

Mr. CABELL, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. OTTINGER, and Mr. GAYDOS):

H. Con. Res. 479. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. FALLON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BARING, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. CAREY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 480. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 786. Resolution to provide further funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 21; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Res. 787. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BROCK, Mr. FISH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONAS, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. McCLOREY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ZION):

H. Res. 788. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. AYRES):

H. Res. 789. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 200; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Res. 790. Resolution to express the sense

of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 15503. A bill for the relief of Domenico Marrone, his wife, Luisa Marrone, and their minor child, Luigi Marrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15504. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Maude Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15505. A bill for the relief of Jack B. Smith and Charles N. Martin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 15506. A bill for the relief of Krikor Garabed Ayvasian, Marian Ayvasian (wife), Leon Ayvasian, Sita Ayvasian, Artini Ayvasian, and Tgohi Ayvasian (children); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FANNIN NOTES INDUSTRY PROBLEM

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of an extremely difficult inflationary situation it is ironic that we are also facing an international trade problem of such burgeoning proportions that it may threaten our domestic economy.

In last Sunday's Arizona Republic, business and financial editor Don Campbell printed an interview with Arizona's Senator PAUL FANNIN outlining the scope of this problem and some of the actions which must be taken if a trade crisis is to be avoided.

Senator FANNIN notes some of the complexities which have gotten us into our current international logjam and puts forth some interesting and innovative ideas on how the problem may be attacked.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article to which I have referred, which appeared in the Arizona Republic on Sunday, January 18, in the RECORD at this point:

INDUSTRY AT THE CROSSROADS?—IMPLACABLE PINNERS OF SOARING COSTS, LOW TARIFFS STRANGLING MANUFACTURERS IN THE MARKETPLACE

(By Don G. Campbell)

With the possible exception of performing brain surgery in the back of a truck camper while negotiating the Coronado Trail, few things come quite so close to sheer impossibility as that of understanding our tariff laws.

And yet, ironically, few international arrangements strike so decisively at the man-in-the-street's pocketbook and arouse so much emotionalism as this complex network of duties that each country erects to protect

its domestic commodities and products from imports.

Ideally, of course, all countries should be so constituted that tariffs wouldn't be necessary and there would be, literally, "free trade" with everyone competing—no strings attached—with everyone else. But life is one thing, art is another, and free trade is an art that is as elusive today as it was when international commerce began.

The fact that the United States is, day by day, getting into an increasingly critical position in its foreign trade is no particular secret, but the very complexity of how we got into our current jam helps to obscure the seriousness of it. As our production costs soar, the fewer goods we sell overseas, the fewer goods we sell overseas, the more jobs are lost domestically.

And, at the same time, the more foreign markets we lose, the more American manufacturers are tempted to move some of their operations abroad to compete more evenly. The result: the loss of even more jobs here in the United States.

One of the more vocal advocates of taking action in this area before the damage is irreversible is Arizona's senior U.S. Senator, Paul J. Fannin, whose concern is underscored by the fact that Arizona's role as a foreign exporter is growing by leaps and bounds—up to \$98.2 million in 1966 (the latest year available), exclusive of agricultural items, from \$63 million just six years earlier. It was in 1966 that Arizona finally nosed Colorado out of the No. 1 spot in exports among the Mountain States.

The key to the crisis, Sen. Fannin said this past week in an interview, is the inflationary cycle in the United States and, in particular, the soaring cost of labor—which, since 1965, has risen at twice the rate of output per man hour.

As a case in point, Sen. Fannin cites the disparity between labor costs among the major auto producing countries. In the United States, according to Fannin's figures, labor costs in the industry amount to about \$5.31 an hour as against:

Argentina, \$1.19; Australia, \$1.92; Brazil, \$0.96; Germany, \$2.20; Italy, \$1.99; Japan, \$1.40; Mexico, \$2.04; South Africa, \$1.05; United Kingdom, \$1.57.

Undoubtedly, too, Fannin feels, labor considerations are also the prime factor in the

explosive growth of imports currently crippling the domestic shoe industry. As recently as 1959, for instance, shoe imports equaled only 3.5 per cent of U.S. shoe production but, last year, they equaled 37.5 per cent of it, and the industry estimates that by 1975 one out of every two pairs of shoes sold in the United States will be foreign made.

The industry, Fannin said, also reckons that for every 10 million shoes imported (and there were 200 million of them in 1969), there are roughly 3,000 job opportunities lost for domestic shoe workers.

Hurt even more, of course, is the consumer electronic industry. Of the total market of 12.5 million television sets last year, for instance, a full 4.2 million of them, 33 per cent, came from abroad. The industry estimates that the import share of this will rise to 43 per cent of the market in the current year.

In the case of tape instruments, the battle already has been decisively lost—a full 10.8 million of the 11.9 million tape machines sold last year, 90 per cent—were imported. This year, the industry expects the import share of the market to rise to 92 per cent.

