result of the October document, Hoover indicated, a wiretap was installed on King's telephone.

Former Atty. Gen. Katzenbach, who was Kennedy's deputy at the time, directly challenged Hoover's interpretation of the June 1963 memo. It was his first public attack on Hoover or the FBI.

"To say or imply that this tap was the original conception of Robert Kennedy—that he was the moving force in this situation—or that he had any doubts whatsoever as to Dr. King's loyalty or integrity is false."

"It is unworthy of the tradition of the FBI to attack in this fashion the reputation of two men who cannot defend themselves.

"Truth is seldom found in selective and partial disclosures of this type. What has been said is unfair to Sen. Kennedy and Dr. King, by no standard that I know consonant with that integrity and sense of justice which has always heretofore been the contribution of Mr. Hoover to the administration of American justice."

Former Atty. Gen. Clark's separate statement echoed these remarks. He described Hoover's statement to The Star as "unfair because it comes after Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King have been murdered in the service of humanity and are unable to defend themselves.

"The truth of the matter cannot be denied through release of selected materials from FBI files."

Clark added that he thought Hoover's statement is deceptive in depicting Mr. Hoover as a reluctant eavesdropper of Dr. King. "He repeatedly requested me to authorize FBI wiretaps on Dr. King while I was attorney general. The last of these requests, none of which was granted, came two days before the murder of Dr. King."

The other person named in Hoover's comments—Courtney Evans, now a Washington attorney—was in San Juan, Puerto Rico, today, and was not answering his hotel telephone.

President Nixon's entry into the dispute came before the Katzenbach and Clark statements had become available.

A reporter at the White House press conference asked whether, in the aftermath of the wiretapping controversy, Hoover still had Nixon's confidence and whether any decision had been made "concerning his tenure."

Nixon replied that the director "does enjoy my complete confidence, and there has been no discussion with regard to his tenure as far as the future is concerned."

Hoover is past retirement age, but presidents have continued to grant him continuations in office from year to year.

Nixon did not stop with a direct answer to the reporter's question. He added:

"I should add further that with regard to the controversy on electronic surveillance that I checked personally into the matter as to whether or not that surveillance which had been discussed had been conducted by him and the FBI, by themselves, or whether it had, as is supposed to be the case always, been approved by the attorney general.

"I found that it had always been approved by the attorney general, as Mr. Hoover testified in 1964 and 1965."

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1969]

KATZENBACH DISPUTES FBI ON KING TAP

Former Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach charged last night that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's account of why Dr. Martin Luther King's phone was tapped is false.

Katzenbach acknowledged that the wiretap was "personally authorized" by then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

"But to say or imply that this tap was the original conception of Robert Kennedy . . . is false," Katzenbach said.

Other sources who held high positions in the Justice Department under Kennedy said the Attorney General approved the tap on Dr. King only after the FBI had urged him to "over and over and over again" for two years because the FBI believed Dr. King was either a communist or a tool of the Communist Party.

Kennedy's defenders spoke after President Nixon strongly supported Hoover.

Mr. Nixon told his press conference last night that his personal check had found that bugging "had always been approved by the Attorney General, as Mr. Hoover testified in 1963 and 1964."

The President made it clear that the recent disclosure of the King wiretapping and the controversy over who wanted it—Hoover or Kennedy—led him to look into the controversy personally.

Katzenbach, issuing a statement in New York, said that: "It is unworthy of the tradition of the FBI to attack in this fashion the reputation of two men who cannot defend themselves."

During Kennedy's first two weeks as Attorney General in early 1961, the other sources said, the FBI came to Kennedy and said that Dr. King was deeply involved with two members of the Communist Party.

FBI representatives repeated their charges frequently during the next two years, these sources, who held positions at assistant secretary level or above, said.

In the fall of 1963, Kennedy agreed to place a tap on King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference phone to verify or disprove the FBI allegations, the sources said.

The version of the incident that Hoover has made public is very similar—except that his account attributes the fears that Dr King was a Marxist to Kennedy.

Hoover told the Evening Star yesterday that Kennedy proposed tapping King's phone to discover if the civil rights leader was closely associated with Marxist ideas and had Marxist followers.

Hoover reportedly showed the Star two memoranda from 1963. The first, written by then assistant director of the FBI and liaison man with the Justice Department Courtney Evans, reported a conversation between Evans and Kennedy in which the Attorney General reportedly inquired whether tapping King's phone was feasible.

The second was Hoover's request for the wiretapping authorization; it bore Kennedy's signature and the date "10-10-63" in the lower left-hand corner.

An FBI spokesman made clear in response to questions that Hoover would not talk to the Washington Post. The spokesman said the Star story "speaks for itself" and would not comment further.

Evans, now in private law practice here, was reported to be en route to Puerto Rico and could not be reached.

The wiretapping of Dr. King's phone was disclosed during Cassius Clay's draft evasion hearing in Houston and has caused angry debate over the role of the FBI, a bureau of the Justice Department.

"I have never authorized installation of technical electronic devices without authority of the Attorney General," the Star quoted Hoover as saying. He said the King wiretap was stopped April 30, 1965—two months before former President Johnson issued an order banning the practice except in national security investigations.

As for his Administration's future policy on eavesdropping, Mr. Nixon said at his news conference the technique would be employed "sparingly," with concern for individual rights of privacy, "but very effectively" with the aim of protecting the United States from both internal and external danger.

The debate over wiretapping was fueled by the claim last week by Attorney General John N. Mitchell that the Executive Branch is immune from court supervision when it eavesdrops on allegedly subversive groups.

[From the Evening Star, June 22, 1969] PROFESSORS ASSAIL STAND ON "BUGGING"

Thirteen professors from major law schools have joined to "firmly condemn" the Justice Department's new claim of unlimited power to use secret listening devices on home-front troublemakers.

In a letter yesterday to Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell, the professors said:

"To grant such a claim would gravely threaten some of our most fundamental liberties as well as the role of law itself."

They linked the new "bugging" policy to the still-growing controversy over FBI wiretapping of the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. They asked:

"If Martin Luther King Jr., the Black Muslim Leader Elijah Muhammad and vigorous opponents of the Vietnam war are considered appropriate subjects for such gross violations of their rights, which groups vigorously seeking change, whether radical, liberal or conservative, is safe?"

BIG BROTHER ARGUMENT

The professors labeled the department's new theory of its power "the argument that Big Brother knows best."

Justice Department lawyers spelled out the newly broadened policy on electronic surveillance in papers filed a week ago in the pending federal case against New Left demonstrators at last summer's Democratic national convention in Chicago.

Whenever the attorney general deems it necessary to monitor secretly the conversation of groups and persons who might "foment violent disorders," the department claimed, he could do so on his own authority without getting approval in a court order.

The Fourth Amendment ban on "unreasonable" searches not approved by a court simply does not apply in such situations, the department claimed in a document filed with U.S. District Court in Chicago.

Never before had the department claimed that kind of authority except when gathering "foreign intelligence" about "external threats."

ADMITTED IN COURT

Atty. Gen. Mitchell's staff did not make this claim to power until after the department had been forced to admit, in a Houston federal court, that it had carried out extensive wiretapping and eavesdropping on Dr. King and Muhammad.

The wiretap on Dr. King has become the source of a deepening conflict between FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and two former U.S. attorneys general, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach and Ramsey Clark.

Hoover has said the late Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy authorized the FBI to tap King's telephone and that it was Kennedy's original idea to do so. Both Katzenbach and Clark have said that it is "false" to attribute the proposal to Mr. Kennedy. Clark has suggested that "perhaps the time has come" for Hoover to retire.

The law professors' 800-word, strongly phrased protest to Mitchell seems likely to broaden the controversy to include current "bugging" policy in general.

Included among the 13 signers of the letter is one law dean, Louis H. Pollak of Yale. The other 12 are described as specialists in criminal and constitutional law.

The others are Anthony G. Amsterdam of Pennsylvania University, Vern Countryman of Harvard, Norman Dorsen of New York University, Steven B. Duke of Yale, Gerald Gunther of Stanford, Yale Kamisar and Arthur R. Miller of Michigan University, Kenneth W. Graham, Jr., of UCLA, Michael S. Josephson of Wayne State (Detroit), Edmund W. Kitch of Chicago University, Herman Schwartz of New York State University (Buffalo) and Alan Westin of Columbia.

"APPEARS IN CONFLICT"

The professors suggested that the Justice Department's claimed authority "appears to be in conflict" with last year's crime control law, which permits electronic monitoring to obtain evidence of riots, treason, sedition and subversion, but only with the advance approval of a federal court.

These are "precisely the crimes for which the department is seeking the authority to eavesdrop without judicial supervision."

Noting that "until just a few years ago," there was little demand for "bugging" except in "the most serious offenses like espionage, treason, kidnapping and murder," the professors commented:

"We firmly condemn this attempt to obtain such absolute power against our own people in domestic affairs."

If the department's claim to power is upheld, the professors said, this would "repudiate one of our oldest and most vital traditions"—that is, having a "neutral and detached" judge pass upon police requests for search power.

They concluded by suggesting that "the government has confessed error before in the

interests of justice, and we call upon it to do so again in this instance."

[From the Evening Star, June 23, 1969] CLAY'S LAWYERS DISPUTE FBI ACCOUNT OF BUGGING

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Attorneys for former heavyweight boxing champion Cassius Clay have filed papers in a federal court accusing FBI officials of lying about the wiretaps and buggings of the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Elijah Muhammad, leader of the Black Muslims.

Clay's lawyers said there were discrepancies between statements made here last week by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and other top FBI officials and testimony in a recent Clay hearing in U.S. District Court in Houston.

The brief, filed in the U.S. District Court in Houston late Friday, says the FBI has produced a "gap of credibility (that) now approaches a crater."

Clay's lawyers are seeking access to wiretap information and personnel that the government so far has avoided making available. The Clay hearings, in which the fighter seeks reversal of his conviction and five-year sentence for draft evasion, touched off the current furor over FBI wiretapping and bugging.

It was in these Houston court hearings that the government admitted that it had tapped the telephones of King and both wiretapped the phone and bugged the home of Elijah Muhammad.

A column by this reporter provoked the FBI to claim that the late Robert F. Kennedy, as attorney general, both proposed and authorized the tap of King's phones. Kennedy's successor as attorney general, Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, and his successor, Ramsey Clark, have both disputed the FBI claim that Kennedy proposed the wiretap on King, although they acknowledge that he approved it.

The brief filed in Houston could force the government to produce documents, wiretap and bugging transcripts and other information.

Here are some of the contradictions that are at issue:

1. Hoover told The Star that he had memoranda signed by Kennedy authorizing the wiretaps on King.

Kennedy resigned as attorney general on Sept. 3, 1964, but Hoover told The Star that the King wiretap was discontinued on April 30, 1965.

Since Katzenbach and Clark deny approving any King wiretaps, who approved FBI eavesdropping during the almost eight months after Kennedy left the attorney generalship?

2. The federal court brief claims that either Hoover lied in saying that the King wiretap was discontinued on April 30, 1965, or else FBI Special Agent Robert Nichols perjured himself in his Houston testimony.

"It was Special Agent Nichols who stated that the King wiretap had continued until April 4, 1968, the day of Dr. King's assassination," the brief states.

(The transcript of Nichols' testimony has not been printed, so the brief reflects the memory of Clay's lawyer, Charles Morgan Jr. of Atlanta, and his associates. The New York Times has reported Nichols as testifying that he was in charge of the surveillance of King until May 1965 "and it was my understanding that it went on after that.")

3. The Star quoted Hoover as saying that on Oct. 7, 1963, he reported to Kennedy that it was technically feasible to wiretap telephones at headquarters of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in Atlanta and at an unnamed location in New York.

But testimony in the U.S. District Court in Houston shows the government exhibiting

a log purported to be the result of a wiretap of King's home telephone.

This raises the question of how many King taps the FBI had, and which ones were approved by Kennedy or anyone else.

MARITIME LABOR-MANAGEMENT NEGOTIATIONS FOR ATLANTIC AND GULF COASTS ATTAIN SUCCESSFUL TENTATIVE AGREEMENTS—NOW IT IS UP TO CONGRESS TO IMPROVE THE MERCHANT MARINE

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I expressed the hope that the 1969 maritime labor-management negotiations would be concluded amicably and that the Nation would be spared another shutdown of its merchant marine.

This happy situation is now a fact, at least so far as the Atlantic and gulf coasts are concerned. Four leading maritime unions have signed at least tentative agreements with groups of the shipowners. The National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, the National Maritime Union, and the American Radio Association reached satisfactory conclusions to the negotiations with the Maritime Service Committee several days before the June 15 deadline. The Masters, Mates & Pilots organization reached a similar arrangement on June 17, before there had been any substantial disruption of shipping.

I believe the men on both the management and labor sides of the table deserve great credit for this achievement. They have negotiated agreements which provide the men and women of the merchant marine with distinct improvements in conditions for the next 3 years. They have ruled out any escalation of benefits during that period, so that shipping management can make necessary long-range plans. They have accomplished this without need of Government aid or interference in the collective bargaining process.

It has been said that strikes make front page news, and agreements between unions and employers get buried back near the classified advertisements. Whether that is so or not, I think it important to stress the merit of this collective bargaining accomplishment. It is good for the parties involved and for the Nation as a whole. These unions and employers have demonstrated their maturity and their concern for the needs of the industry and the whole country.

Now, we in Government have a responsibility, a responsibility not to waste this 3-year breathing spell, but to move ahead toward the creation of a bigger, better, stronger merchant marine. It is tragic that our merchant marine has dwindled so dangerously. Now is the time to correct that trend. The men of labor and management have shown their good faith. I hope that we in Government will do no less. I believe the citizens of the country recognize that an American mer-

chant marine should be second to none, that it should reflect the enterprise of the Nation, the advance of our great technology, and the American belief that a laborer is indeed worthy of his hire.

It is trite, perhaps, to say that there is no reason why a nation that can plan to send men to the moon cannot develop a modern fleet of merchant ships. Let us show, on the threshold of the 1970's, that America is at least as ready to take the initiative in the peaceful competition on the high seas of this planet earth as it is in the boundless realms of space.

TESTIMONY OF DR. PAUL WOODS, COORDINATOR, NDEA, TITLE III

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1958, Congress, under title III of the National Defense Education Act, decided to provide funds to State and local school systems on a 50-50 basis for the purpose of purchasing instructional equipment and materials. At this time Congress declared:

States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education.

The act acknowledged that—

The national interest requires . . . that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense. . . . It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

Dr. Paul Woods, coordinator for NDEA title III for the State of Illinois, believes that for this Nation to meet the new demands of technology and international relations, we shall need all the education that the Federal Government can help support on the State and local levels. He has prepared the following material as testimony for the retention of the present level of financing title III of NDEA. I am placing excerpts from Dr. Woods' statement in the RECORD today so that others in the Congress may have the opportunity to read and consider his valuable contribution to the consideration of this vitally important issue:

TESTIMONY OF DR. PAUL WOODS, COORDINATOR, NDEA TITLE III

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor-HEW:

I come before you today to speak on behalf of education, and to express my extreme distress over the possibility that one of our most important and successful pieces of education legislation—Title III of the National Defense Education Act—might not be funded for fiscal 1970.

Gentlemen, you have before you an awesome responsibility. For, as you deliberate on this appropriations bill, you are doing far more than determining how many millions of dollars shall be spent on what program; you are reaching out and touching, sometimes imperceptibly, often dramatically, the lives of children—the future of this

nation. Taken in that context, it is not inappropriate to suggest that your responsibility is all the more awesome because the decisions you come to in this chamber will affect not only the children of today, but the America of tomorrow. . . .

Specifically, however, I am concerned about the absence of an appropriation request for Title III of NDEA, and I am here to urge that you make an appropriation of the full amount authorized by Congress for fiscal 1970—\$120 million.

Title III of NDEA (Public Law 85-864, as amended) authorizes two programs for the improvement of instruction. Part A authorizes \$120 million for fiscal year 1970 to be matched by State and local school systems on a 50-50 basis for the purchase of instructional equipment and materials. The subjects covered are science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, history, geography, English, civics, reading, economics, and industrial arts. It also authorizes \$10 million for administration of the program and for the employment of subject matter specialists, at the state level, to improve instruction in these ten subjects.

New legislation establishing Part B reinforces other Federal support in improving educational opportunity for deprived students.

The National Defense Education Act, including Title III, was brought into being in 1958. It passed with bi-partisan support and was signed into law by President Eisenhower on September 2, 1958. It has since been renewed four times, always with bi-partisan sponsorship, and the original three subject areas have been expanded to the ten set forth above. Corresponding with the expansion in subject areas and corresponding with the popularity and success of the program, authorizations have been increased as well.

The annual appropriations for Title III over the life of this Act have been as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TITLE III, NDEA

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Part A	
	Grants to States for equipment and materials	State administration
1959	49.28	1.35
1960	52.80	4.00
1961	47.52	3.75
1962	47.52	3.75
1963	47.52	3.75
1964	61.60	5.00
1965	70.40	5.20
1966	79.20	7.50
1967	79.20	7.50
1968	79.20	2.00
1969	75.74	2.00

These facts, I believe, point to a substantial interest in this program on the part of the Congress.

Now, for fiscal year 1970 the Administration has returned with a recommendation that no funds be appropriated for NDEA Title III, neither for Part A nor for the new Part B.

Although Title III of NDEA has not been pushed by either the Johnson or the Nixon budget personnel, the facts are that it is one of the more successful and popular education programs among the people who know it best: those who work with it in the field—the State and local educational agencies, and the school teachers and school administrators of our country.

Both the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made recommendations to the Budget Bureau that Title III be funded; the Office of Education recommended a level of \$14.1 million for grants to the States, \$1 million for loans to nonprofit private schools, and

\$2 million for State administration; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommended that \$17.9 million be appropriated for the new Part B—for direct grants to local education agencies. Although both of these suggestions of appropriations were modest to the point of being meaningless, the fact is that within the framework of the educational bureaucracy there is recognition that there is a need for the special kinds of services and programs that Title III provides.

NEEDS AS REPORTED BY STATE ADMINISTRATORS

In order to determine the bona fide needs of the States for funds under Title III of NDEA, in April of last year the National Audio-Visual Association surveyed the Title III administrators in the various State departments of education.

In reply to the survey, only 5 of the State administrators indicated that they were able to fill all requests from the local educational agencies for funds in fiscal year 1968. The other 44 who replied estimated that they could have used a total of about \$31.8 million more than the \$76.9 million actually spent.

The forty-nine State administrators who replied felt that a total of \$116,035,417 in Federal funds would be needed under Title III for fiscal year 1969, and \$128,260,000 for 1970, as compared to the \$75,240,000 which was available under the fiscal year 1968 appropriation and under the 1969 appropriation.

HAS NDEA TITLE III BEEN EFFECTIVE?

At no time while recommending a reduction of funds for the purchase of equipment and the elimination of funds for supervisory services have Office of Education or Bureau of the Budget spokesmen implied any failure or unpopularity of the program. It is well that they have not. The weight of evidence demonstrates that the program has been instrumental in bringing about a very substantial improvement in education. Since 1958, when NDEA was passed, schools have been adopting the newly developed curriculums in the critical subject areas to meet the new demands of technology and international relations.

Recently, the Fairfax County School System, Fairfax, Virginia, embarked on a study designed to assess the relative achievement of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade pupils in a program saturated with visual media and contrasted with a similar program not including the media saturation. Evaluation was conducted over a period of one full school term, 1967-68, and four months of the second semester of 1967.

Results provide hard data that a program of instruction strongly supported by a heavy concentration of correlated media can make a positive influence on learning as measured by two well-known standardized tests—Lorge Thorndike verbal and non-verbal, and SRA Achievements Tests.

In November, 1968, the Research and Educational Planning Center of the College of Education of the University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, J. Clark Davis, Director, Len L. Trout, Study Coordinator, turned in a "Study of the Bureau of National Defense Education Act Administration" for the State of California.

The results of this study are most pertinent for the deliberations of this committee. 918 questionnaires were mailed to every active, operating school district in California that had participated in Title III-A or III-B NDEA during the past three years. No place was prepared for signatures nor was any effort made to identify the respondent districts. Complete anonymity was thus insured. A total of 756 returns were received.

Question number four read: "To what extent can improved student achievement in your schools be attributed to programs initiated or assisted with Title III of NDEA?"

The response was overwhelmingly weighted toward the "significant value" end of the scale. "Because the districts were involved in the planning, initiating, and funding of NDEA projects," the reporters concluded, "they recognized the value of the programs as related to student achievement."

Question five read: "To what extent do you feel that Title III of NDEA has made it possible to improve instruction in the critical areas covered by the Act?" Once again the response was overwhelming. From the report, again: ". . . almost half of the districts responding to the question indicated that NDEA had made it possible to improve instruction in the critical areas of English, civics, history, mathematics, et al., in an amount of significance. Nearly as many reported that NDEA had made important contributions. The 638 reporting important or significant values greatly outweighs the 26 respondents reporting little or no value attached to the Title III contribution."

My own state of Illinois is one which has been particularly active using Title III funds to advantage. Following is a list of workshops and consultant visits in various subject areas in Illinois for fiscal year 1968, the last year for which figures are available.

ILLINOIS TITLE III NDEA, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Science: 49 workshops, 1,065 participants, 190 consultant visits.

Mathematics: 44 workshops, 1,443 participants, 466 consultant visits.

Foreign language: 13 workshops, 250 participants, 654 consultant visits.

Social studies: 28 workshops, 722 participants, 973 consultant visits.

English and reading: 79 workshops, 2,966 participants, 465 consultant visits.

Industrial arts: new program—no workshops, 200 consultant visits.

Grand totals: 213 workshops, 6,445 participants, 2,948 consultant visits.

Finally, the National Education Association, representing over one million teachers, has said of NDEA Title III, "It is the only program of Federal financial assistance for upgrading the quality of instruction in all of the major subjects of the elementary and secondary school curriculum."

This accumulation of expert opinion should not be taken lightly. Bearing it in mind, I sincerely hope you will not be taken in by vague generalities and assurances that the benefits of NDEA Title III will continue under ESEA. Instead, I ask you to be guided in your final decision by the recognition that NDEA Title III has been tried for ten years, that it has been tested and found effective, that it has been widely accepted in State and local education agencies, and that it is needed now as much as it was in 1958.

A BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCY PROGRAM

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman EVINS of the House Select Committee on Small Business; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), ranking minority member; and the members of its Subcommittee on Government Procurement, in introducing on June 17, 1969, H.R. 12188 which would strengthen the certificate of competency program of the Small Business Administration.

The bill, amending section 8(b) (7) of the Small Business Act, is designed to prevent certain procurement practices which restrict the beneficial use and purpose of the COC program and inhibit small business participation in Government procurement.

This legislation is in line with recommendation No. 26 of the House Small Business Committee's final report—House Report 1985, 90th Congress—as follows:

That, to strengthen the certificate of competency program, to increase competition and economy in Government procurement, and to preserve the integrity of the procurement process, legislation similar to H.R. 18041, introduced jointly on June 20, 1968, by all members of the subcommittee, be promptly considered by the appropriate legislative committee to amend section 8(b) (7) of the Small Business Act to prevent administrative restriction of the small business low bidder's right to appeal and Small Business Administration's authority to review, affirm, or reverse contracting officer determinations of alleged irresponsibility.

Equally disturbing to the subcommittee is that a contracting officer may determine that a small business low bidder, even though he has the capacity and credit to perform the contract, lacks the degree of "tenacity and perseverance" or "integrity" necessary, in his own judgment, to perform the contract. A spot check disclosed more than 200 such cases in fiscal year 1967 in the military departments and DSA. The report, however, does not disclose how many refusals to award contracts to the small business low bidders were based on alleged "lack of tenacity and perseverance" and how many on alleged "lack of integrity."

In such cases, DOD officials contend that the contracting officer need not refer his determination to SBA for review.

SBA testimony on this subject disclosed instances in which SBA notified the contracting officer that his determination to withhold the award based upon alleged lack of capacity and credit was to be reversed, whereupon the contracting officer promptly refused the award on the ground of alleged lack of tenacity and perseverance.

We had believed that the COC program served to encourage small business to compete against large business with knowledge and assurance that an erroneous or discriminatory refusal to award the contract to the small business low bidder for any such reasons could be reviewed and reversed by the Small Business Administration. The members of the subcommittee are understandably concerned with the discouraging effects that such practices by contracting officers have upon the small business community.

A small business firm, whether a newly found source or a veteran supplier, invited to bid in an open unrestricted procurement, realizes the risks of expense and time in preparing a proper bid. Even if he knows he can offer a lower price to the Government than his large business competitor, and even if he knows that he is ready, willing, and able to perform the contract for which he is invited to bid, he must now consider additional risks that have been built into the procurement process in the event that he should be the low bidder. His chance of obtaining the award will depend, in part, upon the attitude and action of the contracting officer. His low bid may be arbitrarily refused; and the review and reversal of the contracting officer's decision by SBA prevented. This condition is hardly conducive to a decision to compete and is undoubtedly a factor accounting for the increased failure rate of invited small business to bid (see Part III, A).

The beneficial purpose of the COC program is frustrated by such narrow or strained interpretations of the statute. The small business right of appeal and the scope of the independent investigation by SBA should include the issue whether the small business low bidder is *ready and willing*, as well as the issue whether he is *able*, to perform the contract in question.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, I urge that prompt and favorable consideration be given to H.R. 12188.

The recommendation is based upon the following findings and conclusions of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement set forth in House Report 1975, 90th Congress:

CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCY PROGRAM

Too often, contracting officers unjustifiably refused to award a contract to the small business low bidder because of alleged irresponsibility due to "lack of capacity or credit to perform the contract." Under such circumstances, the aggrieved small business low bidder has the right to appeal to the Small Business Administration for a Certificate of Competency (COC). If SBA, after an independent survey, reverses the contracting officer's determination, the certificate issued by SBA is binding on the contracting officer as to the contract in question. The COC program is a good one. It has saved the Government millions of dollars by enabling the awards to be made to a low bidder instead of a higher one.

The assurance of a right to appeal to SBA from an unwarranted refusal to award the contract undoubtedly encourages small business to bid. In many instances, however, either the appeal is either not taken or it is withdrawn before completion. The reasons for this vary, but are often attributable to fear of resulting disfavor, reprisal, or costly delays.

In all too many instances, the right to appeal is rendered meaningless through questionable procedures followed by contracting officers in the use of an *urgency* exception to circumvent the requirement for a COC referral. In a statement to the subcommittee, the Comptroller General of the United States described cases in which contracting officers delayed their determinations of non-responsibility for several weeks or months, and, in one case, backdated the certificate of urgency, thus depriving the small business of its right of appeal.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AND THE FUTURE FARMERS

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, vocational education in agriculture is a program of systematic instruction in agriculture at the secondary level. Secondary programs are conducted in public schools or classes for persons whose occupational objectives require knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects. The program is conducted under a plan of cooperation between local schools, State boards for vocational education, and the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Instruction is given by teachers who are specially trained agricultural college graduates. Teachers usually are employed on a 12-month basis. The instruc-

tional program is designed to fit the needs of the individual student, based on his capabilities and interests, and the needs of the community. Specialized occupational training programs in agriculture prepare students for occupations in agriculture production, agriculture supplies, agriculture mechanics, agriculture processing and distribution, national resources development, ornamental horticulture, and Forestry.

The FFA, an integral part of instruction in agriculture, is a national organization of, by, and for students of vocational agriculture in public secondary schools. It is an educational, nonprofit, nonpolitical youth organization of voluntary membership, designed to develop agricultural dealership, character, thrift, scholarship, cooperation, citizenship, and patriotism. FFA is an integral part of the instructional program—a teaching tool. Students must be enrolled in vocational agriculture to become eligible for membership. They may retain their membership for 3 years following their graduation from high school, or until they are 21 years of age, whichever length of time is greater.

The FFA is operated in cooperation with the Vocational and Technical Education Division, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with the various State Boards for Vocational Education and local high school departments of vocational agriculture. The head of the agricultural education in the U.S. Office of Education serves as National FFA adviser, another agriculture educator in the Office of Education serves as national FFA executive secretary. The State adviser for each State association of the FFA is the State supervisor of vocational agriculture, and the adviser of each local chapter is the high school teacher of vocational agriculture.

The national FFA organization was launched at Kansas City, Mo., in November 1928, following many years of development of vocational agriculture student organizations in the States and local communities. Originally incorporated under the laws of the State of Virginia, the FFA was granted a charter of incorporation by act of Congress in 1950—Public Law 740, 81st Congress.

At present the FFA has approximately 450,000 active members in nearly 8,500 local high school chapters located in rural and urban areas throughout the 50 States and Puerto Rico. Similar organizations have been established in Japan, the Philippines, Columbia, Mexico, Peru, South Vietnam, Thailand, and other countries.

Through participating experiences in the Future Farmers of America, members learn how to take part in meetings, to follow parliamentary procedure, to speak in public, and to cooperate with their fellow students in programs for individual and community betterment. Local chapters sponsor recreational activities, organize educational tours, conduct safety and home improvement campaigns, and hold parent-son banquets. They have been known to organize a local chamber of commerce where none existed, and to organize and manage a community fair. They frequently take on

such jobs and the landscaping and beautification of school and church grounds in the community.

Many FFA activities are designed to stimulate the members to do better work in vocational agriculture. The advancement through degrees in the organization is based largely on achievement in agriculture. Awards offered through the FFA Foundation stimulate increased effort by the students. Included among these are awards for outstanding achievement in crop farming, farm and home electrification, forestry, home improvement, livestock farming, ornamental horticulture, poultry farming, agricultural mechanics, and soil and water management. A national chapter award program recognizes local chapters that have outstanding programs of activities. Awards also are provided for agriculture safety promotion by chapters, and for public speaking.

Numerous activities in the FFA are designed to develop leadership ability and the understanding and involvement in good citizenship development programs. Local chapters and State FFA associations conduct leadership development activities. Among them are chapter officer and member development activities, instruction conducted by the local agriculture instructor and in State leadership camps and centers which operate intensive leadership sessions during the summer.

During the week of June 23 to 28, 1969, for the first time chapter FFA presidents—officers who have their senior year in vocational agriculture and FFA still ahead of them—will be attending a national leadership and citizenship conference in the Nation's Capital. Much of the conference will involve the youth in leadership development activities, through participation in panel presentations, small group discussions, and workshop planning sessions at the National FFA Center, located near Alexandria, Va., and at the Olde Colony Motor Lodge Conference Center, which is the conference headquarters.

"FFA—Emphasis Agriculture" is the theme of this important national leadership and citizenship conference. The purpose of the conference is to inspire and inform these youth, preparing for occupations in agriculture, to meet the challenges of leadership in the FFA, the agricultural industry, their communities, and our country.

The program will focus on national and international careers in agriculture, American heritage, our U.S. Government, and the opportunities in the FFA. National FFA officers will moderate thought provoking sessions at the State Department, U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and on Capitol Hill. Inspiring programs are planned at historical monuments and memorials in and around the Nation's Capital. The officers will meet their congressional leaders and discuss their future in agriculture with other national leaders in government, industry, and agricultural organizations.

A final outcome of the week's activities will be a strengthened belief in the FFA motto: "Learning to do, doing to learn: Earning to live, living to serve."

HELPING CHILDREN OVERCOME
LEARNING DISABILITIES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the General Subcommittee on Education, which I serve as chairman, will soon be holding hearings on H.R. 8660 and H.R. 9065, bills to provide assistance to children with learning disabilities.

In order for my colleagues in the House to better understand the multiple forms of learning disabilities in children—and their extent—I shall insert a series of articles on this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first of these articles discusses the symptoms of learning disabilities and how to help children overcome them.

Mr. Speaker, the article from Today's Health of May 1969 follows:

HELPING CHILDREN OVERCOME LEARNING
DISABILITIES

(By Theodore Irwin)

A child may reverse letters when reading, appear clumsy, be overactive or forgetful, or have speech and spelling difficulties. These learning disabilities do not affect his intelligence. But they may mean that he needs special treatment and training.

When he reads aloud, seven-year-old Johnny reverses letters in words, saying "was" for "saw" and "cupperbut" for "but-tercup." Susan, at six, can't tell left from right. In class, Bobby is hyperactive, exploding in sudden rages and tantrums. Other youngsters handle a pencil clumsily, can't concentrate, or seem confused in their speech.

Your own child may have one or more of these and other learning blocks. Yet he could be intelligent, his health, hearing, and eyesight perfectly normal. Your child would not be unique. According to Dr. James Cavanaugh, chief of pediatrics at Boston's St. Elizabeth Hospital, "one out of four American kids has some problem in regard to learning."

Often it's termed a "perceptual motor difficulty," involving impressions received through the senses and appropriate movements. It's possible—but by no means certain—that a child's special learning handicap may be due to a subtle, slight irregularity of brain function. The condition, or syndrome (a group of characteristic symptoms), has come to be generally known as minimal brain dysfunction (MBD) or special learning disabilities—a relatively new entity in the health field. Last May, a Congressional Subcommittee on Education conservatively estimated that one to three percent of our school population may have learning disabilities severe enough to require special remedial procedures.

This does not necessarily mean that if a child misbehaves or does poorly at school, his brain functioning is out of whack or that he's "retarded." He may just be a late starter, have a poor teacher, feel an emotional conflict, show an hereditary lag in development, or suffer a low-grade physical ailment. Some other innocuous hidden factor also could be responsible. Still, it is important for parents and teachers to understand, recognize, and know what to do about MBD, if that's the eventual diagnosis.

The following careful definition of "learning disability" has been suggested by the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children: "Children with special learning disabilities exhibit a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological pro-

cesses involved in understanding or in using spoken or written languages. These may be manifested in disorders of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling, or arithmetic. They do not include learning problems which are due primarily to visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, to mental retardation, emotional disturbance, or to environmental disadvantage."

Various states refer to learning disabilities by other names, such as educational handicaps, special learning disorders, or perceptual impairments.

An increasingly recognized element in learning failure, minimal brain dysfunction is a catch-all technical phrase for widely differing problems. When a child is diagnosed as having MBD, he may have no demonstrable brain injury, as in cases of cerebral palsy or epilepsy, which show irregular electroencephalograph (EEG) patterns.

"MBD is largely an inference, and cerebral impairment is assumed," says Dr. Norman Sher, child psychiatrist at Maimonides Medical Center, Brooklyn, New York. "The assumption is that there is anatomic damage, that it may be minute and limited to highly focal areas of the brain."

Significantly, whatever hindrance in the nervous system there may be in a mild learning-disability case is "minimal," subtly affecting learning and behavior without evident lowering of a child's general intellectual capacity. In other words, these youngsters may be smart. When tested, they achieve near average, average, even above average in intellectual functioning.

About 100 symptoms of MBD have been identified, and each affected child has his own particular cluster. Signs may show up in various combinations of impaired visual or hearing awareness, language, memory, concept-formation, or muscular function.

Among early medical symptoms are slowness or awkwardness of movement, an inability to develop a sense of up and down, a deficiency in the senses of touch, time, or distance. An MBD-child's hearing, vision, and voice may be normal, but something in his brain centers may not understand the messages received by his eyes and ears; or his brain centers may not direct his tongue and lips to talk properly.

Behavioral clues include overactivity or underactivity, lack of normal attention span, and displays of unusual and changeable emotions. Educational symptoms are detected in a child's reading, writing, spelling, and arithmetic.

Many of the characteristics, however, tend to smooth out and vanish spontaneously as the child grows older, with the natural maturing of his central nervous system. Very bright children with reading problems often learn to read later, when they're highly motivated. They compensate for their original difficulty by interest and intelligence, though they may be hampered by a spelling problem.

If the multiple symptoms confuse you, the labels being applied to MBD are even more perplexing. "Terms are often used to lend a touch of mystification to ignorance," contends Dr. Alfred L. Abrams, senior staff psychiatrist at Queens College, New York.

In an effort to clarify the lingo, a task force of 14 experts was assigned to the job by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. Their report revealed that some 38 terms are employed to describe conditions grouped as minimal brain dysfunction. Labels range from "association-deficit pathology" to "organic behavior disorder," "perceptual cripple," "clumsy-child syndrome," and "dyslexia."