But, while "Cheap foreign labor" is the traditional rallying cry of the protectionists, Fannin said, the whole problem is a bit more complex than that. The disparity in labor costs, is further complicated by unfavorable tariff structures coming out of the "Kennedy Round" of tariff negotiations—a drastic reduction in the tariffs on about 100,000 products involved in world trade and a move that was decidedly overdue.

The negotiations were the result of congressional action in 1963 giving the late President the authority to slash import duties up to 50 per cent across the board. The knotty details of the authorization, however, kept all 46 nations involved in the matter busy clear up until it was finally signed into law on Nov. 13, 1967.

"The trouble is," Sen. Fannin said, "that the tariffs worked out were supposed to even up the productive capacities of the countries involved. Countries like Mexico, with a much lower productive capacity than the United States, were protected from a flood of imports with relatively high tariffs."

The trouble is, the Arizona senator said, the situation changed quickly and, by the time the nonstop negotiations on the Kennedy Round had been completed, the pro-

ductivity capacity of such countries as Japan and Germany had drastically changed—they no longer needed the "protection" that the high tariff still gave them.

Meanwhile, of course, inflation in the United States had continued at a dizzy pace and—between soaring costs and disadvantageous tariff barriers—American goods were rapidly being priced out of the market. (In France, for instance, tariffs are based on "horsepower units" which makes the duty on a Volkswagen only \$16 while on a Chevy II, with only twice the "horsepower units," the duty is \$180).

In order to sell abroad, at all, then, American manufacturers have been fleeing to such free-port assembly zones as Mexican border, Taiwan and Singapore—not merely to pick up lower priced labor, but to execute an end-run around the tariff barriers, too. The result: plants that should be built in the United States ("You can train an American Indian," Sen. Fannin said, "to assemble a part just as easily as you can teach a Korean.") are being built abroad and staffed by foreigners.

By the end of 1970, the electronic industry estimates, all but two of the major American manufacturers will be importing complete TV sets, or substantially finished chassis, from their own foreign plants for sales in the United States.

No one, Fannin said, wants to try to counter this by launching a drive for a return to the isolationistic high tariffs associated with the disastrous Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1931 which would simply result in retaliatory tariffs around the world, shutting us completely out of all markets.

The solution, Arizona's senior senator believes, has to be a return to realism on the part of organized labor in the United States, plus legislation that would give American industries the same incentives for building plants in the United States as they now have for building them abroad.

"I don't see how labor can take much satisfaction in getting workers a \$5-an-hour scale," Fannin said, "if there aren't any jobs to be filled—and that's the direction we're going."

Currently under study by the Treasury Department, he added, is proposed legislation that he has drafted that would domesticate some of the incentives—such as tax deferrals on funds reinvested in plants—that American manufacturers now enjoy in setting up foreign subsidiaries.

But the time is short, and the squeeze is rapidly becoming a stranglehold.

J. EDGAR HOOVER, PATRIOT

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Albany Herald, a distinguished newspaper in my district, on January 5, 1970, paid a most deserved tribute to one of America's most dedicated and respected public servants, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A little over 5 years ago this body unanimously adopted a resolution expressing the hope that Mr. Hoover would "continue in his present office for many years to come." I would like to reiterate that hope now.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the editorial entitled "J. Edgar Hoover, Patriot":

J. EDGAR HOOVER, PATRIOT

J. Edgar Hoover has reached age 75, an occasion his friends have chosen as a signal to salute his 45 years of dedicated service as director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while his enemies have inveighed against him on the grounds of advanced age and anachronism.

As far as we are concerned, and we daresay as most Americans are concerned, the former have all the best of it.

Mr. Hoover is the one American in whom most other Americans have the greatest degree of confidence and respect. What is true today has been valid through the Administrations of eight Presidents of the United States. Because of it, Mr. Hoover, who is five years past the mandatory retirement age for Federal Government employes, could announce quietly that he has no intention of retiring, a decision in which the President concurs and which he, like Lyndon Johnson, made possible through a special Executive order.

Nor is this feeling confined merely to the Executive Branch of Government. On May 7, 1964, when Mr. Hoover completed 40 years as FBI director, the House of Representatives adopted a unanimous resolution expressing the hope that he would "continue in his present office for many years to come."

Certainly we cannot call to mind immediately any other American who has served his Government so long and so well as this by now familiar figure. Upon assuming his office, Mr. Hoover erased the vestiges of a veritable Augean Stable of corruption and scandal which he was named to correct, then proceeded to write a record of achievement in the area of law enforcement that became the envy of Scotland Yard and the French Surete and much, much older agencies of Western Europe which long had been adjudged the ne plus ultra in this field.

In so doing, Mr. Hoover, by dint of personal example, carved into the pillars of his bureau a reputation for honesty, integrity and flinty character, individually and collectively, that has often stood in stark contrast to other agencies and departments and even Branches of the Government. The Congress, both House and Senate, have been ensnared in scandals in the last 45 years; the FBI has not. The White House has had its deep freezes and minks and vicuna coats; the FBI has not. The Supreme Court has had the probity of some of its Justices questioned; the FBI has not endured any such tribulation.

Mr. Hoover would never permit it. It is as simple as that.