Perhaps the most familiar and fashionable term today is "dyslexia." Simply, this means a child is a poor reader. He may reverse letters or words, "mirror write," be unable to translate symbols on a printed page into meaningful ideas, or exhibit other symptoms.

The syndrome is not caused by brain dam-

age, in the opinion of Dr. Lloyd J. Thompson of the University of North Carolina Medical School. It's accounted for, he believes, by "an innate or constitutional developmental lag," and a child can catch up through special treatment. Doctor Thompson calls dyslexia "a congenital word-blindness and word-deafness" comparable to color-blindness, which is independent of intelligence. Others say that while dyslexia often accompanies MBD, an MBD child is not necessarily dyslexic.

The very existence of specific dyslexia is questioned by some knowledgeable authorities, although more than 20,000 books, articles, and reports have been published on the condition. Dr. Henry F. Eichenwald of the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School maintains that most of what's written on dyslexia is "speculation, faddism, unproven theory, uncontrolled data, or dogma presented as fact." The vast majority of otherwise normal children called dyslexic, contends Doctor Eichenwald, could do as well, perhaps better, if they were left alone to "have time heal their trouble."

Parents are apt to accept, perhaps even welcome, the dyslexic label because it's respectable—not a report-card "F." If Mary brings home a poor paper from school, her suburban mother might say, "I must find out if Mary is dyslexic."

In cases of faulty learning ability attributed to MBD, what are the causes? Medical researchers have found that neurologic disorders such as MBD are significantly linked to pregnancy complications of the mother and to prematurity. In the prenatal period there may be "insults" (physical or chemical injuries) to the embryo or fetus; at birth, anoxia (lack of oxygen) could affect the central nervous system. Or there may have been an illness or injury during the critical development years of the brain and central nervous system. Frequently, however, the cause of the brain dysfunction cannot be traced.

It's not unusual for a learning problem to be tied to emotional disturbance. They could be related, but it's hard to say whether the learning trouble triggers the emotional upset or vice versa.

Says Dr. J. G. Minskoff, director of the U.S. Bureau of Education of the Handicapped: "Parents should bear in mind that a learning-disabled child may be physically intact and intellectually normal except for one or more areas, such as learning arithmetic."

Currently, concepts, orientations, and approaches to the problem vary widely among professionals in the field. Thus, they often differ over methods of diagnosis and treatment.

How is an MBD-learning disability detected?

"Diagnosis of minimal brain dysfunction," explains Dr. John Emmett Peters, director of child psychiatry, University of Arkansas Medical Center, "is made on the basis of clinical behavior, history, psychologic evaluation, and neurologic signs. These must be evaluated against the background of environmental and interpersonal factors."

Ideally, evaluation includes both a physical and an educational checkup. The first symptoms may be observed by a parent or teacher. Initially, the question is whether anything is wrong medically. The family physician, pediatrician, pediatric neurologist, and other specialists all may play a role.

Starting with a thorough medical history and physical (including neurological) examination, a full check should be made of vision and hearing. When advisable, the physician may ask for special tests. For example, he may order an EEG to record the electrical activity within the brain or refer the child to an endocrinologist for tests of brain chemistry.

An educational or behavioral diagnosis encompasses an analysis of the child's school record, psychological tests, an assessment of his speech and coordination, his ability to

use ideas meaningfully, his language development, plus observation of behavior in a variety of situations. With all this data, a hypothesis is arrived at to see what may be expected of the child and what can be done for him.

Experts explain that in most instances MBD is an unproved diagnosis. Warning against alarming parents with an unwarranted diagnosis of "brain disorder," Doctor Abrams of Queens College recommends that, in cases where brain dysfunction can't be proven, a descriptive term such as "delayed or irregular maturation" should be used.

Specialists in the field rely on a wide range of diagnostic tools. Some exams measure visual-motor functions or visual perception. Others focus on psychological areas as related to language abilities. Many phonics tests analyze a child's ability to relate sounds and symbols. The best diagnostic clinics tend to use several of these, plus observation of the subject.

Philosophies and techniques differ among clinics throughout the country. One of the most up-to-date facilities is the Learning Rehabilitation Service at Maimonides Medical Center. Part of the Community Mental Health Center, it was started three years ago as part of the child psychiatry program headed by Dr. Norman Sher. The service, helping about 650 children a year, was developed and is now directed by a vibrant educational psychologist, Dr. Cecelia Pollack.

In her diagnosis of a child's learning problems, Doctor Pollack looks for developmental lags, beginning with observations of behavior (distractibility, attention span, etc.). She notes such factors as coordination, directional awareness, and sense of rhythm. The child is asked to skip, hop, balance on a board, face right and left, throw and catch a ball. Sunday other psychological and physical tests are given. The service has access to such hospital departments as pediatrics and neurology; when necessary, a psychiatrist, ophthalmologist, speech therapist, or other specialists are consulted.

The other morning, chubby, eight-year-old Tommy bounced in for diagnosis. Hyperactive, he moved quickly, touching one object after another as though driven. He asked, "What's this?" and reached for some thing else without waiting for an answer. On various tests, he couldn't balance himself or tell one direction from another. When Doctor Pollack moved a pencil in front of him, Tommy moved his head and shoulders with it. His eye motions were erratic. Shown a sketch of a chicken, he failed to discriminate whether it was looking up or down. The psychologist said words like "swing-sling" and "butterfly-flutterby," and Tommy was asked to tell if they were the same or different.

During three such sessions, Tommy submitted to some 30 different tests. Then Doctor Pollack called in the boy's parents to analyze his condition. Tommy had perceptual motor disabilities and poor coordination. He was unable to deal with written symbols in a meaningful way, could not combine his visual auditory, and motion senses. Emotionally, he was on the level of a three-year-old. Based on the entire spectrum of symptoms, Doctor Pollack's diagnosis was that Tommy was a learning-disabled child.

The remedial program is based on the diagnosis. Doctor Pollack believes in delineating the areas of a child's weakness, then trying to treat these specific areas. "I prefer to call ours a "rehabilitation clinic," she says. "I believe learning functions can be rehabilitated."

For example, seven-year-old Martha may be given various visual exercises to help her develop a sense of spatial relationships—awareness of her body in space. Later, an intersensory reading method may heighten her reading skills. Such a method combines linguistic and phonic principles, employing

visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (motion) senses. Speech-sound skills, letter recognition, and reading are developed gradually.

Many training methods begin with a phonic readiness kit to develop, a "phonetic ear." These systems work with sound, build them into words, then into sentences—in a programmed sequence. Thus Martha will learn to read, write, and spell simultaneously.

Elsewhere in the nation, efforts to help the learning-disabled take multiple forms. Mild cases may be corrected by a regular classroom teacher, but only a small percentage of schools give special attention to those with more severe difficulties. Sometimes two or three schools share the time of an itinerant special teacher and a resource room. A hopeful trend is the enactment by 13 states—including California, Illinois, and New Jersey—of legislation to set up educational programs to deal with learning disabilities.

"The need for clinical teaching is apparent from the great variety of programs presented," notes Dr. Jeanne McCarthy, associate professor of education, University of Illinois. "Each child has his own learning style. A system that works for one youngster may not work for another. So the teacher must precisely match the learner and his treatment. What these youngsters need is individualized attention."

UNIT RETAIL PRICE LABELING: RELIEF FOR THE HARASSED CONSUMER

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, despite the 1966 Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, retailers and manufacturers of everyday household products are, more than ever before, harassing consumers with an unending variety of shapes and sizes of packages and commodities. Proliferation of containers and package sizes labeled with unlimited variations of confusing quantities and prices has virtually rendered the 1966 act meaningless.

In our system of self-service shopping, every buyer has a right to know exactly how much he is paying for a product, and how much product he is receiving. The 1966 act attempted to provide for this fundamental consumer right. For a number of reasons, neither the act nor individual initiative of private retailers or manufacturers brought about any semblance of fair containerization or price labeling. Today the situation is no better than in 1966.

To cite just one example, in a local Northwest Washington, D.C., grocery store, Ivory Liquid dishwashing soap was recently found in three different sized plastic bottles: a 32 ounce "king size" bottle for 89 cents; a 22 ounce "giant size" bottle for 59 cents; and a 12 ounce "regular size" bottle for 35 cents. On the container was a retail price marked by hand. According to the 1966 act, net quantity of the contents was imprinted on the label by the manufacturer. A housewife requiring the most economical value must stand before a shelf of goods, figuring out by herself which bottle is the most economical buy. This is done by dividing the retail price figure by the net

quantity figure—in this case ounces—and is called unit retail price.

Until recently, it was assumed that the largest container was most economical. It was said it is cheaper for a manufacturer to produce in quantity. This is not necessarily so today. In the example just cited, the cheapest bottle of Ivory Liquid was the middle size "giant" 22 ounce, 59 cent item with a unit retail price of 2.68 cents per ounce. The largest sold at 2.78 cents per ounce and the smallest at 2.91 cents per ounce. This is but one example of how retailers have been convincing the unaware and unprotected consumer into paying more for less.

In light of the fact that the 1966 Fair Packaging and Labeling Act is not accomplishing what was intended, I am introducing a bill to allow American consumers the opportunity to find at a glance exact unit retail price of a product. My bill simply and effectively provides that a retailer must place on every package and item for sale both retail price and unit retail price of the product.

This bill does not impose undue hardship upon retailer or manufacturer. At present the retailer must mark every item for sale with the retail price, either by hand or machine. My bill provides that in addition to retail price he must also place on the item price per unit of weight, volume or measure. He may do this by hand, machine, or separate label which he can affix to the container.

Specific guidelines are provided in the bill for appearance and location on the container of these two figures. To reduce confusion for the retailer, such specifications are in language similar to existing specifications for the manufacturer's net quantity mark. My purpose is not to bind and intimidate the retailer, but to provide in a workable and effective manner, clarity, fairness and truthfulness in price labeling.

Mr. Speaker, every consumer should rightfully be told exactly how much he is paying for a product and how much product he is receiving. I therefore urge prompt and careful consideration of this bill in light of the obvious ineffectiveness of the present 1966 Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. We have for too long tolerated deceptive and unfair packaging and price-labeling practices, whose sole purpose is to confuse vulnerable consumers.

My bill amending portions of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act of 1966 reads as follows:

H.R. 12322

A bill to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of packaged consumer commodities, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4 of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1453) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) No person engaged in business in the sale at retail of any packaged consumer commodity which has been distributed in commerce, or the distribution of which affects commerce, shall sell, offer for sale, or display for sale any package containing any such commodity unless such person theretofore

shall have placed upon such package a retail price mark. The retail price mark required to be placed on a package by the preceding sentence shall—

"(1) contain information effective to disclose plainly to purchasers and prospective purchasers (A) the retail price of the entire contents of the package, and (B) the unit retail price of such contents determined in such manner as the promulgating authority specified in section 5(a) shall by regulation prescribe; and

"(2) be prepared and placed upon or affixed to the principal display panel of the label appearing on the package—

"(A) in conspicuous and easily legible type in distinct contrast (by typography, layout, color, embossing, or molding) with other matter on the package,

"(B) in letters or numerals in a type size which is uniform for all packages of substantially the same size,

"(C) so that the lines of printed matter included in the retail price mark are generally parallel to the base on which the package rests as it is designed to be displayed, and

"(D) in accordance with such additional requirements relating to manner and form as the promulgating authority specified in section 5(a) may by regulation prescribe."

(b) Section 10 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 1459) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) The term 'unit retail price', when used in relation to the contents of a package of any consumer commodity, means the retail price of the contents of that package expressed in terms of the retail price of such contents per single whole unit of weight, volume, or measure—

"(1) in which the net quantity of contents of such package is stated upon the label appearing on such package; or

"(2) if the net quantity of the contents of such package is so stated in terms of more than one such unit of weight, volume, or measure, the unit thereof prescribed by regulations which shall be promulgated by the authority named in section 5(a)."

Sec. 2. Section 7(a) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 1456(a)) is amended by inserting after "or delivered for introduction into commerce" the following: ", or sold at retail, offered for sale at retail, or displayed for sale at retail."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the seventh month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

LAST LETTER TELLS PROUD SOLDIER'S HOPES

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any oratory is needed from me to explain to my colleagues the intense feeling of pride coupled with overwhelming compassion that came over me upon reading the following article which appeared in the June 19 edition of the Flight Trainer, publication of the U.S. Army Flight Training Center and Fort Stewart, Ga., concerning a truly great American patriot, Sgt. Jeff Davis:

LAST LETTER TELLS PROUD SOLDIER'S HOPES

A moving letter, written by a Division sergeant before his death in September, speaks for virtually every American Soldier who has risked his life in Vietnam.

"It is too bad I had to die in another country; the United States is so wonderful," wrote Sgt. Jeff Davis of Manchester, N.H. "But at least I died for a reason . . . and a good one."

Davis was killed in a firefight Sept. 6 while serving with A Co., 3rd Bn., 187th Abn. Inf. near Cu Chi. Before departing for Vietnam, he wrote the letter to his fiancée, whom he later married in Hawaii. He requested that it be opened only in the event he died here.

The letter showed that Davis, fighting with bravery and pride like every other Screaming Eagle, was aware that the commitment of the 101st in Vietnam calls upon young Americans to be both diplomats and warriors. He spoke a tribute to these men, fortified with the belief that his job and the mission of his fellow Airborne troopers will someday bring peace to the people of Vietnam.

"I may not understand this war or like it, or want to fight it, but nevertheless I had to DO, and I DID," wrote the proud American. "I died for the people of the United States."

The young sergeant served with the Screaming Eagles in combat for more than nine months after arriving in Vietnam Dec. 1, 1967. During his tour, he earned a Bronze Star with "V" Device, Bronze Star Vietnamese Campaign Medal, Vietnamese Service Medal, Combat Infantryman's Badge and Purple Heart.

Davis saw compensation for his death in a future of freedom for his relatives, friends and others also who enjoy this wonderful country, who appreciate what they have and thank God every day for it.

"I died for the guys with long hair and protest signs," he continued, "the draft card burners, the hippies, the 'anti-everything' people who have nothing better to do. The college kids who think they shouldn't have to serve because they're too good. I died so these people could have a little longer time to try to get straightened out in life. God knows they need it."

"Yes, I died for the so-called 'younger generation,' of which I was a part, but for some unknown reason I never became an active member. I guess I was a 'square' or something with short hair, no police record, didn't drink or smoke (pot included) and volunteered for the service. I died for the parents of these kids also, God forgive them."

"I died so these members, active members of the 'younger generation,' could have the right to do what they do. To protest, have long hair, go to the college of their own choice, wear weird clothes, and run around mixed up with no direction at all."

"I died so they can protest the war I fought and died in. Without it, what would they protest? But I also died for the many thousands who died in this war and other wars before, for these same reasons . . . for the men who fought gallantly on the many battlefields of many wars to keep this country free. I guess that in order to gain freedom there must be war. I died for the United States."

THE ARCHAIC FEDERAL 160-ACRE LIMIT POLICY MUST BE MODERNIZED

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a House sponsor of legislation drafted by the senior Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) to increase the acreage limitation of the Federal reclamation law from 160 to 640 acres and to

make it possible for lands in excess of the limitation to obtain reclamation water under certain conditions.

Two other identical bills also have been introduced in the House, H.R. 9475 by Mr. TALCOTT and Mr. TEAGUE of California and H.R. 10140 by Mr. PRICE of Texas. We all are hopeful of early consideration of this important bill.

The official newsletter of the American Farm Bureau reports that the Farm Bureau also supports the objectives of these bills.

Another strong supporter of this legislation is Mr. Allan Grant, president of the California Farm Bureau. Mr. Grant is an authority on agriculture in general and California agriculture in particular. In addition to being president of the California Farm Bureau, he also is chairman of the State board of agriculture and a regent of the University of California.

For many years, he has been an outspoken advocate of modernizing the acreage limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act. In a recent issue of Western Water News, Mr. Grant addresses himself to the current proposals and the need for prompt congressional action. The article follows:

THE ARCHAIC 160-ACRE LIMIT POLICY MUST BE MODERNIZED

(By Allan Grant, president, California Farm Bureau Federation)

The 160-acre limitation on water deliveries from Federal water projects is geared to a horse and buggy type of agriculture and general economy. Congress must act, without delay, to modify and modernize this archaic law to fit our present day economy and its demands on agriculture if farmers and ranchers are to maintain their capability to meet the food and fiber needs of the United States and its foreign commitments.

In order to keep pace with the demand for food and fiber placed on agriculture in recent years, farms have been forced to mechanize their operations and increase the size of their farm units. This was necessary in order to stay in business and continue efficient production of high quality food and fiber products in the quantity needed by our growing economy and to maintain a strong, healthy citizenry. During 1968, 24 million acres of farm land changed ownership. Over half of the buyers were purchasing additional acres to add to their existing farming units in order to stay in business and earn a reasonable income for their families.

Congress, in its wisdom, has recognized that it was impractical to apply the 160-acre limitation policy to all Federal projects, even in bygone years. There are some 19 or more Federal projects where Congress has provided exemptions or modifications of the policy. Legislation has been introduced in the current session of Congress, supported by several national organizations, designed to modernize this outdated Federal policy. The California Farm Bureau Federation joins with the California State Chamber of Commerce, the Irrigation Districts Association of California and other state groups in support of the national effort seeking favorable action by Congress on this legislation.

Financial institutions, which provide credit to farmers, are becoming increasingly concerned with the effect of the application of the 160-acre limitation policy to lands already privately owned and desiring a supplemental water supply from Federally-constructed reservoirs. The security of loans is threatened. Credit risks are greater.

This is not a problem affecting only the Western reclamation states. Financial insti-

tutions, manufacturers and distributors of agricultural supplies, fertilizer, equipment, etc., in other areas, as well as the total economic structure of the country, will suffer unless Congress takes positive action correcting this archaic policy so family farms can continue to operate on an efficient, economically sound basis.

TITLE IX—A NEW DIMENSION IN FOREIGN AID—VI

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress and the new administration will make great strides in modernizing the U.S. foreign aid program. However, Prof. John Schott warns that some new approaches would be harmful rather than helpful. He cautions against multilateralizing and he warns against the fragmentation of the program. If these routes are followed, the outlook is dismal, he feels. He wrote these remarks earlier this year before the administration's proposal was made public.