Consequently the only criticism that is leveled against him, except by those criminal sources which he himself has said would cause him great concern if they did not attack him, is that he over-concentrates on the threat of Communism to the American system. His critics charge that his expressed view in 1919, that Communist "doctrines threaten the happiness of the community, the safety of every individual, and the continuance of every home and fireside," has not altered in 50 years. Yet they contend that the nature of Communism is not today what it was 50 years ago.

We suggest that Mr. Hoover is right and they are wrong. For the Hoover critics would have a difficult time selling their view to, let us say, a quadruple amputee of the Vietnam War or the Korean War; to a horribly crippled East Berliner pulled bleeding to safety across the barbed wire of the Berlin Wall by humane West Berliners; to the political prisoner lying rotting in one of Senor Castro's dungeons, and to at least two brilliant Russian writers now undergoing Soviet incarceration for the offense of exercising the right of free speech which the U.S.S.R. Constitution guarantees to them—on paper only, it seems.

The "Communist menace" is only a "myth," say the Hoover critics, and the FBI director

does the nation a disservice when he calls attention to it. What fuzzy-headedness! What nonsense!

It may not be politically chi chi these days to speak strongly on behalf of America, to express fealty and devotion to her principles of freedom—in short, to be a patriot. It may not be popular, but thank God for those who do so. And no American does so more forcefully, more convincingly, and then acts to give substance to these principles, than J. Edgar Hoover.

THE ARAB-ISRAELI DISPUTE

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I have already joined with some of my colleagues in expressing concern over the recent statements of Secretary of State Rogers with respect to the Arab-Israeli quarrel in the Middle East. I have consistently stated that I believe that face-to-face discussions between Israeli and Arab representatives afford the best chance for permanent peace in that part of the world. Last week I had the opportunity to talk to representatives of the United Jewish Federation of Norfolk and Virginia Beach, the Jewish Community Council of Newport News-Hampton, and the Jewish Community Council of Portsmouth, along with other distinguished representatives of the Jewish community in Tidewater. These organizations have prepared a paper which I believe would have particular interest to my colleagues in the Congress. The paper sets out clearly past resolutions and analyzes the statements made by Secretary Rogers, as well as the positions adopted by the great powers with reference to the Arab-Israeli dispute.

The material follows:

PREPARED BY DIRECTION OF THE UNITED JEWISH FEDERATION OF NORFOLK AND VIRGINIA BEACH, THE JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF NEWPORT NEWS-HAMPTON, THE JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF PORTSMOUTH, AND THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE ABOVE BODIES, JANUARY 9, 1970

I. Introduction:

This paper will attempt to outline our understanding, as interested citizens of the key points of disagreement between the United States, Israel, USSR and the Arab nations resulting from Secretary of State William P. Rogers' recent speech. We will attempt to evaluate these positions relating to the best interests of the U.S. and the free people of the world.

II. The UN resolution of 1967—the Six Day War:

- (1) Advocated withdrawal of Israel armed forces from certain newly occupied territories.
- (2) Stated that all nations should respect and acknowledge the sovereignty, territory integrity and political independence of every state in the area.
- (3) Stated that all peoples have a right to live within secure and recognized boundaries without fear of war.
- (4) Guaranteed freedom of navigation through international waterways.
- (5) Required a just settlement of the refugee problem.
- (6) Stated that Jerusalem must be available to all religions.

III. U.S. interpretation and position prior to Secretary Rogers' speech is as follows:

(1) Territorial integrity must be secured for all.

(2) Direct negotiations are necessary with the Rhodes Formula as a possibility.

(3) Israel is a sovereign nation and has a right to exist.

(4) International waterways are open to all.

(5) Refugee problem must be solved.

(6) Israel military position must be maintained at a level necessary for defense.

(7) Within the city of Jerusalem, the religious rights of all religions must be protected and guaranteed.

During subsequent Big Four conferences, the U.S. till now has continued to maintain these positions, specifically reiterating that direct negotiations are paramount, and further adding that no settlement would be imposed, and the U.S. would draw no maps of territory adjustments. Secretary Rogers' speech changes these positions.

IV. The Russian position has been as follows:

(1) All occupied territories must be returned.

(2) An imposed peace by the giant powers is the only possible solution.

(3) Waterways are to be internationalized.

(4) Refugees from Israel must all be repatriated.

V. The position of Israel has been and is:

(1) First, peace treaties must be signed between the belligerents, then the UN resolution of 1967 can be implemented.

(2) Israel is willing to cooperate in solving the refugee problem.

(3) Territory and other advantages won by Israel are negotiable and can be discussed.

(4) Direct negotiations are a necessity; the Rhodes Formula as used by Dr. Ralph Bunche is acceptable.

VI. Position of the Arab nations is:

(1) First, withdrawal by Israel from all occupied territories, then negotiation through the UN is possible.

(2) No direct negotiations with Israel.

(3) Israel's sovereignty is not recognized.

(4) The Rhodes Formula is not acceptable.

(5) The Arab nations are unalterably dedicated to the destruction of Israel.