The concluding section to his very thoughtful paper follows:

OUTLOOK IS DISMAL

Given these three conditions as prerequisites of a successful attempt to implement title IX, the outlook seems pretty dismal. It is generally assumed that the Nixon Administration will recommend organizational and perhaps substantive changes in the foreign aid program. To date, there has been no official indication as to what these may be. Rumors, fortified by several unofficial proposals and continuing Congressional criticisms, suggest that multilateralizing significant aspects of the foreign aid program and/or distributing several of its existing facets among a number of private and semipublic agencies will be given serious consideration. If either of these general proposals become government policy, Title IX should suffer.

The multilateral approach is a noble one and has much in its favor. Further support of existing multilateral organizations is undoubtedly in the long-term interest of this country. Many large capital projects can be effectively designed and efficiently administered by a world organization so, too, can certain humanitarian and politically-immune technical assistance activities. Title IX, however, involves undertakings of a potentially sensitive and multidimensional character. To seek to increase a country's GNP or to care for its sick and hungry is one matter; to promote increased popular participation in the benefits of development, in the implementation of development activities, and in the decision-making processes governing a country's development, is quite another.

On three grounds it appears unlikely that a multilateral agency can be optimally effective in directly influencing these latter developments: (1) by representing sovereign states with greatly differing social, political, cultural, and economic value systems, a genuinely multilateral agency seeking to realize Title IX goals could not expect from its backers the degree of single-minded, durable support required; (2) denied the forms of leverage possessed by a powerful U.S. government, a multilateral agency would

more easily be victimized in delicate Title IX areas by established regimes and prevailing socio-economic elites fearful of increased popular participation in their country; and (3) lacking the variety of assistance instruments potentially at the disposal of the U.S. Government, multilateral agencies would find it more difficult to provide multi-faceted, fully coordinated programs so essential when dealing directly with the social and political framework of a country.

At the other end of the spectrum, proposals to splinter the responsibilities now under the general aegis of A.I.D., would further complicate the process of coordination, reduce leverage, disintegrate the country programming approach, and—most importantly—probably make Title IX implementation the responsibility of but one of the resulting agencies, most likely that concerned with residual technical assistance activities. Title IX would thereby become narrowly construed and be rendered largely ineffectual. What, on the contrary, is required for Title IX implementation is recognition of the fact that this mandate relates to all facets of U.S.-sponsored development efforts in the LDCs. As A.I.D.'s administrator recently said:

We want Title IX considerations to be weighed when we decide on the overall composition of a country program. When we prescribe the negotiating instructions for a program or an agriculture sector loan, when we decide on a particular capital assistance project, when we undertake and evaluate technical assistance activities, when we support the development efforts of private institutions.¹

Title IX relates not only to *what* is done, but *how* it is done. Its implementation requires not only an expansion of the spectrum of "allowable" undertakings by A.I.D. and a reorientation of priorities along that spectrum, but conscious Title IX attention to the ways in which particular projects are undertaken and to the conditions attached to various sorts of loans and grants. It means that a feeder road can be built in the most efficient or quickest way possible primarily to increase agricultural productivity; it can also be constructed by inefficient labor-intensive methods in "uneconomic" areas primarily to ameliorate unemployment, teach laborers new skills, or promote national integration. It means that a family planning program can give first consideration to the most efficient and broadest dissemination of propaganda and devices, or it can seek more slowly to establish or strengthen indigenous groups or nascent organizations to perform this work, thereby encouraging small group activity and cooperative local undertakings at the possible sacrifice of a more greatly quickened decline in the birth rate. A sector loan can be granted only on condition that the moneys are channelled to local or intermediate governmental institutions which will have largely autonomous control over their use, thereby seeking to get a particular developmental job done while strengthening the interest and capacity of local decision-making units to perform such jobs without awaiting the sluggish administrative hand of the central government to do it for them.

Military assistance programs can begin to recognize in their training programs the uncomfortable fact that the military in many LDCs will not remain an "a-political" force. Acceptance of this would suggest that officers should be trained as much in the developmental problems and prospects of their country as in the use of sophisticated military hardware, the methods of counter-in-

¹ Statement of William S. Gaud before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, March 20, 1968.

surgency warfare, and the irrelevancies of the American way of life. The Peace Corps, without too great sacrifice of its myopic attitude towards the U.S. Government establishment, can intensify its halting and fragmentary efforts of the past to dovetail its program with that of A.I.D. and to demonstrate greater appreciation of the role of its volunteers as promoters and auxiliaries of a host country's development in contrast with the value of the overseas experience to its volunteers, (however residually important for recruiting purposes that may be). U.S.I.A. can begin to utilize its expertise in the field of communication and public diplomacy to provide needed technical assistance in these areas; they can also begin to fashion overseas programs which in fact—not just in name—give priority to the transmission or dissemination of information and skills relevant to the developmental needs, desires and capacities of the people in particular countries, as opposed to explaining away our public and private foibles and proclaiming the virtues of American-style democracy and life in suburbia.

There is good reason to despair of this more systematic, integrated and long-term approach to the foreign aid process ever becoming the reality which it should. Yet many would not be in this business if they did not foresee significant reforms taking place in the near future. It is hoped by a few of these that Title IX will constitute a catalyst for these reforms, if not their principal synthesizing element.

Perhaps these reforms may not replace old myths with new realities, but only substitute new myths for old—ethnocentric myths of the universal applicability of pluralism, popular participation and certain types of democratic institutions; egocentric myths of the infallibility of our predictive power as regards the resources of—and prospects for—political development in the new states. Hopefully, however, if Title IX becomes an important energizing force within our foreign aid establishment, greater modesty will be displayed than has been the case among many economists and technicians, and greater appreciation of the necessarily marginal impact U.S. assistance has on LDC development will prevail among the American public and their Congressional representatives.² It may be too much to hope that Title IX will at once broaden our horizons and limit our aspirations. There probably are not many precedents for this; but then, again, there really are no precedents to Title IX.

² It may be suggested that Title IX arrives at a particularly inauspicious time in the history of this country. When democratic principles are being so violently abused and when institutions based upon these principles appear so incapable of coping with the domestic problems confronting this country, who are we to suggest the possible applicability of these principles and institutions to the lesser developed countries of the world? Without attempting to argue here a case for seeking to uphold the dignity of the individual in varying contexts and the author's particular faith in the general validity of democratic principles, it will only be suggested that: (a) the validity of these principles is further strengthened—not brought into question—by the institutional changes now being sought so strenuously in the United States, and (b) it is to be hoped that the United States may soon recognize that we may have as much to learn from the LDCs as we may have values and skills to impart to them. Development should be—but has been inadequately seen as—a two-way street. Title IX and its broader conception of the development process may help us to recognize this simple reality.

TAX, SPEND, ELECT—THE GAME
CONTINUES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will be asked to consider a new tax bill relating to extension of the 10-percent surtax—a discriminatory tax, double taxing people who already have a duty to pay a tax—and to repeal the investment credit.

It becomes more and more difficult to explain our Government's fiscal policy and it is impossible to justify the continued theft of dollars out of the paychecks of hard-working Americans.

How, for example, can a Congressman explain a \$120,000 grant by HEW to a Communist University at Ljubljana, Yugoslavia—not only a Communist country but one that hastened to recognize the Vietcong-sponsored provisional revolutionary government in South Vietnam which is killing the sons of our taxpayers?

Or how can any Member explain 8½-percent interest to our banks, business people, contractors and homebuilders when we just last week announced a U.S. Export-Import Bank loan of \$14,688,000 to the Irish Government to buy Boeing jet planes. The interest rate on this loan was 6 percent.

Or, how can anyone defend \$480,000,000 to the World Bank for 30-year loans at no interest—or the overall foreign aid slush funds at the discretion of diplomatic bureaucrats, estimated to be \$10,428,000,000? Interest? We will be lucky even to get part of the principal back.

How can we defend the gift to the U.N. and its specialized propaganda agencies of \$83,886,000 with no benefit to our people but rather deterioration of our national sovereignty and constitutionally secured individual protections?

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of the people who settled and built this land fled Europe to escape excessive taxation.

The United States of America declared its independence from the unremitting domination of a king because of taxation without representation.

Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette lost their thrones for less than the tyranny of the taxes being piled again on the backs of our American people.

Taxes have become the curse of the continent.

Our people are being taxed federally, by the States, municipally, locally—directly and indirectly—whether they want the purported reforms or not.

Rather than a continued barrage of taxes against the people, I feel it is time that we who are charged with representing our people start earning our pay by reducing their taxes. Hard-working Americans can be the best deterrent to inflation by handling their own dollars—by enjoying the benefits of the income earned from their own initiative and ingenuity.

Regardless of all the flowery oratory, no one is fooling the man back home

who knows that his savings have been wiped out and whose wife knows that groceries, clothing, and rent continue to soar. And he is getting more incensed at those who would say inflation is caused by his spending rather than by the Federal giveaways of what they first have to take away from him. He just cannot understand taking away from him the money he needed to have his daughter's teeth straightened—then sending it to Yugoslavia, or bribing rioters not to riot again.

I include a recent newscipping:

INTEREST RATE TODAY REACHES HISTORIC HIGH
NEW YORK. (AP)—Major banks today raised the prime rate—the interest charged their biggest and best customers for loans—to a historic high of 8½ per cent from 7½ per cent, effective immediately.

An increase had been expected for some time. But the amount of the hike—a full one per cent—was surprising.

The first bank to increase the rate was Bankers Trust Co. of New York and it did so without making any comment on its reasons. Other New York banks, and then Chicago, Philadelphia and Boston banks quickly made the same move. Among the banks was Chase Manhattan and First National City of New York.

Reacting to the move, the Dow Jones industrial average dropped about 7 points shortly after the New York Stock Exchange opened.

When one bank increases the prime rate, others usually follow.

The prime rate is used in determining the interest rate charged most large corporations. Other rates, such as interest rates to consumers, are scaled upward from the prime rate.

The old rate of 7½ per cent was a record high when it was set on March 17. As recently as last Dec. 2 the rate was 6¼. A series of rate increases, usually one-fourth or one-half of a per cent at a time, had occurred between December and March.

The Federal Reserve Board has taken a number of steps to make it more expensive and more difficult for banks to borrow money. But the demand on banks for money to borrow has continued strong.

By raising the prime rate banks can afford to pay more for the money they borrow.

DISPLAYING THE STARS AND
STRIPES

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Edward Hunter, who publishes a monthly newsletter entitled "Tactics," called my attention recently to an article he wrote in 1965 concerning the lack of interest on the part of many Americans in displaying our American flag on July 4, Independence Day.

As I believe Mr. Hunter's article contains a message for all Americans, I welcome the opportunity to reprint it in full at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

WHY NOT FLY THE STARS AND STRIPES?—OUR FLAG NOW "CONTROVERSIAL"

Last year, as July 4 approached, this writer found he was without a suitable American

flag. He found none on sale in the neighborhood. On Independence Day, not a flag was flying on any house in the area, and he had to go blocks before seeing the Stars and Stripes. Startled, he made a tour of the District of Columbia. One could tell where government employees lived; there seemed to be some unwritten rule among them not to display the flag of the country which even was paying their salary. Flying the flag just did not fit in their so-called "sophistication." This editor went home and ransacked closet and drawers until he found an old souvenir flag with 48 stars, 8 by 5½ inches, which he tacked at the top of a downstairs, outside window. At least it was a flag, our flag!

The fact of the matter is that the American flag has joined the word "patriotism" as "controversial." Schools don't teach patriotism any more; it's chauvinistic and apparently a symbol of extremism. It's intolerant to fly the U.S. flag unless you fly the U.N. flag alongside, so as to show you are in the mainstream, and consider all countries the same, the same as all religions, and all the people of the world. After all, to display preference for your own country is a value judgment, and as almost any social scientist will tell you, a value judgment is "unscientific." Nobody wants to be unscientific.

Bunk and buncombe! The failure to fly the American flag, and avoidance of such words as "patriotic," are evidences of the extent to which our people are being softened up by enemy propaganda tactics, and how subtly it spreads.

This writer is going to call this situation to the attention of some leaders hereabouts. Maybe some readers will do the same, for their home areas and the national capital. Maybe the White House and our legislators might suggest American flags be available for purchase conveniently, and they be flown on July 4. Maybe federal employes can set the example.

A GREEK POLITICAL TRAGEDY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years a Greek political tragedy has unfolded in Athens step by inexorable step, with the final chapter looming more tragic than all that has come before.

America's role in this political tragedy has been an inglorious one. From the time the Papandreu government fell in 1965 until the colonel's coup in 1967, the American mission in Athens was a party to the maneuvers which forestalled elections. By forestalling elections the victory of the Democratic and Liberal Center Union Party was averted, a very questionable political judgment. The political pot was allowed to boil and an atmosphere was created which encouraged a military coup.

When the colonel's coup came on April 21, 1967, it came from an unexpected source; namely, antiestablishment middle-ranking officers in the Greek Intelligence Service, a service trained and financed but not directed by the United States.

From the beginning in April 1967 several of us in Congress have spoken of the short-term and long-term political and moral consequences of America's support of the junta which has been im-

posed on the Greek people. The State Department at the beginning explained that the junta was merely interested in constitutional reform—an explanation which we did not accept and which has proved to be an utter illusion.

Furthermore, the State Department had been and is tepid in asserting the political consequences involved, yielding always to a highly questionable "military" argument based upon the junta's support of NATO. One of the jokers in this argument is no matter what the regime in Greece—conservative or liberal—it has and it will support the Western alliance.

Three outstanding articles on the Greek situation have appeared in the last few days in newspapers of national prominence. They deserve the most thoughtful attention of every Member concerned with American foreign policy and the sometimes inadvertent damage done by short-term military considerations.

Two of the articles are by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in the June 19 and June 23 issues of the Washington Post. The third, in the June 19 Christian Science Monitor analyzes the demoralization of Greece's officer corps, civil service, and diplomatic service as a result of the dictatorship.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
June 19, 1969]

GREECE FACING GRIM ALTERNATIVES: SALAZAR-TYPE RULE OR BLOODY REVOLT
(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

ATHENS.—The Greek military dictatorship, after two years of bland assurances to Washington about restoring democracy, intends to retain power indefinitely without free elections—posing immense danger to long-range stability in the strategic eastern Mediterranean.

If the colonels who seized power April 21, 1967, on the pretext of preventing communism here ever intended any partial return to representative government, that intention is dead. Even the few politicians who have tried to cooperate with the colonels now concede that Col. George Papadopoulos, the Premier, envisions an institutionalized tyranny modeled after Salazar's 37-year dictatorship in Portugal.

Unlike our last visit there two years ago when the freshly installed junta pledged an early return to constitutional forms, the regime now regards itself as permanent. Brig. Gen. Stylianos Pattakos, Deputy Premier and the junta's No. 2 man, bristled when we asked about popular elections. "That is an internal matter that you cannot inquire about," he said. "Go ask the people on the street. Nobody wants elections."

Indeed, all objective sources here agree that the military regime would lose badly in free elections. The colonels' "revolution," attempting by edict to transform the Greeks into work-oriented puritans, has depleted what popularity the regime enjoyed in 1967. Although past Greek governments have had excellent success in rigging elections, the military regime's popular base is so low—perhaps 10 per cent—that calling elections would be equivalent to surrendering power.

Unwilling to surrender power, the colonels have turned Greece into a huge political pressure-cooker with the true feeling of the Greeks suppressed by the local gendarmerie's watchful eye. An election today probably would show a sharp leftward swing. More ominously, after two or three additional years, the pressure-cooker may explode into

insurrection with Communists in leading roles.

These ominous prospects have their source in perhaps the tightest police state this side of Moscow. Violating the colonels' own new constitution, non-Communist potential foes of the regime—mainly army officers and intellectuals—are imprisoned without indictment or trials. Reports of torture are impossible to verify in detail, but maltreatment and brutalization of low-level political prisoners continue.

Former political leaders are watched constantly. They cannot speak their view, are denied passports to travel abroad, and have their mail and telephone calls monitored. One former Premier cannot move without a car full of police agents following him. All former cabinet members are tailed when they visit their old constituencies.

The regime's iron vise is even tighter on the academic world. So many teachers have been purged that the educational system is crippled. Distinguished professors are subject to humiliating interrogation by Col. John Ladas, hard-line secretary general of the Interior Ministry. University students, solidly against the regime, are intimidated by police agents attending their very classes. A further deterrent is formed by severe prison sentences given six young teaching assistants (two of whom later were tortured) for distributing anti-junta propaganda.

The first armed resistance against this tyranny has come from the right: clandestine supporters of exiled King Constantine. Infrequently reported in the controlled Greek press are daily bombing incidents in the heart of Athens (forcing the government court martial to change buildings). There have been unconfirmed reports that the royalist resistance was responsible for the recent deaths of three pro-junta officers.

Thus, 16 retired officers arrested recently are all royalists with anti-Communist records (two of them with service in the Korean war). The regime's contention that the arrested officers participated in a left-wing army plot is only a propaganda smokescreen.

Harassing though it may be, however, the royalist resistance is incapable of overthrowing a regime so vigilant against potential opposition. Remembering the existence of the anti-Nazi resistance in World War II, Greeks fear that the Communists—better organized than ever—will dominate if and when the resistance assumes major proportions.

That day remains relatively distant. Greek Communists, badly fragmented into rival segments, are passive. The Soviet Ambassador here is circumspect, declining to discuss Greek internal affairs during a recent two-hour luncheon with an anti-junta politician. The Communists know the time is not ripe for insurrection.

But heavy government borrowing and stagnant investment here the last two years are storm signals for the modest prosperity now enjoyed by Greece. If an economic recession and rising discontent with dictatorship intersect some years from now, the dismal alternatives may be these: an institutionalized police state along Salazar lines or a bloody insurrection with Red overtones. Before that happens, however, the colonels might yet be turned out by a strong stand against them from Washington—a prospect, even though unlikely, worthy of discussion in a later column.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 23,
1969]

U.S. ACTION AGAINST GREEK JUNTA IS PREVENTED BY MILITARY NEEDS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

ATHENS.—The growing need by U.S. foreign policy for a tough stand against the Greek military dictatorship to avert ultimate political tragedy here is being undermined by

the Pentagon's military requirements in the eastern Mediterranean.