VII. The positions held by the U.S. prior to Secretary Rogers' changes have been *advantageous to the best interests of the U.S.* as follows:

(1) The USSR moved into the area in strength, arming and rearming the Arab nations. The USSR dispersed a fleet into the Mediterranean; the USSR began a program of economic aid, and military advisors, chiefly to Egypt. The obvious and ultimate goal of the USSR was to nullify the U.S. influence in the area and to threaten the NATO alliance. A free and strong Israel has prevented USSR influence from engulfing the Near East and the NATO alliance, especially Turkey.

(2) The wishes of the American people have been fulfilled in their desire to succor the survivors of the European holocaust of the Hitler era.

(3) Even though diplomatic relationship between certain oil producing Arab nations and the U.S. were severed immediately after the Six Day War, these nations *continued* to sell their oil to their most valuable customer, the U.S. The U.S. has continued to secure oil as needed from the Middle East without having to commit troops to defend American interests. Contrary to Messrs. Rockefeller, McCloy and Anderson, there is no reason to believe these nations will discontinue selling oil to the U.S. now.

(4) Although the USSR has been able to extend its influence into certain Arab nations, this influence has been held to a reasonable degree by the existence of Israel, a staunch ally of the U.S.

(5) Obviously the U.S. believes its best interests are served by a strong Israel. For ex-

ample, the hot line between the U.S. and the USSR was used during the Six Day War to cool the action. Secretary Rogers' proposal for admission of all refugees would create an enemy within that could eventually destroy Israel and deprive the U.S. of Israel's Mid East strength.

(6) The USSR can only be deterred by strength. This is one area of the world where strength by Israel has held the Russians in check throughout that part of the world without committing U.S. troops. Israel has specifically gone on record as not requiring or even considering U.S. troops.

(7) The democracy of Israel which supports, defends and strengthens the U.S. position in the Middle East has accomplished this without grant-in-aid from the U.S. in dollars or manpower.

VIII. Does Secretary Rogers' new position further the best interests of the United States? Will it bring peace? We think not.

(1) These new proposals represent a continued softening of the U.S. offers at the Big Two Conferences without any reciprocal proposals from Russia. The reverse is true; Arab and Russian intransigence becomes more evident. Their tactics most obvious; wait long enough and Israel's cards available for negotiation and compromise will have all been played by the U.S.

(a) Historically, only negotiations from positions of strength have been successful in containing Russian ambitions. The deterioration of Israel's bargaining position, i.e., imposed boundaries, refugee solution, city of Jerusalem, etc. ceded to the Arab world for very little in return by Secretary Rogers, weakens the possibility of peace in the Middle East.

(2) An "even-handed" policy on the part of the U.S. is excellent, provided it does not create an imbalance of military power in the Middle East. If the Arab nations continue to receive arms, money and advisors from Russia and also receive arms and aid from the U.S. in its "even-handed" policy, the end result is that Israel, receiving arms only from the U.S. will not be as strong as Arab nations. She will become vulnerable to attack as the Arabs receiving more material grow stronger. Inevitably this will weaken U.S. influence, strengthen USSR presence and create a salutary climate for Arab attack.

(3) The most recent addendum to Rogers' position which allows Jordan and/or Egypt to nullify any bilateral treaties between Israel and either of her neighbors, will emasculate present hope of peace between Israel and any of her neighbors willing to take a moderate tone.

(4) A potential threat to escalation is Israel forced to the wall by continued border warfare and terrorist tactics, stripped of its materials for negotiation (other than the methods of implementing Rogers' "give-away" proposals) seeing its enemy growing stronger and foreseeing no hope for peace being forced to take additional military action to keep Russia off-balance and the Arab nations from getting strong enough to carry out Nasser's recent and continual threats of extinction.

5. If a nation refuses to negotiate it does not want peace. Traditionally the only successful way to end a war is for the parties to negotiate a viable peace treaty. The Arab nations have refused repeatedly to negotiate under any circumstances, while Israel continues to offer to negotiate. As long as Arabs believe U.S. will accept "no direct negotiation", peace will not come.

IX. Secretary of State Rogers omitted discussion of certain dynamics in the situation and changed others:

(1) El Fatah was not considered nor their continued use of UNWRA refugee camps, supplied mostly by U.S. funds, as recruiting and training centers for terrorists.

(2) Omitted was financial adjustment to those Jews forced to flee Arab nations leaving

possessions behind. These refugees number approximately the same as Arab refugees.

(3) Omitted was provisions for releasing present Jews in Arab countries who wish to leave and are not allowed to do so.

(4) The Rhodes Formula was changed from that used by Dr. Ralph Bunche so that indirect negotiations through Rogers' recommendations means little. Direct negotiations between belligerents dropped. Provisions for enforcing Rogers' position vague and unworkable partly depending upon Russia and France as guarantors.

(5) Enforcement provisions still allow Arab nations to force withdrawal of policing troops under certain circumstances. Jordan and Egypt can nullify bilateral treaties with Israel.

X. We believe the U.S. should return to its positions prior to Secretary Rogers' speech and use its good offices, with others to bring these belligerents together and negotiate a political settlement.

Therefore we respectfully ask our Senators and our Representatives to reaffirm their position of April 24, 1969 wherein they recognized the necessity for direct negotiations between Arabs and Israel.

We further request that they ask President Nixon to reaffirm his statement of March 4, 1969 wherein he indicated there would be no "map drawing" of territories or imposed settlements on Israel by the U.S. and other nations.

A course requiring direct negotiations by the U.S. must eventually lead to peace. Historically any other course would not be lasting. Peace would help preserve the NATO alliance by lessening USSR pressure on Turkey and eventually Greece. A refuge for Jews would be preserved for Jews without placing a humanitarian strain for their rescue and resettlement in the Western world. Peace would permit the expansion of U.S. economic interest in the Near East. It will encourage Israel to remain and grow stronger as the only democratic nation in the Middle East, and a friend of influence of the U.S.

Newsweek, January 5, 1970 capsules the results of Secretary Rogers' position:

"But for the moment, Washington seems to be backing the policy that offended the Israelis, did little to improve relations with the Arabs and with Moscow with no reason to increase the pressure on its Arab clients to come to terms. All this underscored an unavoidable drawback to Mr. Nixon's low profile stand—namely, that it spells out how much Washington will allow its opponents to get away with. By applying that policy to the Middle East, Mr. Nixon was running the risk that his administration might dissipate its influence without achieving a settlement that serves the national interests."

HIGH INTEREST RATES AND SCHOOLCHILDREN

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, high interest rates have hurt nearly everyone in this Nation, but no group has been hit harder or more tragically than the schoolchildren.

The high interest, tight money policies, which do not seem to worry anyone in the Nixon administration, are striking at the heart of our great public school system. Outrageous interest rates are forcing hundreds of school districts to forgo much-needed bond issues to finance new schools. Others are find-

ing it impossible to market bonds already voted.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, schoolchildren are being faced with greatly overcrowded classrooms and, in some areas, the students are being forced into a half-day schedule because of rising interest rates.

Surely this Nation is not willing to see its school systems destroyed by high interest rates. It is a terrible shame that we have allowed this situation to reach this point. Mr. Speaker, apparently the situation in California is among the worst in the Nation. Recently, the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee conducted "grassroots" hearings in Los Angeles and much of the testimony came from school officials who expressed great concern about what rising interest rates were doing to their schools.

Last week, the Daily Bond Buyer, a publication which follows school district bond issues closely, reported that high interest rates had stalled new school construction in California to the point where more than 100,000 elementary and high school students will be without adequate classroom space this year.

The publication reported that no funds are available for 225 building projects in 125 different California school districts.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a copy of the article from the Daily Bond Buyer of January 15, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert in the RECORD testimony by Mr. Monroe Sweetland, legislative assistant for the National Education Association, Western States, before the Domestic Finance Subcommittee on December 2, 1969, along with his pertinent insertions:

[From the Daily Bond Buyer, Jan. 15, 1970]
THE \$275 MILLION SCHOOL BONDS NOT SALABLE IN CALIFORNIA DUE TO 5 PERCENT INTEREST LIMIT

SAN FRANCISCO.—The State's inability to market its bonds due to high interest rates has stalled new school construction to the point where more than 100,000 elementary and high school students will be without adequate classroom space this year, a new report states.

The report, the work of the State Allocation Board, warns the Legislature that no funds are available for about 225 building projects in 125 school districts. More than \$275 million in school construction bonds, authorized by the voters, are unsalable because the interest rate has soared above the maximum 5 per cent limit.

The board, which makes loans to school districts under the State's school building aid program, said that since last March 13 it has been forced to fund only projects actually under construction or in site condemnation proceedings. And to assure completion of these projects existing monies in the State School Building Fund are being augmented by a loan from the General Fund, the report says.

Board executive officer Don Anderson said the main concern is for the spiraling number of non-funded projects. These have been listed according to a complicated priority point schedule, he explained, adding:

"When State bonds can be sold again and additional funds become available, this backlog will be financed in such priority order."

Of the \$275 million in unsold bonds, \$185 million has been committed to approved projects, leaving \$90 million for new loan applications.

The report states that Proposition 7, which will be on the June 2 ballot, would increase

the ceiling on State bond interest from 5 to 7 per cent. Bond interest rates now are averaging 6.7 per cent—highest in history. But even if the measure passes, Mr. Anderson said school districts will be hard pressed to fit construction bids into budgets approved a year or more before, when costs were less.

Then too, he said if the bonds again become salable, they will be competing with other State water, education, veterans and park bonds.

He urged establishment of priorities for scheduling bond sales in accordance with a coordinated policy.

STATEMENT OF MONROE SWEETLAND, LEGISLATIVE CONSULTANT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, WESTERN STATES

Mr. SWEETLAND. Thank you, I certainly will, Mr. Chairman.

The other day a columnist in one of the leading California newspapers, a financial columnist, took off on your distinguished chairman and quoted in some disparagement I think at the height of his emotion about the subject of high interest rates.