Indeed, Greece poses a critical dilemma in American foreign policy. A return to Greek democracy may well depend upon U.S. repudiation of the colonels and halting all military aid. But such action conceivably could deprive the U.S., in the short run at least, of naval bases and communications guidance for the 6th Fleet and Polaris submarines vital to the nuclear deterrent.

Those military considerations prevent sharp U.S. action against the junta. But the long-run cost could be immense. At worst, perpetuated dictatorship here could trigger a popular insurrection led by the Communists. At best, U.S. permissiveness toward the military regime already is building intense anti-American sentiment which will surface in any regime that replaces the colonels without Washington's help. Thus, the long-range U.S. military position in the eastern Mediterranean is becoming dependent on permanent tyranny in Athens.

Even though military needs inhibit American diplomats, relations between the Greek government and the U.S. Embassy here—so intimate for 20 years—are icy. The junta deeply resents the absence of an American ambassador since January. U.S. diplomats do not hide their displeasure with the colonels' aim of institutionalized dictatorship.

But whatever impact this official American fridity might have is counteracted by the U.S. Military Advisory Group here whose commander, Maj. Gen. Samuel Eaton and his subordinate officers have exercised little discretion in telling their Greek counterparts how they oppose the Embassy's fastidiousness about democracy.

Any psychological influence of the vacant Ambassador's chair is obliterated by constant shutting in and out of Athens by U.S. officers assigned to NATO. Their photographs in friendly poses with Col. George Papadopoulos, the Prime Minister, almost daily adorn the controlled Greek newspapers. Most notorious was the reply to a Papadopoulos toast by Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, retiring NATO commander, in which Lemnitzer conveniently omitted phrases about democracy and the rule of law while quoting from the NATO Treaty's preamble.

The same impression was given by President Nixon's shabby treatment of King Constantine, self-exiled in Rome since his bungled counter-coup in December, 1967. A tentative visit with the King during Mr. Nixon's visit to Rome early this year was cancelled after pressure from the junta. Constantine was denied a meeting with the President while in Washington for the Eisenhower funeral (although Brig. Gen. Stylianos Pattakos, the Deputy Prime Minister, had a few minutes with Mr. Nixon).

Moreover, the Greek colonels are expert at disregarding signs of displeasure from Washington. In an interview, Gen. Pattakos told us that the portion of military aid which has remained suspended since the coup of April 21 will be resumed soon. When we asked the basis for this forecast, Pattakos replied with a statement that simply is untrue: "President Nixon has promised it."

In fact, Pattakos's triumphant account of his Washington visit was so removed from reality that the State Department on April 24 issued a sharp statement indicating Pattakos had been urged to restore representative government and civil liberties. When we asked about that statement, Pattakos told us it did not represent the U.S. Government's position. Then who wrote it? "Some Communist," he snapped.

Summing up, a conservative Greek politician says. "Everybody I know thinks the American Government participated in the coup." Old-line politicians such as former Prime Minister Panagiotis Canellopoulos argue with friends that Washington cannot be blamed. But among the younger genera-

tion and particularly students, anti-American feeling is rising steadily in a land where once it was almost unknown.

Nevertheless, the United States might yet put itself on the side of democracy. The three elements whose maneuvering degraded Greek political life before the coup—the King and the two major political parties—are belatedly cooperating and ready to form an interim unity government.

Tentatively, King Constantine would return as rallying point for all Greeks with the government headed by conservative Constantine Karamanlis, who provided stability during eight years as Prime Minister and is now exiled in Paris. But neither the King nor more important, Karamanlis will return to Athens without Washington's repudiation of the junta.

Few realistic Greeks, however, believe the Nixon Administration will move decisively against the colonels. That accounts for skepticism among gloomy Greek democrats that the dictatorship can be terminated peacefully. Worse yet, they feel preoccupation with naval bases is wedding the United States to the fate of the colonels, be it a generation of tyranny or their violent overthrow and the dangerous days that would lie beyond.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
June 19, 1969]

NATO DOUBT: IS IRON FIST IN GREECE WEAKENING RELATIONSHIP WITH ATLANTIC ALLIANCE?

NICOSIA, CYPRUS.—The demoralization of Greece's officer corps and civil service by the authoritarian rule of Prime Minister George Papadopoulos has seriously affected Greece's role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It also has made it more difficult for Western European governments to supply Greece with defense equipment which NATO leaders believe Athens needs to fulfill its NATO obligations in the Mediterranean.

These are conclusions of authoritative, non-Communist and pro-Western Greek opponents of the Papadopoulos regime. They have managed to supply detailed evidence to newsmen of other countries inside and outside Greece.

The resulting picture is bleak: the Greek military establishment, government bureaucracy, and diplomatic service are reported thoroughly terrorized and weakened by the former colonels now ruling in Athens.

CORRUPTION CHARGED

Mr. Papadopoulos and his associates seized power April 21, 1967. They used a secret NATO plan reserved for the emergency of a Communist uprising. They said they were saving Greece from communism and strengthening its ties with NATO. They also pledged they would end favoritism, nepotism, and corruption.

Instead, their pro-NATO opponents charge, they have ruined Greece's reputation in the West and its effectiveness in NATO. Corruption, nepotism, and the other abuses they vowed to abolish now flourish, these opponents say, in their own power group.

On May 5, antigovernment tracts reached foreign correspondents in Athens. They were signed, "General Akritas, chief of the national resistance movement." Akritas is a legendary pseudonym of the sort politically minded Greeks love.

The tract called on Greek officers to "separate yourselves from power-hungry colleagues." It added, "the Greek people have begun to feel hate for the Greek uniform because of the same ambitious, small-time dictators."

Meanwhile, during May courts-martial tried scores of persons for subversive activities.

Earlier this month Mr. Papadopoulos told a news conference that 15 retired officers had

been arrested in connection with an abortive plot to overthrow his regime.

Greek opponents of the Papadopoulos regime say that it is completely false to call the regime, as Western news media frequently do, "Army backed." They say that it seized power in April, 1967, through a ruse which deceived King Constantine and the Army's highest staff officers.

They were led to believe that a Communist take-over attempt was imminent. But the junta never produced a scrap of real evidence to support this. The King and the armed forces were tricked into opening and activating sealed orders for "Operation Prometheus," a NATO plan designed to counter such an emergency.

Purges have eliminated all but two of about 40 senior officers who functioned before the coup of 1967. These two are the regent, Gen. George Zoiakakis, who was assigned the King's ceremonial functions after the King's flight, and Gen. Odysseus Anghelias, chief of the defense general staff.

A number of high-ranking officers out of favor were sent to remote frontier garrisons or obscure posts. In each of these, as in every Greek embassy or mission abroad, there is an officer of KYP, the Greek Central Intelligence Agency.

Following the Soviet model, he often holds junior rank but is always the most powerful. Those of higher, equal, and lower rank flatter him and go to him for favors. "This completely disrupts the Army's traditional hierarchy and destroys morale," says one Greek close to the Army. "Greeks cannot bear to take orders from lower-rank people."

By contrast, those who cooperate with the junta are richly rewarded.

CIVILIAN POSTS TAKEN

Fifteen officers last year followed the example of Mr. Papadopoulos, Deputy Prime Minister Stylianos Patakos, and Coordination Minister Nicholas Makarezos. They ostentatiously resigned from the Army. Two of these were Mr. Papadopoulos brothers, Constantine and Haramboulos.

These 15 and hundreds of others who have served the junta have become general secretaries of ministries; heads of government committees; chairmen of the broad of public companies; the directors of athletic teams, theaters, and the opera.

Both their income and their influence have increased far beyond what they were as officers. Constantine Papadopoulos was named general secretary of the Prime Ministry. His brother Haramboulos became general director of the Prime Minister's political office.

Their salaries and fringe benefits are many times their former military pay.

Politics always have existed in the Greek Army, a well-known Greek historian points out. But they always were factional. They never concentrated around one leader or center of power. Posts were not distributed for nonmilitary reasons or as political plums.

JOSEPH P. McCAFFREY—25 YEARS OF RESPONSIBLE SERVICE

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Joe McCaffrey this month is observing his 25th year as a Washington news commentator, and I am proud to associate myself with his many friends in congratulating him on his important, honest, and dedicated service in the public interest.

There is no other newsmen in Wash-

ington, to my knowledge, who reports news more accurately, precisely and factually than does Joe McCaffrey. We in the Congress are particularly fortunate that Joe has made the daily activities of the Congress his broadcasting specialty. His daily reports have been called the "Congressional Record of the Air." Joe himself has been called "the Voice of the Congress." Both titles are truly justified.

It is not easy for the public to always understand the intricacies of complex congressional action, and unless a knowledgeable, objective commentator undertakes to interpret Congress to the listening public, a great deal of misinformation is sent along the air waves.

Joe McCaffrey is an eminently responsible and enormously able reporter and commentator. His broadcasts reflect the highest standards of excellence and he is listened to with confidence.

I have known Joe personally for many years and value his friendship. He is a warm, kindly, sincere person, and his friendships never stand in the way of his first duty—to report the news fairly and accurately.

His record is a worthy example of the best in broadcasting to all the members of his profession, and I hope that Joe will continue to be the "Voice of the Congress" for many, many years to come.

THE MISSION OF MANPOWER POLICY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Prof. E. White Bakke, sterling professor of economics at Yale University, has a long and distinguished career as a labor economist and analyst of labor market problems. In a recent publication of the Upjohn Institute entitled "The Mission of Manpower Policy," Professor Bakke demonstrates the breadth of his perspective in addressing the question of what elements must be included in a truly comprehensive manpower policy.

Because Dr. Bakke takes an unusually cosmopolitan view of what such a national manpower policy should include, and because this Upjohn Institute bulletin raises a number of problems in relation to such a manpower policy which other critics have too often neglected, I rise today to call his remarks to your attention. The excerpts I am introducing here include Professor Bakke's definition of the mission of a positive manpower policy and his summary of what the distribution of responsibilities and tasks in such a national manpower policy should be:

EXCERPT FROM "THE MISSION OF MANPOWER POLICY"

VII. THE MISSION OF A POSITIVE MANPOWER POLICY

Government manpower policymakers and administrators need to have a clear concept

of the mission for which they are responsible if they are to answer adequately these questions: How are we doing? Where do we go from here? How do we get there? The conclusion implicit in the preceding discussion is that the *de facto* concepts of mission emerging from the action programs labeled "manpower" in the United States is too narrow to provide a satisfactory criterion for answering the second and third questions, and is useful in answering the first question only to the extent that achievement is measured by the degree of effectiveness in doing what we are doing rather than in doing what we could be, or ought to be, doing. The "manpower" programs launched in this decade to increase the employability and employment of those who have been left out, kept out, or left behind in the system of self-support through gainful employment mark a major milestone in the recognition and acceptance by government of its responsibility to equalize for the unsuccessful few the opportunities for a secure and meaningful working life enjoyed and satisfactorily exploited by the many. In principle and purpose those efforts represent the most significant advance, since the introduction of social insurance, in the alleviation of the causes of poverty and in remedial public service to those who are the victims of the hazards to continuous and secure employment.

But even a maximum fulfillment of that mission does not exhaust the potential benefits of a positive manpower policy to the nation and all of its citizens who work for a living or desire to do so. The narrow mission does not suggest the operational field which needs to be cultivated and the whole set of essential functions that need to be performed if those potential benefits are to be realized. It might be compared to confining the mission of a conservation and water policy for a valley to draining the swamps. Important and necessary as that is, it is only a part of the task.

The definition of the whole is a precarious task. The twin dangers are that the boundaries for action suggested or set by the definition may be too limited or they may be too comprehensive. If too limited, the potential of the action for service to the individual and the nation is unnecessarily restricted. If too comprehensive, the focus for action is confusing and not operationally meaningful.

Nevertheless, since policy implies and requires a purpose, there have been much interest, concern, and discussion about manpower objectives among political, social, and economic leaders, among government officials, and among social scientists. A consideration of their published thoughts on the subject indicates a focus on several questions, the answers to all of which are important in providing clues to a necessary and appropriate mission for manpower policy. Among these questions are:

1. What target group or groups should be served and how?
2. What basic human values are to be served?
3. To what societal problems can manpower programs contribute complete or partial solutions?
4. What is the necessary and appropriate operational field for manpower policy?
5. What specific functions in the cultivation of that field are essentially and appropriately assigned primarily to manpower authorities?

Concern with the answers to each and every one of these questions provides an orientation essential to the development of the concept of the mission of a sound and workable comprehensive manpower policy. Disassociated from the answers to all the questions the answer to any one question furnishes an inadequate clue to that con-

cept. In my judgment, however, the answers to all the questions follow and are dependent upon the determination of the boundaries and action focus of the *operational field*. In other words, a definition of manpower policy mission by reference to its essential and appropriate operational field provides the clue for an integration of the aspects of that mission whether stated in terms of target groups, support for basic human values, contribution to the solution of basic societal problems, or functions assigned appropriately to manpower authorities.

A brief consideration of these several approaches to the definition of the mission of manpower policy will indicate the reason for this judgment.

Target group mission

Sufficient attention has been given to the consequences, both positive and negative of the approach indicated in the first question, that is, definition by reference to target groups. This is the approach which has characterized the development of the concept of manpower mission in the United States, both in the explicit declaration by manpower authorities and in the implicit assumptions revealed in action taken. It is an obvious requirement of a practicable concept of mission that there should be a definite answer to the question, "Mission to whom?" If the answer to that question is to be integrated with answers which I would suggest are appropriate to the other questions, however, the "whom" will necessarily have to be defined more broadly than the disadvantaged unemployed at or on the borders of poverty and the residents of urban slums or impoverished rural areas.

The alternatives range from the inclusion of the total actual or potential labor force to limitation to specific groups in the labor force expressly disadvantaged in the matter of finding and holding jobs. There is, in my judgment, no basis other than political expediency for defining those eligible as clients of manpower services in terms narrower than the following: All citizens or permanent residents of whatever income level, educational achievement, skill status, occupation or profession, age, race, creed, sex, marital status, or employment experience (employed or unemployed) who have employment potential which is not being used, which is being inadequately used, which may not be used (i.e., become redundant) in the future, which can be used to achieve balance and growth in the economy, or which is being used in ways not consistent with legally established standards of economic or social justice.¹

Consideration of how such a comprehensive clientele is to be served by government sponsored or supported manpower programs raises a related question. What organization premises as to program orientation will lead to the most effective and nonduplicating set of services and institutional facilities? The chief alternatives are an orientation toward client categories, e.g., youth, dropouts, disabled, aged, nonwhite, selective service rejectees, Indians, parolees, the urban or rural poor, hard-core unemployed, higher talent personnel, etc.; or an orientation toward functions and institutional facilities, e.g., planning; monitoring; counseling; placement; training; giving work experience; providing movement, education, and training allowances and grants; job creation; research; information; etc.

¹ Professor Fred Harbison's definition of the appropriate target group is similar to this: "In the broadest terms, manpower policy should be concerned with the development, maintenance, and utilization of actual or potential members of the labor force, including those who are fully and productively employed as well as those who experience difficulties in getting work."

The present policy and programs emphasize orientation toward client categories, in part because this is the way in which appeal could be made to the political instincts of legislators. The major shortcomings of this orientation are that overlapping among programs is inevitable, that different standards for the same functional services and institutional facilities are established for different client groups, and especially that the definition of the task to be carried out is influenced by the total life problem (not just employment problems) faced by any specific group. This makes the setting up of orderly guidelines as to the objectives and operations of an employment-system-oriented manpower program difficult.

The advantages of defining the manpower policy mission by reference to client groups to be served are that it keeps attention focused on facilitating a humanly equitable employment experience for disadvantaged individuals, and that it provides a ready and politically attractive reason for legislative action. The disadvantages are that it may prevent the focusing of attention on anything else, and that some such client groups are peculiarly subject to definition by reference to the political payoff for legislative attention to their needs.

Support for basic human values mission

At the other end of the spectrum from the concept of limited mission implicit in existing American manpower programs are concepts of the manpower mission which are nearly as unspecific and comprehensive as "providing the greatest happiness to the greatest number."

To make democracy a reality, not a dream; to promote social welfare; to implement the right of every American to a livelihood possible in an affluent society; to humanize the life of the forgotten among us; to establish justice as a foundation for law and order; to bring a sense of human dignity to those who have lost it or have never experienced it; to bring all citizens into the mainstream of American life and work; to share equally the costs of technological change; to achieve fuller and more productive and humanly satisfying utilization of human resources; to enable every American to realize his full potential and to utilize it fully in his own and the nation's interest; to achieve a full realization of human aspirations—these are some of the phrases which have expressed such global concepts of the mission of manpower policy.

Walter Reuther has provided one such wide-ranging definition, and an appealing one:

"When we speak of manpower policy, we generally think first of full employment—how to create it, how to maintain it. But the proper goals of manpower policy go far beyond assurance of a job for everyone willing and able to work. The job must provide a useful and rewarding outlet for the worker's highest capacities. The work environment must promote dignity and self-respect. The work must offer opportunity for development and advancement. The job must pay a decent wage and insure the maintenance of income when the worker is unable, or denied the opportunity, to continue at work.

"All this, however is still only part of the story. Manpower policy is, or at least should be, concerned with the nature of work and the elimination of its discontents; with the preparation of human beings for creative and constructive activities and for the enjoyment of leisure; with swift and painless transition from one job to another in an economy in which advancing technology is constantly changing the educational and skill requirements for work and the occupational, industrial, and geographical distribution of employment opportunities. Manpower policy must also be concerned with

the disadvantaged individual and the disadvantaged community—with breaking down the barriers of prejudice, with provision of opportunities for the handicapped, with preventive as well as therapeutic medicine for personal or area distress.

"Most of all, however, manpower policy should aim at making obsolete such words and phrases as 'manpower' and 'labor market,' for our central concern must increasingly be with the worker as a human being rather than as an instrument of production. For example, the major purpose of education and training must not be simply to produce more effective human tools for the use of employers but, rather, more effective human beings for participation in, and for enjoyment of, all aspects of living."