He quoted Congressman Patman as referring at times to highway robbery and a boarding house reach and the swindlers, and so forth. I have been on the telephone talking to school administrators in California, and I began to make notes after I talked to a few of them and I came up with the following words from them: users, pound of flesh, scalpers, legalized larceny, and bank robbery in reverse.

Now, this arises because probably the most devastating assault on our schools at the moment is the strike of the moneylenders and the bond houses. Their refusal to buy the bonds voted for our new schools by local taxpayers unless they can somehow exceed the present legal interest and force the States to hike the return to the lenders has set back our schools in a time of great need and is doing uncounted damage to the education of children.

In California, as Mr. Hanna well knows, it is aggravated by a game of Russian roulette we are playing with the children in the schools because of the fact that we built years ago many schools that were not earthquake proof. Under California's field act our district has been required under State law to eliminate the unsafe schools within a short period of time. That time has now run out and yet even when the local district passes a bond issue in response to that demand of the State of California they cannot build their buildings because they cannot sell the bonds.

I am here to report for the National Education Association and for our principal California affiliate, the California Teachers Association, that our leadership is not only aroused and determined to do something about this, but we are more than a little frightened at the impact of the skyrocketing interest rates on our school bonds.

I was dismayed this morning to see in the New York Times that the impoverished State of West Virginia yesterday sold a \$90 million road bond issue but it received only one bid, and it accepted a record interest rate of 6.89 per cent.

Mr. HANNA. Those are tax-free bonds.

Mr. SWEETLAND. Yes, sir. They are comparable to the bonds we are talking about for our public schools in this State. When the California voters vote next June on raising the interest rate from 5 to 7 percent with all of its multi-million-dollar inflationary impact on our economy, and they may well turn it down, but when they vote they will be setting a limit of 7 percent. And already we see in the State of West Virginia, we saw in Silverton, Oregon, earlier this week that they are touching the 7-percent-interest rate anyway. So what are we doing? Are we engaged in a game that cannot lead us anywhere?

The Governor's principal consumer adviser,

Mr. Valory. I thought her testimony was deplorable as indicating a lack of appreciation of the gravity of this problem. She pointed out what a powerful weapon the consumer has in leaving the product which he doesn't like or she doesn't like right there on the grocery shelf as if this was some solution. Well, you can't tell that to the children in the California schools, some of them are two and three shifts a day, disrupting the whole family schedule, destroying the efficacy of teaching. And yet, the best we could get out of our leadership in the State is a statement deploring the situation and saying that maybe we should leave the goods on the shelf.

Well, I want quickly to just mention I work in a number of Western States, in 13 of them, and I thought your committee might be interested in hearing a little about, just a word from each of several of them.

Washington State. Its 1969 State legislature, with a gun at its head, because of the refusal of the bond sellers to bid at 6 percent, hiked its rate to 8 percent, and bonds voted since March 31, 1969, may now go to 8 percent; 7 and 8 percent mean that on 25-year bonds the face value of the bonds doubles in the lifetime, more than doubles in the lifetime of the payroll.

Washington has to resubmit many bond issues and these are expensive special elections, and in that State they have to somehow attract 40 percent of the voters to a special election, and then 60 percent of them have to say "Yes," in order to ever raise the interest rate on these bonds.

Oregon. Oregon State Treasurer Bob Straub summed it up by saying, "High interest rates in 1969-71"—he told me I could say this to you—"tragically will cost Oregon schools and cities millions of dollars that could be much more usefully spent to meet greater needs for education and public health. However, we seem to have no choice. With extreme reluctance, our legislature has raised these limits on interest rates from 5 to 7 percent on the advice of our State bond attorney."

Nevada. Mr. Lincoln Liston, the finance officer of the State department of education reports the legislature raised the interest rates from 5 to 6 percent back in 1967, and in 1969 raised it to 7 percent.

Arizona. Governor Williams has requested the legislature to raise the rate.

California. And I have attached to my report a number of newspaper stories on the acute crisis in California as a result of the boycott of school issues by the financiers.

Mr. HANNA. At that point may I say that all of your testimony together with the attachments and the newspaper articles will be received and placed in the record.

Mr. SWEETLAND. I won't show you the—I won't try to read here or recite the many letters from school districts telling what havoc this thing is committing on the children in their districts.

Now, that isn't something you can correct next year. Once these kids have lost a year in school or have operated under very disadvantageous circumstances, you don't make that up.

Now, I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that we welcome Mr. Patman's bill, and there is other legislation—you have made some proposals, Mr. Hanna, and I know Mrs. Sullivan and others have proposals, but we are looking for a way out and we hope either through the establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or something like it, the RFC, we will find a way in which the Federal Government can come to the rescue of State and local governments in this crisis. Nothing is more subversive to local government about which we hear so much than to have absentee faceless bond houses say they won't buy the bonds and won't carry out the policies which the local school district, the people in the district and the States ask for. It appears

that they feel immune from public responsibility. They force their high interest rates through our legislatures. They are coercing the parents and the taxpayers to go along with these usurious proposals. And we welcome your hearings in the hope that it is going to lead to the only solution we can see and we wish the Governor of this State had asked for it, and that is Federal intervention to provide the massive infusion of funds at modest low interest rates which the people need and have to have. We wait eagerly an opportunity to work with your committee and we would like to be told, Mr. Chairman—and of course I mean Mr. Patman in this respect also because he is chairman of the full committee, and we like his initiative in this matter—we want to be told how can we tie in and gear in. We have no small political strength. We have considerable strength. How can we help to find some way out of this terrible situation which California and all of our States face?

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Sweetland. Let me assure you of this, that your testimony together with others that we have heard here and probably will hear as indicated to this committee—and I am sure Mr. Gettys agrees with me—one of the most serious threats that the schools of the United States have faced since its full inception both to quality and quantity is today's high interest rate and the shortage of funds to carry on this most important activity; am I not correct?

Mr. SWEETLAND. Thank you very much. You will find, for instance—maybe you knew this already—in your folio a letter from Newport Mesa, that is in Orange County, is it, and from other districts in the State, I think there are 20 letters or so in their showing what this does at the local level, what it actually means.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. SWEETLAND. We certainly feel encouraged by your holding these hearings.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you.

Mr. SWEETLAND. Thank you.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MONROE SWEETLAND,
LEGISLATIVE CONSULTANT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, WESTERN STATES

On November 22nd, the financial editor of one of the principal California daily newspapers headed his column: "Patman's Cure—Roll Back Interest." Referring to your committee's distinguished Chairman, he went on to say, "The Old Populist * * * demonstrated yesterday that he hasn't changed his mind one bit. He flailed out at his favorite whipping boys with plenty of the old verbal vim, remarking that he sees no signs of the Administration really checking the inflation trend. Patman declared: 'They'll never reduce the cost of living until they roll back interest rates. Interest rates are so high now they are really against conscience.' * * * The Congressman, who has made a career out of battling banks, lards his comments freely with phrases like "highway robbery" and "boardinghouse reach," and "swindlers."

In the course of my preparation for this testimony I have heard again and again, from usually restrained and judgmental school administrators and state officials, as well as teachers, words far more explosive than those attributed to you, Mr. Chairman, by the columnist who sought to disparage your leadership. Among the epithets spit out by school leaders whom I interviewed this last week across several Western States, and I quote from my notes, occurred the following colorful verbiage: "usurers," "pound of flesh," "scalpers," "legalized larceny," "blackmail," and bank robbery in reverse."

What is the situation with our Western schools which can provoke such unaccustomed vehemence and expletive? It is simply that at a time of great population growth there has been an intensification of local property-tax-payer resistance to the rising cost of new schools. Probably the most devastating

current assault on our schools is the strike of the money lenders. Their refusal to buy the bonds for our new schools voted by the local taxpayers, unless they can exceed the present legal interest and force the States to hike the rates for the lenders, has set back our schools in time of great need, and is doing uncounted damage to the education of several million children.

Attached to this prepared statement is a chart showing the growing resistance to taxpayer-approval of sorely-needed new classrooms. A big new factor in these rejections is the skyrocketing interest rate which kites the cost of new schools far beyond previous years. The cost of construction has risen materially, to be sure, but the greatest increase by far is in one single item—the interest rate—and this factor lays no bricks, nor raises a roof, nor provides a single laboratory.

I am here to report, and I speak for the National Education Association, that our leadership is both aroused and more than a little frightened at the sky-rocketing interest rates on school bonds.

When the bond merchants refuse to bid on bonds authorized by the voters, they subvert self-government itself. These same money hucksters have been traditional opponents of general Federal support for local school districts, and have on occasion struck a holy pose as defenders of State and local school control. Yet nothing is more destructive, more subversive of local control, than to have disregarded the expressed will of the local taxpayers unless and until they accede to the demand of these same bond-buyers for greatly increased rates of interest.

I am submitting herewith some examples from our survey of several Western States which make clear the harm being done to our schools by these usurious demands of the bond merchants:

WASHINGTON

Washington's 1969 Legislature, with a gun at its head because of the refusal of bond-sellers to bid at the legal 6% rate, hiked its rate to 8%. Bonds voted since March 31, 1969 may now go to 8% interest.

In suburban Seattle, an area of great growth, we find schools operating on double shifts, shortened class time and with severe disruption of both family and teacher schedules.

Last year in the *Kent School District* the voters approved a \$3-million bond issue at the legal rate of 6%, but there were no bids from the striking bond houses.

In *Renton School District* the voters approved \$18-million in bonds, but only \$12-million were sold. The authority has expired on the remaining \$6-million and an expensive second election must be held at the new interest level. It may or may not be approved.

In *Puyallup District* an issue of \$490,000 at 6% was voted but not a single bid ensued.