Arthur M. Ross, when he was Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, pointed to the emerging of this kind of an idealistic concept of the goal of manpower policy:

"Up to now, 'full employment' has been the most general statement of our national objective. There is considerable evidence, however, that a more ambitious and challenging goal, which might be called 'full realization of human potential' is emerging.

"Thematic statements of this type represents the ideal which is sought, not the reality which is achieved. We have almost never enjoyed full employment except in periods of war. Yet, the existence of the commitment has certainly made a difference. . . .

"The goal is to give all Americans [who are out of it] the opportunity to move into the mainstream of national life [or working life].

"Thus, a new view of the manpower goal, which concentrates on human aspirations and possibilities, as well as accumulated skills and jobseeking endeavors, is emerging. Up to now, labor-market policies (as well as labor-force statistics) have concentrated on the quantity of jobs. One hour's work—no matter what kind of work and what kind of pay—classifies an individual as employed. But jobs have not only a quantity but also a quality; they vary in capacity to contribute to the output of goods and services, to yield a decent income, and to satisfy other legitimate human aspirations.

"Recent policy declarations state that rewarding, self-respecting, and self-fulfilling employment, not merely something which qualifies statistically as a job should be the birthright of every American. . . .

"The emerging restatement of the manpower objective involves a radical concept of equal opportunity which might be called economic universalism. We are in the course of resolving that the illiterate farmhands and casual laborers in the back country and small towns of the South, the subsistence farmers and ex-coalminers of Appalachia, the inmates of the slums and ghettos of the North, and the pauperized Indians of the Southwest will all be provided with sufficient motivation, discipline, education, and training to join the parade on the broad highway of economic progress."

There are those who scoff at such idealistic goals for manpower policy, labeling them "pure rhetoric." It is a mistake to do so, for they provide a qualitative humane dimension to the goal of activity, an essential dimension when that activity is a service carried on both for and by human beings. Although such goals provide few guidelines for functional specifications, they do remind us that any action taken comes eventually into sharp focus on the life problems failures and successes, frustrations and aspirations of real human beings. Such goals reassert what can easily be forgotten, namely, that these human beings accept and support popular government with a willingness premised on their expectancy that the ultimate purpose of government is to promote and

make secure *their* general welfare. They offer a challenge to any tendency to plan and operate programs as though the beneficiaries were merely resources for a productive and profitable enterprise, or numbers on a roster, or the inputs in a computerized accounting system. They announce alike to beneficiaries and administrators that man does not live by bread alone; and they stress not only the importance of what is done, but also the spirit and the climate of compassion and mutual respect in which it is done. Such goals also give meaning and significance to the efforts of those who direct and administer the projects. Bureaucrats do not live by rules and statistics alone. Moreover, while it is difficult to translate such ideal statements into programs of action, the process of invention of projects will be stimulated by a contemplation of the significance of such ambitious goals for the next steps to be taken.

But concern for the shaping of policy and practice which is consistent with progress toward realizing such common values does not distinguish those engaged in manpower tasks from those engaged in other fields of private and public activity. Manpower programs have no monopoly on making contributions to the achievement of such goals. A commitment to bringing out into life the ideal values of western democracy is an essential but not a unique feature of manpower programs. The programs of public health agencies, community development commissions, religious institutions, schools and colleges, charitable organizations, the conservation service, civil rights commissions, and public assistance agencies hopefully serve the same end of supporting basic human values.

Activities in all such institutional areas must, however, be geared operationally, not only to such ultimate objectives, the most of which are the same for all of them, but also to a specific mission which provides a direction for, and a standard for, testing the specific policies and programs in their particular area of involvement, and a guide to the appropriateness of the kind of activities in which the particular agency should be engaged.

Contribution to the solution of societal problems mission

A somewhat similar generalization is applicable to the concept of the mission of manpower policy as that of helping to stabilize and strengthen the economy and the political system. The spelling out of desirable specific characteristics of a sound economy is, however, a bit more suggestive of the particular functions required of manpower programs if they are intended to make a major contribution to full employment or low aggregate unemployment; reasonable price stability; increased productivity; a satisfactory rate of economic growth; the economic security of workers and their families; the full exploitation of the opportunities presented by technological change; the uncovering of ways to develop and use, rather than squander, our vast wealth of human resources; the avoidance of urban or rural decay; and the improvement of the chances for societal peace and harmony.

These goals do imply specific functions of collaboration for manpower authorities, but success or failure in their fulfillment is the shared responsibility of so many agencies and the consequence of so many variables outside the control of manpower authorities that such goals do not define a mission with respect to the carrying out of which the manpower authorities can be independently evaluated.

Because, however, the resources and operations of the labor market are factors so clearly related to such objectives, the collaborative relationship of manpower authorities with the others contributing to the attainment of such goals provides essential

ingredients in the mission which is appropriate for those authorities. In activities which involve so many partners, it still remains necessary to determine what, in the whole set of tasks essential for moving toward such goals, is the specific task of manpower policy and practice.

Operational field mission

No operational concept of the mission and responsibilities of private or public policy and of the agencies charged with formulating and implementing it can be clearly stated until we define the nature and boundaries of the operational field within which, and with respect to the peculiar and characteristic problems of which, the contemplated action is to take place. Once that is done, the functions essential to dealing with these problems (that is, the policy in action) can be outlined; the ideal values to which the action is especially to be, or ought to be, oriented can be chosen; the reciprocal cooperative or competitive relationship of action in this operational field to the action in other operational fields can be determined; the targets of action in terms of persons and institutions can be visualized; the appropriateness of choices among alternative approaches such as authoritative direction, technical assistance, financial assistance (and in what form), advice, inspiration and stimulus, regulation and control, or other forms of participative relationship can be assessed; the balance between preventive and remedial action most likely to solve the problems presented can be calculated; and an appropriate organizational and administrative system can be devised.

Consider the definitive character of the operational field, and consequently of the mission, of the following public agencies when compared with that of the manpower authorities: Federal Reserve Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Labor Relations Board, Public Health Service, Judiciary, and Bureau of Indian Affairs. Their mission has evolved over time, but the comparative definiteness of their respective operational fields has provided a framework which has kept the mission both within bounds and comprehensive enough to deal with the most critical of the problems relevant to the fields. There have been debates over the choice of values to be served. There have been border jurisdictional skirmishes with other agencies on the frontiers of their operational fields as well as rationally worked out collaboration and division of labor. There have been disputes over what groups of persons and what institutions should be the target of what kinds of action. There have been challenges that their functions were inadequately designed and, in some cases, inappropriate for the particular agency. But the understanding of the nature, problems, and boundaries of their operational fields has provided a catalytic element inducing a resolution of differences.

Now if we are going to be satisfied to accept the operational field of manpower policy in the United States as the life conditions and resources of the disadvantaged unemployed, the limited mission to increase the employability and employment of that group makes good sense. That definition provides a touchstone by reference to which target groups and institutions can be chosen. It brings into the center of attention and concern the human values which must be, and can be, supported. It gives a clue to the kinds of functions that are relevant to the problems of people in that operational field. A major weakness with respect to the organization and the carrying out of those functions is that many of them are so similar to, or identical with, the functions of those whose operational field is the world of poverty that border disputes are difficult to resolve.

The chief weakness of that definition of the operational field, however, is that its boundaries do not enclose a territory providing operational room for a policy and program serving the ends which manpower policy and program can potentially serve. If the scope of a manpower policy and program for the United States is not to be exclusively directed toward increasing the employability and employment of the disadvantaged, the boundaries named above do not mark out an adequate operational field. Nor are the derived concepts of mission, placing upon manpower authorities the opportunity and responsibility to support human values and to contribute to the solution of large economic and political problems, sufficiently focused to provide the clues to the distinctive operational field appropriate for those carrying out a manpower mission of broader scope.

How can we define the focus and boundaries of the operational field of a comprehensive manpower policy and action by reference to which the several aspects of its mission can be determined?

What's in a name?

The original term used to describe the operational field for this postwar development in specifically assigned public responsibility was "the labor market," and the relevant policy was referred to as "an active labor market policy." The mission was described as "bringing into short- and long-range balance the supply of, and demand for, labor to achieve full employment with price stability and to promote national and personal economic stability and growth." The logical sequence from the concept of operational field to that of mission originated with labor-movement economists in Sweden and was promoted with some amplification, but with no essential change in focus, generally, and particularly in Western Europe, by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

The decision to change the name of the policy from "labor market" to "manpower" was made by OECD in 1963. I was very conscious of that change, for I had been invited to deliver the orientation paper for the OECD conference of trade union leaders in Vienna on "An Active Labor Market Policy." I had prepared the paper, making extensive use of the term "labor market." Just before my departure, I received a communication from OECD that the term had been changed to "manpower." It became clear in the conference discussions that a major reason for the change was a concession to trade union objections to the impersonal, inhuman, and "commodity" concept of labor implicit in the original terminology.²

But it was also clear that the change in name was not meant to connote a change in the nature, scope, and mission of the efforts formerly considered to be relevant to the im-

plementation of "labor market policy." The terms were used interchangeably throughout the conference, and the Swedes still use "labor market policy" in discussions among themselves and "manpower policy" in discussions with foreigners. There is no difference in substance. And once it becomes clear, from that substance, that the human interests and needs of people as well as the economic and political interests and needs of the nation are to be served by the policy and practice involved, any sense of conflicts is removed. It can be assumed that as long as the scope and focus of the activities which implement a policy are meeting a felt need, the name of the policy is of secondary importance. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

It is not likely that the current *de facto* concept of the operational field for American policy as "the employment and life conditions of the disadvantaged unemployed," with the emphasis on direct services to persons, particularly disadvantaged persons, grows solely from the spelling out of the most obvious connotation of the label "manpower." But that word does suggest the primary emphasis on the *supply* of labor, and is not inconsistent with concern about the least employable persons constituting that supply. The word does not, however, automatically call to mind the full extent and mission of an active labor market policy and program.

I do not wish to engage in a debate whose issues are semantic. But in setting forth the concept of mission for "manpower" policy, which in my judgment provides both adequate scope and sufficient and practical operational focus for such a policy, I am going to use the term "employment policy" as more descriptive of what I have in mind than either "manpower policy" or "labor market policy."

The operational field for a more comprehensive "employment policy" is the *system and process of particularized employment* in each locality and in the nation as a whole. The adjective "particularized" is used to distinguish this policy from that which has sometimes also been referred to as "employment policy"; namely, the policy of utilizing monetary and fiscal measures to expand or contract aggregate consumer demand and industrial and business investment and activity, resulting in the derived demand for labor. The projected results of this latter policy are relevant, not simply to producing either aggregate or particularized employment but to the operation of all processes of the economy, including profitmaking, investment, government revenue and expenditures, foreign trade, and maintaining the soundness of the dollar. It is therefore properly labeled "economic policy."

The system and process of particularized employment are as important foundations for the social, economic, and political health and growth of the nation as the systems and processes of communication; transportation; banking; intrastate, interstate, and foreign commerce; industrial production; education; conservation; public health; defense and public order; taxation; wealth and income distribution; collective bargaining; religious faith and practice; the creation and support of ethical and cultural values; the administration of legal justice; political representation; and public assistance and relief. If that system of particularized employment is effectively and efficiently ordered and managed, the efforts within all of those other operational fields are likewise more effective and efficient, for its impact on what can be done in these other areas is great. The adequacy and quality of the economic, political, and social products in those fields are dependent on the quantity and quality of the particularized employment relationships organized to carry on that work. The goods and

services produced by those employment relationships are the foundation not only for the economic strength of the nation, but also for the plane of living available to the people. The income from those relationships determines the degree of access of individuals and families to those goods and services. In a culture in which self-support through work is a dominant value, the opportunity and security provided by particularized employment are an essential basis for the experience and realization of self-respect and human dignity. Moreover, performance in that system of employment is a major ingredient in the criteria by which individuals are judged, and therefore their social status among their fellows.

The expectancy that government will promote and undergird the general welfare leads it to meet that expectancy and to discharge the implied responsibilities by setting up agencies to cultivate and bring order and effectiveness into the operational fields of such systems and processes as communication; transportation; banking; intrastate, interstate, and foreign commerce; defense and public order; etc. It is equally important that the system of particularized employment relationships receive the same attention. That importance is increased by the obvious fact that policy in this operational field serves not only economic goals, but political and social and individual human goals as well.

A comprehensive manpower policy

Government policy and practice in this field is therefore highly significant in the promotion and sustaining of the general welfare. And because the operational field is defined as "the system and process of particularized employment," it has focus and recognizable frontiers. Stated in the most general terms, therefore, the mission of the government *employment policy* is to promote and sustain the general welfare insofar as that general welfare is dependent on the system and process of particularized employment.³

More specifically, the mission of employment (manpower) policy within this operational field is:

1. To facilitate and expedite particularized employment which is maximally productive, economically rewarding and dependable for workers and employers, individual and national growth-stimulating, and freely chosen, by:

- a. Developing employability in particular people—employed, unemployed, underemployed, and nonemployed.

- b. Creating, enlarging, and increasing the productivity of, and opportunities for, employment wherever and whenever these are inadequate to provide jobs for those desiring to work.

- c. Providing or stimulating local and national labor market facilities and services and arrangements to bring available workers and available jobs together expeditiously.

2. To undergird the effectiveness of the above processes through:

- a. Anticipating and initiating preventatives of, and correctives for, both shortages and surpluses of labor in both the short and the long run.

³ Among the students of manpower policy and practice there are a number whose definitions of objectives suggest this emphasis on the system of particularized employment as the operational field for policy. The definition of Professor Charles A. Myers, for example, is of this sort. "The central task of manpower policy is to facilitate the *employment process* [emphasis supplied], and in these times to assist in the achievement of full employment with reasonably stable prices . . . the end result is the productive employment of people."

² This was not the case with the Swedish Trade Unionists; the term "labor market" is still employed in Sweden. There have begun to appear in Swedish reports, however, signs that they are sensitive to the overtones of the term. In recent official statements and in explanations by public officials of an "active labor market policy" occur such statements as the following:

Labour market policy not only has the task of balancing economic changes, dependent on the labour market situation. It also plays an important part in facilitating structural changes. Besides this, it is subordinated to social and humanitarian considerations, which as a matter of fact were its primary task.

Obviously, to attain balance on the labour market is not the only aim of labour market policy. Its first aim is to assist individuals to find the kind of work which gives them economic and personal satisfaction.

b. Making more effective the public institutions which provide services immediately related to the processes named in (1) above, with respect to their organization, administration, and personnel; and stimulating such action in relative private institutions.

c. Strengthening the institutions and processes which are basic to the general development of employability, to the creation of employment opportunities, and to matching the two, but which have broader societal functions as well.

d. Contributing to the formulation and implementation of broad social welfare and economic policies which affect, and are affected by, the carrying out of the mission of employment policy authorities and by the system and process of particularized employment.

3. To supply resources for mission aspects (1) and (2) above by:

a. Conceptualization and the gaining of a working acceptance of the comprehensive and basic mission of employment policy and functions.

b. Continuous monitoring and evaluation of the performance of public and private agencies engaged in the three basic processes for facilitating and expediting particularized employment. (See [1] above.)

c. Periodic reports to the President, Congress, and the public concerning: (1) purpose, (2) problems, (3) program status and progress, and (4) situation and trends with the adequacy of public and private facilities relevant to fulfilling the mission of employment policy.

d. Research: its distribution and application related to basic and operational problems faced, both current and anticipatory

e. Direct operation and/or funding of mechanisms for accomplishing the mission of employment policy supplementary to or supportive of those provided in the private sector.

f. Economic support for individuals and firms appropriately assisted by employment policy programs, including allowances to encourage movement of workers to jobs and jobs to workers.

g. Financial support to institutions and organizations engaged in the development of employability and in the creation of employment opportunities.

h. Technical assistance and advice to such institutions and organizations.

i. Collaboration with other public and private agencies and organizations whose efforts also contribute to strengthen the system and process of particularized employment.

j. Identification of changing needs and the initiation and development of strategic activities and programs to meet these needs.

The integrating focus: Economic or social welfare?

By naming the policy here under discussion as "employment policy," by delineating its operational field as "the system and processes of particularized employment," and by defining its mission as "facilitating and expediting particularized employment which is maximally productive, economically rewarding and dependable, individual and national growth-stimulating, and freely chosen," one opens himself to the charge that this approach neglects the human and social aspects of that mission and concentrates dominant attention upon its economic aspects.⁴ The charge is superficial. It assumes a dichotomy

⁴ That charge has been made concerning my discussion of the premises of manpower policy in an earlier book, entitled *A Positive Labor Market Policy* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963), Chapters I and XI of that book contain an answer to the charge.

between economic and social welfare which in fact does not exist. The emphasis on particularized employment is made in order to give focus and organizational integration to an economic effort, the success of which is a *sine qua non* in the achievement not only of economic well-being but of human and social welfare as well.

Individuals cannot satisfy their total human needs and aspirations, and government cannot provide effective support for that achievement in the absence of rewarding, dependable, secure, and productive gainful employment. Arranging and managing the factors and processes which make that possible are chiefly economic problems. Nevertheless, because the process involves building and maintaining a relationship between human beings, an impact on the success or failure of the effort is made by every human quality, interest, predisposition, and condition of life of both employees and employers. The development of employability in people contributes to the satisfaction of their total human needs and aspirations only if that employability is useful to themselves and others, and if they can find employment in a healthy economy. That employment will be offered only if their work is considered economically advantageous to profitseeking employers, or if it is considered to supply services which can be paid for within the budget restraints of nonprofit institutions, or if it is considered by taxpayers to be work which provides products and services for which they are willing to pay by the very economic process of taxation.

This does not mean that employment serves only economic ends for workers, or employers, or the public. Its doing and its rewards are important ingredients in the cement which stabilizes family and community relationships; lack of employment and inadequate rewards therefrom undermine those relationships. Experiences in gainful work develop qualities of character and moral action important to the stability of organized society. The degree of adequacy of the opportunities provided by the system and process of particularized employment is a basic determinant of the degree of experienced justice, which in turn has its impact on the commitment of people to the support of the economic, political, and social system within which they live and work.

Nor can the exclusive economic character of employment be supported by evidence that the motivation for either public or private employers is, or needs to be, solely economic. It never has been. Private and government employers have been known to use their power to create and fill jobs to help disadvantaged and unfortunate people out of trouble, to answer the urgings of moral and religious conscience, and even to provide favors to friends when mere economic efficiency motives would have suggested another course.

The fact that the system of particularized employment is one of the most essential foundations upon which the achievement of values important to human beings is based, is as obvious as the fact that other essential foundations are the systems of public health, education, communication, transportation, industrial production and distribution, legal justice, political representation, conservation and development of natural resources, money and credit, and public assistance. But the focus of effort, the functional specifications, and the integration of required activities to build and maintain these foundations are not supplied, for those charged with responsibility in these areas, by the proclamation of their social welfare relevance. The soundness of policy and practice of agencies in some of these areas (e.g., agencies in the areas of public health, education,

political representation, and public assistance) is continuously tested by whether or not such agencies make a contribution to social welfare. Manpower agencies are also subject to such testing. The human and social consequences of this relevancy to human and social welfare add significance and urgency to the work of those performing public tasks in these areas. Their concerns are broadened beyond attention to the immediate technical requirements of those tasks. But the organization and direction of their labors lose focus and integration unless the guiding principles of operation are geared to the central and dominant problems relevant to those technical requirements.

For those who plan and direct government efforts to facilitate and expedite the establishment and maintenance of a system of particularized employment which is maximally productive, economically rewarding and dependable, individual and national growth-stimulating, and freely chosen, the technical requirements are produced by the fact that the process of employment is one in which the parties are first of all exchanging what has economic value and by the fact that the exchange can take place in normal circumstances only when the supply of labor offered by one and the demand for labor made by the other are reciprocally advantageous in economic terms.

VIII. DISTRIBUTIONS OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND TASKS

Summary

The government's role in the manpower field is in some respects new but in many respects old. Many of the activities which today are recognized as falling under the manpower umbrella have long been the concern of those chosen to carry on the nation's political affairs. For example, support for vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, land grant colleges, professional education, armed services training, and even for some aspects of general education has long provided government assistance in the development of a qualified labor force. The regulation of immigration has greatly affected the labor supply. Urban and regional development, the direction of government purchases, depressed area renewal, work relief, the encouragement and protection of invention, industrial development, and foreign trade have amplified job openings for portions of that labor force. The Employment Service and the continuous statistical activities related to the operations of the labor market have provided facilities intended to expedite and make more rational the bringing of men and jobs together. This evolution of a multiplicity of activities which have a bearing on manpower problems is one reason for the wide distribution of the responsibility for such activities among many departments and bureaus of the government.

What is new in this decade, in addition to a special effort directed toward the sponsorship of a number of training activities and special efforts for particularly disadvantaged members of the actual and potential labor force, is the effort to develop a concept of a positive manpower policy and to synchronize and integrate the support for, and administration of, the various supply, demand, and labor market facility elements involved in the implementation of that policy.

That effort has not been completely successful. One reason for this is that a workable policy necessarily assumes that the action contemplated is focused on a commonly accepted objective, or at least on a priority relationship among several objectives. That is something we are not clear about.

There are two paramount objectives which have traditionally motivated government ef-

forts in the manpower field. The first is to amplify the economic strength of the nation. The volume, productiveness, and adaptability of the particularized employment relationships in the country provide the national economy with essential resources for economic stability, viability, and growth; and with the ability to meet the tests of national strength raised by war, competition in international trade, and the desires of political leaders and others to boast about the superiority of our economic system.

A second paramount objective traditionally motivating government efforts in the manpower field is to increase the economic and social well-being of the nation's individual people. The volume, productiveness, and adaptability of the particularized employment relationships in the country provide individuals with income to buy a living and give them working roles which are an important factor in determining their status in society.

The effort to achieve each of these objectives is essential to the achievement of the other. Successful efforts to increase the nation's economic strength make firmer the institutional foundation for individual economic and social well-being. Successful efforts to improve the economic and social well-being, and especially the employability, of people provide better human resources contributing to developing national economic strength.

The demands of two wars and the scare thrown into the nation's leaders by Sputnik led to an initial emphasis on the national economic strength objective.

The rapid advances in technology and both the threat and the promise of automation and the need to turn these developments into sources of national strength and growth provided an initial objective for MDTA.

The actual working objective that can be inferred from the way manpower legislation and its administration have developed in the United States in the 1960's is, however, more closely related to providing economic welfare for individual people and, in many ways, to carrying out a major aspect of the war on poverty. Indeed, if one can infer objective from practice, it can be said, I think, that the manpower policy of the 1960's is simply the latest of those policies by which government has acknowledged responsibility for the economic well-being of individual citizens, and in particular those on the bottom rungs of the economic ladder. The idea of what is appropriate and important for government to do in implementing its overall manpower role has been colored very naturally by the idea of what is appropriate and important for government to do in relieving economic distress of certain people.

A positive manpower policy must necessarily be based on objectives. The two paramount and interdependent objectives have been the economic strength of the nation and the economic and social well-being of individual citizens. I am willing to accept the second objective, the one which has come to the fore in our present manpower programs, as highly important at this time. But I am not willing to accept it as the exclusive objective, or even as the paramount objective, of a positive manpower policy and program for the future.

The concentration of attention at the present time on the problems of disadvantaged groups and on the utilization of new so-called "manpower measures," not merely with the objective of improving the employability of the disadvantaged but as a means for income maintenance, is concentration on one laudable and desirable objective of manpower policy. Unless, however, the other objective of manpower policy: namely, to increase the nation's economic strength, stability, and viability, develops a wider and

more comprehensive clientele and operational field for manpower activities, those activities will simply add up to a more sophisticated form of public assistance. In my judgment that is not the end sought by a positive manpower policy and program.

To be more precise, I look forward to a time when the meaning of manpower policy and program will be provided by an emphasis related to achieving national economic strength as well as the economic and social well-being of our disadvantaged citizens in the following ways:

1. Manpower programs will emphasize the development of particularized demand in the form of jobs geared to the characteristics of the available labor supply, as well as the development of employability in individuals.

2. The supply resources and, therefore, the focus of concern will be regarded as *all* potential workers whose productive potential is underutilized, as well as the disadvantaged, be they employed or unemployed.

3. The maximum development and utilization of productive potential will amplify, though not replace, the objective of removing men from the rolls of the unemployed.

4. Labor shortages will receive as thorough remedial attention as labor surpluses.

5. The needs of, and the opportunities provided by, the national labor market will receive attention equal to that given to the needs and opportunities provided by local and state labor markets.

6. The anticipation and prevention of unemployment in particular places, among particular groups, and in particular seasons will receive attention equal to that devoted to the relief of the unemployed.

7. The total overall direction and guidance of, and financial support for, all aspects of the manpower effort will be synchronized by a single agency at the federal level and at the local level.

8. The agency referred to in (7) will be responsible for keeping the public and public officials informed about the current status and anticipated developments related to the factors influencing demand and supply in connection with employment relations supporting all goods and services consumed in the nation, and about the facilities, both private and public, for achieving balance in that supply and demand.

9. The modification and development of programs will be guided by built-in and follow-up evaluation procedures so that the primary reliance for progressive improvement will be empirical experience rather than brainstorming sessions.

10. Every decision with respect to economic and social welfare policies will be made in full collaboration with the manpower agency and after due consideration of the reciprocal impact of the implementation of those policies and of employment (manpower) policy on each other.

A manpower policy which can realize its potential contribution to the economic, social, and political strength of the nation and to the economic and social well-being of all its citizens is an *employment* policy, the operational field of which is the system, processes, and mechanisms of particularized employment and its dual resources of employability in people and opportunities for work. Its objective is a system of full *particularized employment* which is maximally productive, economically rewarding and dependable for workers and employers, national and individual growth-stimulating, and freely chosen. Its clientele is the total labor force now employed, to be employed, unemployed, underemployed, or ineffectively employed, whatever their type and degree of skill, industrial or occupational attachment, or condition of social or economic advantage or disadvantage.

BETTER LEGAL REMEDIES FOR CONSUMERS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1969, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, in cooperation with the American Bar Association Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants, held a seminar on consumer law problems. The participating consumer lawyers, who have been deeply involved in consumer problems over the past several years, discussed, among other topics, Federal legislation to assist the consumer and tasks facing the new National Consumer Law Center in Boston.

Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, spoke to the group about legal remedies available to combat consumer abuses. Her statement, which follows, suggests specific ways or providing consumers with new and improved remedies:

STATEMENT BY MRS. KNAUER

I am pleased to be here today since I understand this Seminar is to plan for action. I am all for that. I believe consumer abuses and possible remedies have been discussed long enough. I read speeches, articles, accounts of meetings a decade ago—or longer—to discuss consumer abuses and I find they are decrying many of the same abuses being discussed here today. It is time for action.

Of course there have been heartening signs of progress. That is why I commend the organizers of this meeting. It is time for those who have been working somewhat independently or concentrating on some specific problem or remedy to come together to assess progress, determine how the work can be better coordinated, and to develop a united plan that will accelerate progress. One of the priorities of my office will be establishment of closer liaisons with Legal Services Programs and the provision of research and other assistance.

I offer my congratulations, too, to the new Consumer Law Center at Boston College Law School under the direction of the very capable Professor William Willier. One of the priorities in the consumer area is research. Sometimes lack of *extensive* research which would prove the consumer's case overwhelmingly has materially slowed progress in securing remedies for abuses known to exist. Lack of research has permitted consumer advocates to be dismissed too often with the charge they are mere "bleeding hearts." Actually, it is a sad commentary that the consumer has been researched from his head to his toe, by the marketers to determine what he will buy, how he can be induced to buy, when he will buy, where he will buy, and so on ad infinitum. But research as to what his *problems are*, the scope and the scale of those problems, and how they can be resolved is still in its infancy.

Also sadly lacking, and I believe a factor which has also slowed the progress of securing remedies for consumer abuses, has been the absence of a source of centralized information to assist lawmakers, educators and others.

Consumer law courses have been yet another deficiency. There has been even the more basic deficiency of text and reference material for use in such courses. Law courses, in the main, have been presented from the

strictly commercial point of view. As a result, the number of lawyers who have developed an awareness of the consumers' problems and have directed their careers to consumer law have been few. Admittedly, the development of more consumer law courses is a long range project. But it is essential to start now. Not only will this be reflected in the private bar within a few years, it will be reflected in those who serve in government, in legislatures, and in the courts.

I believe it is a reasonable statement that the private bar is the sleeping giant in this area. For obvious reasons, the organized bar has for years avoided consumer transactions. The small amount generally in controversy, the difficulties of proof, and the lack of adequate compensation for professional service have relegated the handling of consumer litigation to a very small portion of practicing lawyers. Yet no greater protection for consumers could be provided than an aroused bar, properly motivated. Not only would consumers receive greatly enhanced measures of protection, but the cost of such a program to government at all levels would be slight.

An import step to bring the private bar into the consumer protection picture is proposed in the suggested revision of the Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law. The four keys to greater involvement as suggested in the proposed law are: (1) Minimum damage recoveries; (2) Admonitory damages, such as treble damages; (3) Class action; and (4) Payment of attorneys' fees.

Hopefully, the creation of the new Consumer Law Center will inspire and guide the creation of others throughout the country. It goes without saying that my office will seek to cooperate in every way possible.

Ideally, a nationwide program to resolve consumer problems will reach literally from the consumer's door-step to the State Capitols, to the White House, and the Congress, and to the courts at every level. It will be a working partnership, incorporating the business community, educators, consumers themselves, government at all levels, and the private bar.

There is also an increased role which I believe the National Legal Aid and Defender Association can take. (1) Documentation of the problems, particularly, of course, in the case of the poor consumer. (2) Bring test cases into the courts so that in time we will have established a broadly expanded body of reported case law. For example, three weeks from today the Federal Truth-in-Lending Law becomes effective in this country. In order to dramatize its meaning to consumers and to businessmen, I would like to see representatives of your groups file private suits of behalf of consumers for violations of the Act in our courts pursuant to the statute. I think that such litigation will point up in a way that no other action could that Truth-in-Lending is indeed the law of the land and that it will be enforced as Congress intended. The Federal Truth-in-Lending Law provides for private remedies. Let us use them.

One of the major needs today—and one which this group can play a major role in resolving—is improvement of the grievance and redress procedure for the consumer. A key factor here is a review of the present court system. Debtor's prisons supposedly are a thing of the past—the dim, dark unlightened past. But, imprisonment for debt as a result of the supplementary process procedure in our courts is still possible. That this should be so in America in 1969 is incredible—and intolerable.

We must also improve the small claims courts procedures. We must make wider use of consumer class suits. Given the crowded

condition of court dockets and the realities of the present day market-place, perhaps courts of law are not the most satisfactory forum for settling controversies, and we should explore other possibilities.

We must also review the whole range of Federal and State laws in which the buyer does not, in effect, have equal rights with the seller. The holder-in-due-course doctrine in consumer transactions should be eliminated. As those who have long studied the consumer's problems point out, the risk of dealer fraud now rests squarely with the consumer under the system in which a financing agency can purchase installment notes free of consumer defenses or can assume this position a short time after a contract is signed. The fact that some States have removed holder-in-due-course protection from all installment sales raises a strong question as to the validity of the argument that removal of holder-in-due course protection would put finance companies out of business. Not only are financing agencies quite able to protect themselves by requiring reserve deposits, for example, from sellers of installment paper, but the self-policing that they would initiate would rebound to the benefit of consumers and ethical businessmen alike. Once a finance company knows that it has some responsibility in seeing to it that the goods or services underlying the installment contract are properly furnished, we can confidentially expect that consumer complaints will decrease in volume.

Harsh collection practices should be outlawed, especially the third party contacts. I think it outrageous that a consumer's employer, neighbor, or brother-in-law should be contacted about an alleged debt owed by the consumer. Confessions of judgment in consumer credit transactions, wage assignments, and wage garnishments should be prohibited. So should referral sales. The whole concept of repossession of goods in the consumer field should be reexamined.

Cooling-off periods should be provided in door-to-door sales contracts, so that the housewife who signs the contract in order to get rid of the persistent salesman can have an opportunity to rescind without cost and without cause.

Some of these practices have been restricted in the proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code adopted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and introduced into a number of the 1969 State legislative sessions. We recognize that the Code provides stronger protection for the consumer than now exists in some States. But some States have stronger provisions already on the books. Many provisions of the UCC must be changed for it to become even basically acceptable to consumers. As one example, the Code inexplicably excludes pawnbrokers from its coverage. Yet, pawnbrokers traditionally are the highest rate lenders available, and their clientele are invariably our poorer and disadvantaged citizens. Further, the Code excepts insurance companies selling insurance from its coverage, with the exception of credit insurance. And yet, automobile and fire insurance is surely often sold on credit, and the consumer who buys that service is entitled to protection. We should strive to make the Code a real consumer bill rather than one which is merely better than nothing.

Essential to the improved consumer protection framework which must be built is the establishment of strong consumer affairs offices in every State. Such offices should be adequately financed and adequately armed with basic protection laws, power to conduct investigations, hold hearings, issue subpoenas, and enforce the laws effectively. Such offices should have branches throughout the State, especially in the urban and

rural ghetto areas so they are easily accessible to the poor.

Of course, one of our highest priorities both at the Federal and State level must be attention to the special consumer problems of the poor. There is unmistakable evidence that a factor in the discontent in our cities is frustration with a system which for years has permitted the unscrupulous to take advantage of those least able to pay. These frustrations and the alienation were voluminously documented by the Kerner Report. The present system has permitted laws and institutions designed for the more affluent to work special hardship on the poor and the least sophisticated. We must make the establishment work for the poor, and we must help them overcome their fears of the establishment. Certainly consumer education can help—and must be increased. Urgently needed, too, are nonprofit debt consolidation services and family financial counseling. Perhaps consideration should also be given to some form of Federal grant-in-aid programs to the States to provide this counseling. In this connection, I would urge that commercial debt-pooling practices be reviewed carefully, with a view towards outlawing or, at the least, restricting such practices. We must also devise a means to increase credit options and increase true competition in the ghetto areas so that the poor do not pay more. I stress again, we must improve the grievance and redress system. When we consider the results achieved by the Legal Defense Fund of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People to secure equality and justice for Black Americans, we are convinced that a similar venture to eliminate the oppression of the low income consumer will meet with equal success.

I expect much from this Seminar in terms of concrete proposals which can assist consumers, and I would welcome the presentation of those proposals to my office. I want you to know that you have, in my office, a sympathetic ear and that I intend to be active in the consumer area.

The consumer, especially the poor, has waited long for effective remedies and elimination of abuses. He must soon see results. It is my intention that he will. I know it is yours.

Thank you.

NEW DRUNK DRIVING GUIDELINES

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which I am setting out in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. It updates the District of Columbia law on driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor. A blood alcohol level of 0.10 rather than the present 0.15 would generally be evidence of being under the influence of intoxicating liquor. In addition, it would establish the legal right for an arresting officer to have a blood alcohol or similar test performed on a driver operating a motor vehicle within the District. This is the law in a vast majority of the States.

This type of legislation has been very effective in discouraging drunk driving in other parts of the country and I believe it will be very helpful in the District of Columbia. The bill follows:

H.R. 12317

A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes

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 "Implied Consent Law for the District of Columbia".

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the District or his designated agent.

(2) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(3) The term "license" means any operator's permit or any other license or permit to operate a motor vehicle issued under the laws of the District, including—

(A) any temporary or learner's permit;

(B) the privilege of any person to drive a motor vehicle whether or not such person holds a valid license; and

(C) any nonresident's operating privilege.

(4) The term "nonresident" means every person who is not a resident of the District.

(5) The term "nonresident's operating privilege" means the privilege conferred upon a nonresident by the laws of the District relating to the operation by such person of a motor vehicle, or the use of a vehicle owned by such person, in the District.

(6) The term "police officer" means an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park, or the Capitol Police force, or any other person actually and officially engaged in the performance of police duties in connection with guarding the property of the United States or of the District.

Sec. 3. Any person who operates a motor vehicle within the District shall be deemed to have given his consent, subject to the provisions of this Act, to a chemical test or tests, of his blood, breath, or urine, whichever he may elect, for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content of his blood. The test or tests shall be administered at the direction of a police officer who, having arrested such person for a violation of law, has reasonable grounds to believe the person to have been driving or in actual physical control of a motor vehicle within the District while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

Sec. 4. Only a physician or registered nurse acting at the request of a police officer may withdraw blood for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content thereof. This limitation shall not apply to the taking of a breath or urine specimen. The person tested may, in addition to submitting to the test administered at the direction of a police officer, also submit to a chemical test or tests administered to him by a physician, registered nurse, or other person of his own choosing who is qualified to administer such tests or tests. The failure or inability to obtain an additional test by a person shall not preclude the admission of the test or tests taken at the direction of a police officer. Upon the request of the person who is tested, full information concerning the test or tests taken at the direction of the police officer shall be made available to him.

Sec. 5. Any person who is unconscious, or who is otherwise in a condition rendering him incapable of refusal, shall be deemed not to have withdrawn the consent provided by section 3 of this Act and the test or tests may be given; except, that if such

person thereafter objects to the use of the evidence so secured, such evidence shall not be used and the license of such person shall be revoked, or, if he is a resident without a license, no license shall be issued to him for a period of six months.

Sec. 6. If a person under arrest refuses to submit to chemical testing, he shall be informed that failure to submit to such test will result in the revocation of his license. If such person, after having been so informed, still refuses to submit to chemical testing, no test shall be given, but the Commissioner, upon receipt of a sworn report of the police officer that he had reasonable grounds to believe the arrested person had been driving or was in actual physical control of a motor vehicle upon the public highways while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, and that the person had refused to submit to the test or tests, shall revoke his license for a period of six months; or if the person is a resident without a license to operate a motor vehicle in the District, the Commissioner shall deny to the person the issuance of a license for a period of six months after the date of the alleged violation, subject to review as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 7. (a) Whenever any license has been revoked or denied under the provisions of this Act, the reasons therefor shall be set forth in the order of revocation or denial, as the case may be. Such order shall take effect five days after service of notice on the person whose license is to be revoked or who is to be denied a license, unless such person shall have filed within such period written application with the Commissioner for a hearing. Such hearing by the Commissioner shall cover the issues of—

(1) whether a police officer had reasonable grounds to believe such person had been driving or was in actual control of a motor vehicle upon the public street or highway while under the influence of intoxicating liquor; and

(2) whether such person, having been placed under arrest, refused to submit to the test or tests, after having been informed of the consequences of such refusal.

(b) If, following the hearing provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner shall sustain the order of revocation, the same shall become effective immediately.

Sec. 8. Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commissioner revoking his license or denying him a license under the authority of this Act, may obtain a review thereof in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals in accordance with chapter 3 of title 17 of the District of Columbia Code.

Sec. 9. (a) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of the first section of the Act of March 4, 1958 (D. C. Code, sec. 40-609a) are amended by striking out "fifteen one-hundredths" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such paragraph "ten one-hundredths" and by striking out "twenty one-hundredths" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such paragraph "eleven one-hundredths".

(b) Subsections (c), (d), and (e) of such Act are repealed.

BLACK REPARATIONS OR
BLACKMAIL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Lord's servants have converted his tithes and offerings to the devil's work. See Matthew 7: 6.

So that our colleagues may understand the background on the National Black Economic Development Conference and its parents, the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization—IFCO—and the American Baptist Convention, I include articles from the American Baptist Crusader magazine, from Christian Beacon, and newsclippings:

[From American Baptist Crusader]
THE BLACK ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
CONFERENCE
WHAT IS IFCO?

"The Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization is a unique national coalition of Protestant, Jewish and Roman Catholic social agencies and local and regional development groups. It seeks to implement common programs and strategies of member organizations, give local assistance in technical areas, conduct research in cooperation with indigenous community groups, and raise funds for the development of mass-based community organizations."—from an IFCO release dated Sept. 5, 1968.

IFCO was founded in September, 1967. Currently 23 religious and quasi-religious agencies are members (membership fee: \$1,000 per year). It has raised and disbursed \$1,495,510.49 to about 50 community-type social-activist and/or training organizations.

The executive director is the Rev. Lucius Walker Jr., an American Baptist clergyman and an ecumenical missionary of the American Baptist Home Mission Societies. In a statement prepared for delivery at the recent ABC sessions in Seattle, Mr. Walker reported (in part): "I would also like to make it very clear that IFCO funds have not gone exclusively to militant groups. Our funds go to projects that are inclusive in their membership and promote people power so that poor minority groups can redress their grievances in society. The groups we fund represent diverse segments of community population ranging from conservative to militant. . . . The claim that we are connected with the Black Panther Party is utterly ridiculous."

HOW ARE AMERICAN BAPTISTS INVOLVED WITH
IFCO?

American Baptists are related to IFCO through their Home Mission Societies which pay the annual membership fee and which, additionally, has made an unrestricted grant of \$200,000 to IFCO from World Mission Campaign receipts. Two ABHMS staff members are on IFCO's board: Dr. Paul O. Madsen and the Rev. Ray L. Schroder. As noted above, the Rev. Lucius Walker Jr., IFCO's executive director, is a commissioned missionary of the ABHMS.

WHY ARE THE AMERICAN BAPTISTS INVOLVED
WITH IFCO?

A statement released on May 26 by the ABHMS says:

"One denomination is limited in its resources. In IFCO we saw a viable entity through which we could combine resources with others to address massive problems. We also saw IFCO as a means of keeping in meaningful dialogue with black leadership. . . .

"But those are strategic reasons. Our prime reasons for charter membership in IFCO were (and still are) theological. The social problems of today are massive. . . . We feel a compulsion as Christians to minister to those needs. Support of community organization, with its emphasis on the right of local determination (clearly a Baptist principle) is currently the best way known to us for carrying on this ministry."

The Home Mission Society explains that the \$200,000 donation to IFCO was not included in World Mission Campaign publicity "be-

cause it did not exist at the time the literature was prepared." The release also states:

We realize that many constituents are critical of the ABEMS Board for not dramatically increasing that amount. We realize that good stewardship will require constant re-evaluation.

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL BLACK ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE?

A three-day conference April 25-27 in Detroit, Mich., called together and funded (\$50,000) by IFCO attracted more than 600 black leaders from all parts of the nation. The white press was barred but black reporters were admitted. Director Walker (in the document cited above) reports:

"Throughout the conference speakers and participants concurred in total consensus on such points as the irrelevance of black capitalism . . . the dysfunction of capitalist interest in contributing to the genuine liberation of the black community and . . . an impatience with piece meal programmatic projects for the economic development of the black community. . . . These points were contained in many conference workshop and caucus resolutions and were reiterated in a document that was presented on Saturday evening, title 'Total Control of Black Communities—The Only Solution to the Black Economic Development' by Mr. James Forman. At the close of this speech, Mr. Forman presented a document that has since become known as the 'Black Manifesto' in which reparations in the total of \$500 million from white Christian churches and synagogues was demanded."

After presenting the manifesto (adopted by the conference by a reported vote of 187 to 63 with many abstentions), the National Black Economic Development Conference was declared established with a Steering Committee of 24 members headed by James Forman. It first received headlines with its confrontation at Riverside Church, New York, on May 4.

ARE IFCO AND THE NATIONAL BLACK ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE RELATED?

Technically, no. At a meeting on May 6 in New York City the IFCO Board (among other things) supported "the programmatic aspects of the manifesto and the other conference resolutions" without "endorsing the strategies or tactics by which this manifesto is implemented." It suggested that no IFCO staff member serve on the Black Economic Conference Steering Committee; it urged the churches to come up with \$270,000 necessary to launch the conference's activities; and it said that only money so designated and coming to IFCO "above and beyond present church commitments" would be turned over to the conference.

It is fair to say, therefore, that the Black Economic Conference was spawned under the IFCO umbrella—and IFCO is related to it as it is to 50 other organizations—but organically the two are separate.

Director Walker (in the document cited above) says, however, that "IFCO applauds itself and feels that its responsibility . . . has been justly exercised in convening the forum where such a new thrust could emanate." He also records his personal position as follows:

"In my judgment the introduction of the concept of reparations through the National Black Economic Development Conference occasioned a new level of awareness and an encouraging turn in developments within the movement of black liberation. In the years ahead our society will need to deal with the question of restitution for its maintenance of and participation in the slave economy and in a dual system that has deprived and denied black citizens equal rights in

American society. The guilt of white America has never been expiated in any formal manner. The concept of reparations will allow an opportunity for formal restitution which will not only contribute to the economic development of the black community but the psychological relief of the white community that can potentially diffuse the rising tension between the races and put us on the road towards viable reform rather than the present tack that we seem to be following towards revolution and conflict in American society."

**[From Christian Beacon, June 19, 1969]
ABC LEADERS HEAR FORMAN**

The American Baptist Convention at Seattle, Washington, May 14-18, 1969, became the platform for James Forman and his Black Manifesto, and he received "a considerable hand when he finished." The American Baptist news-magazine *Crusader* gives a detailed account:

"The convention's most dramatic moment—though certainly not its most inspiring one—came on Saturday when Mr. James Forman, chairman of the newly-formed National Black Economic Conference, and several supporters arrived in Seattle and requested platform time to address the delegates. After a huddle of officials, it was decided to give him 15 minutes at the start of the afternoon's business session, a decision later approved by vote of the delegates who also agreed to grant another 15 minutes to any who wanted to respond.

"In the interest of adhering to his time allotment, Mr. Forman skipped most of the verbiage of his manifesto which he had read before some religious groups and in which he demands one-half billion dollars in 'reparations,' and came directly to the three demands (he said there were four but announced only three) which he levied against American Baptists.

"These were:

"(1) The deeding of all unused ABC land holdings in the South to the Black Economic Conference for conversion into cooperative farms;

"(2) A donation of \$60 million to the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO).

"(3) A listing of the denomination's holdings in stocks, bonds and investments, and the turning over of 60 percent of the income to the Black Economic Conference.

"Mr. Forman said these sums were due the blacks as reparations for years of economic subjugation. He declared that he and his followers were prepared to die to achieve them. He received a considerable hand when he finished.

"He was followed at the podium by the Rev. Orlando E. Costas, an American Baptist clergyman from Milwaukee, who proclaimed himself a spokesman for 'The Brown American Baptist Churchmen.' In three minutes of impassioned speech Mr. Costas said that Baptists with a Spanish accent had yielded for many years to the wishes of their 'patrones' (bosses) in the American Baptist Home Mission Societies but 'no more. We have taken enough and no longer will we, the young brown churchmen, accept your paternalism and tokenism.' He proclaimed compatibility with the 'black churchmen,' though some inquiry among the blacks and other Spanish-speaking American Baptists did not turn up any broad basis of support for Mr. Costas.

"Five additional speakers then addressed the delegates for three minutes each. Two of them (both white) supported Mr. Forman and his demands and two others (also white) rejected them before the Rev. Samuel B. McKinney, chairman of the Black American Baptist Churchmen, announced that his group endorsed 'the principle of reparations

without necessarily agreeing with the methods of the Black Economic Conference.'"

The Baptist magazine also reports the attitudes of American Baptist leaders on this matter:

"ABC President Thomas Kilgore, Jr.: 'I don't necessarily agree with Jim Forman's tactics and I'm not sure "reparations" is the word to use but in substance I favor the idea.'

"Black American Baptist Churchmen: The Rev. Samuel McKinney, chairman, announced on the platform at Seattle that his organization 'endorsed the principle of reparations as a first step toward repentance' and that it 'endorsed the programmatic aspects of such utilization of funds without necessarily endorsing the tactics of the Black Economic Conference.'"

**[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
June 7, 1969]**

**FORMAN, FOLLOWERS OCCUPY NEW YORK
CHURCH CENTER**

(By William R. MacKaye)

Negro militant James Forman and his followers yesterday disrupted the nerve center of a broad swath of American Protestantism by occupying three full floors of the Interchurch Center on New York's Morningside Heights.

The Forman group, acting in the name of the National Black Economic Development Conference, has demanded \$500 million from American religious bodies as reparations for the ill-treatment Negroes have received from whites in this country.

"These are liberated areas," Forman was quoted as saying from his command post in the headquarters of the Reformed Church of America.

On Monday we'll have a strike of all the black and Puerto Rican workers in this building and we hope white workers will support it," Forman was quoted. "We are not going to leave until we get some action on our demands."

The new occupation began Thursday when the demonstrators moved in on the 18th floor offices of the Reformed Church.

Many of the denomination's officials were in New Brunswick, N.J., preparing for their annual meeting, the General Synod, which began yesterday. But about 50 office workers were forced to leave.

Employees arriving at the eighth floor executive offices of the National Council of Churches found barricades of furniture blocking the exits from the elevators.

There was a similar scene at the 11th floor offices of the Board of National Missions of the United Presbyterian Church. Forman backers occupied the Board offices for five days last month.

A Presbyterian who holds posts in both the United Presbyterian unit and in the National Council said at midafternoon that withdrawals of the Forman forces from the eighth and 11th floors had been successfully negotiated.

The Rev. Lawrence W. McMaster Jr., an executive secretary of the Board of National Missions and an acting associate general secretary of the Council, said the occupiers left the Council's offices after R. H. Edwin Espy, the general secretary, promised to submit their demands to the organization's general board "at the earliest possible date."

He added that Forman had agreed to withdraw also from the Presbyterian floor after he was promised a meeting with the Rev. Dr. Kenneth Neigh, general secretary of the Board of National Missions, as soon as possible.

Dr. Neigh was in the hospital in Detroit yesterday, Mr. McMaster said Forman had indicated in the negotiating session he did not know Dr. Neigh was out of town.

The Interchurch Center is a 19-story building adjacent to Riverside Church, where Forman first used his tactic of calculated disruption by presenting his reparations demand at a Sunday service May 4.

It was not known how many of Forman's supporters were in the Center.

Some confusion developed at the Center over who would determine how the occupation was to be handled.

The Center's board of trustees, headed by New York banker Edmund F. Wagner, met in emergency session, according to Mr. McMaster, to decide whether to seek a court injunction ousting the occupiers.

Mr. McMaster said such a move was strongly opposed by most of the religious agencies housed in the building. The building manager's office declined to say what decision the trustees reached, but a National Council spokesman said he believed they had decided not to ask for an injunction.

Since his campaign began, Forman has also presented his reparations demand to officials of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, the Episcopal Church, the Lutheran Church in America, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), American Baptist Convention, and the United Methodist Board of National Missions.

[From Christian Beacon, June 19, 1969]

SOME 2,000 STRIKE AT NCC CENTER

Two thousand employees of the Church Center, headquarters of the National Council of Churches in New York, and other church bodies, walked out in a one-day strike at the call of James Forman. Forman, who is demanding that all the church organizations in the Church Center contribute to his reparations, called the sympathy strike. He estimated that 80 percent of the workers in the building obeyed his call. Other church officials insisted that only 50 percent went out. Work, however, was disrupted for that day.

SENATE—Tuesday, June 24, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and glory, at this morning altar of devotion flood our souls with a sense of Thy presence. Dispel all doubts of Thee, and of Thy divine guidance of this Nation in the processes of history. Assure us once again "that they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength." Grant us clean hands and pure hearts for high and holy work in this place. Equip us with a faith that dares, a love that shares, and a service that cares, until by Thy grace this shadowed earth becomes Thy kingdom of justice and truth and brotherhood. Bring us to the end of the day unashamed, with quiet mind, and the assurance of work well done. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 23, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISCAL 1970 FOOD STAMP AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 126, Calendar No. 254, be laid

before the Senate and made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 126) to increase the appropriation authorization for the food stamp program for fiscal 1970 to \$750 million.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

S. 2470—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO EXTEND THE BENEFITS OF THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM TO ELDERLY PERSONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana permit me to introduce another food stamp measure?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation to extend the benefits of the food stamp program to elderly persons now denied eligibility because they lack kitchen facilities, or because they are physically unable to cook for themselves. Under my bill, nonprofit, charitable organizations would be authorized to accept food stamps in exchange for cooked meals prepared either for home delivery or for consumption in community dining halls.

I welcome as cosponsors in this effort Senators ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada; EDWARD W. BROOKE, Republican, of Massachusetts; THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut; HIRAM L. FONG, Republican, of Hawaii; PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan; VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana; MARK O. HATFIELD, Republican, of Oregon; ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, Democrat, of South Carolina; DANIEL K. INOUE, Democrat, of Hawaii; EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington; WINSTON L. PROUTY, Republican, of Vermont; WILLIAM B. SPONG, Democrat, of Virginia; TED STEVENS, Republican, of Alaska, and EDWARD J. GURNEY, Republican, of Florida.

In the House of Representatives this bill is being introduced by Congressman

JOSEPH M. McDADE, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Congressman EDWARD G. BIES-TER, JR., Republican, of Pennsylvania; and others.

Congress, in approving the Food Stamp Act of 1964, intended to help older citizens with meager incomes to buy more and better food. Under the present law, however, persons who otherwise meet age, residency, and income requirements are still not eligible for food stamps if they do not have cooking facilities in their households. If a physical incapacity or chronic illness make it impossible for persons to shop or prepare food, and if they have no one to do these things for them, these persons, too, are in effect denied the use of the food stamps. I see no reason why these citizens, who are often among the most isolated and needy in the community, should be denied the benefits which the Food Stamp Act was enacted to provide.

My bill would amend the Food Stamp Act to meet this problem. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations carefully prescribed and administered by him, to designate specific church and other nonprofit organizations of a bona fide charitable nature to accept food stamps in exchange for prepared meals. Although the redemption of these stamps would assist eligible groups in the purchase of food, the stamps themselves would be issued only to individuals, who would be the direct beneficiaries of this amendment. This, I believe, is fully in keeping with the congressional intent behind the Food Stamp Act. Moreover, by engaging the cooperation of nonprofit, charitable organizations, my proposal would be in keeping also with the current focus of relying more heavily on private initiative for solutions to pressing national problems, of which one, certainly, is hunger.

Today, in communities across America, more than 50 charitable organizations are taking one approach to the alleviation of hunger through programs which offer prepared meals to "shut-ins" and other elderly persons who are unable to cook for themselves and who, in the absence of this assistance, might otherwise face the dismal prospect of institutionalization. These programs, relying heavily on voluntary effort, are aimed at an element of the hunger problem which,