Under Washington's strict election law, it takes at least a 40% voter turnout and a 60% "yes" vote to approve a bond issue. I do not need to tell you Congressmen what an onerous law this is. Only when the public is deeply aroused and informed can a special election attract 40% of the presidential year voters, and 60% approval is a huge majority. Yet the decision of the taxpayers can be set aside by faceless absentee brokers who simply sit it out until their terms are met. Moreover, Washington law provides that if bonds are not sold within two years, the authorization expires. Therefore, Washington Districts are now engaged in re-submitting their bond issues in expensive special elections. These elections are paid for by the taxpayers but they are caused by the boycott of the bond agents who have no responsibility for these extra costs to the local taxpayers. Who pays for the campaign materials and promotion necessary to inform and re-sell the public? It is the PTA's, the teachers, the local busi-

nessmen, and the parent who know and care about their children's education.

Even when the Legislature in Washington and other States gave in to the bond merchants' boycotts, and hiked the legal rate, this act, too, precipitates still another local election.

In *Kitsap County*, where the local school board prepared a \$425,000 issue, the bid call has been canceled by the board because they felt the new interest load made their cause hopeless.

In *Pasco District No. 1*, in Eastern Washington, the voters this year passed a \$1,630,000 issue at the legal 6% rate. Only \$600,000 of this was sold and when the balance was re-submitted for bids last week (November 25), the boycott by the bond houses was complete and not a single bid was made. Here, too, in the face of urgent need by the children, another expensive election and delay will be required to approve a hike to 8% interest.

In the small rural districts of Deer Park and Kettle Falls, the school boards have twice decided, in the face of pathetically inadequate local school conditions, to call off proposed bond issues because in their judgment the voters would not approve it at these exorbitant interest rates.

The State of Washington presents many more grave local crises, of which the above are only a few examples.

OREGON

Oregon's 1969 Legislature, like Washington, felt it had no choice but to hike the legal interest rate. Oregon State Treasurer Robert Straub expressed the sentiment heard all across the Western States and he authorized me to use this comment: "High interest rates in 1969-71 tragically will cost Oregon schools and cities millions of dollars that could be much more usefully spent to meet greater needs for education and public health. However, we seem to have no choice. With extreme reluctance our Legislature has raised these statutory limits on interest rates from 5% to 7% on the advice of our State bond attorney, who has predicted that no construction bonds can be sold below that figure during the coming two years."

The *Lake Oswego Unified District* offered its bonds, but was shocked to receive a bid of 6.14%. Early in 1969 the board rejected this bid as exorbitant. The bonds were then re-submitted to the market and were sold at 6.24%. This effort by the local board to save their taxpayers some money actually cost the District an additional \$140,000 over the life of the issue.

At *Albany Union High School* this year the board has declined all bids as too high, even though they were under the new 7% ceiling.

At *Silverton, Oregon*, a reluctant school board recently accepted a bid at 6.8% interest, which clearly indicates that even the 7% ceiling cannot long withstand the demands of the bond-buyers.

NEVADA

Mr. Lincoln Liston, Finance Officer for the State Department of Education reports that the Legislature raised the legal interest rate limit from 5% to 6% in 1967, and in 1969 raised it to 7%.

ARIZONA

Governor Williams has requested the Legislature to raise the 6% limit now in effect. There has been a serious problem in the Tucson District, but we will have to check every county in Arizona to compile precise information because the State Department of Education does not collect the records on local bond issues.

CALIFORNIA

At the end of this prepared statement are newspaper stories summarizing the acute crisis in California as a result of the boycott of school bond issues by the financiers. (See particularly the *New York Times* story attached herewith.)

Because the interest rate is a constitutional provision in California, it is necessary to submit it to the vote of the people, which is being done at the time of the primary election in June, 1970. Most California Districts in which the voters have recently approved bonds, have been unable to sell them. I am attaching herewith statements from the superintendents and fiscal officers of a wide variety of California Districts in which they relate their local problems. The statements referred to may be found at the end of the prepared statement.

Also attached to this testimony I am presenting a table which will indicate to you why this boycott is so devastating to the financial position of our local schools. You will note that a \$2-million bond issue with interest of 5% for 20 years increases the cost of the total issue by more than 50%. When the interest rate is raised to 7% for 20 years the total cost is increased to about 80%. If the interest rate is 8%, as in Washington, the \$2-million issue is more than doubled—it becomes in fact a \$4-million bond issue.

If the pay-off period is 25 years, which is very common in public bond issues, the face value of the bonds sold is greater by more than 100% by the time the 25 years have elapsed and this would be true at both California's 7% ceiling and Washington's 8%.

Mr. Chairman, we welcome your proposal as embodied in H.R. 14639 to establish a Development Bank to aid in financing public agencies. We in the National Education Association hope that either through this or some similar program the people may find a way whereby our Federal Government can come to the rescue of State and local Governments in this crisis of our schools. This Legislation may also serve to remind these banks and bond houses that the public established them and accredits them, and that they must not operate without a sense of public responsibility. It appears to us that they now feel immune from public responsibility. They have forced their high interest rates through our Legislature. They have coerced the parents of our children into acquiescence with usurious interest rates. We welcome your hearings and the opportunity it provides to bring this crisis to the attention of the Congress and the public. Only action by the Federal Congress can save this situation. We await eagerly an opportunity to work with your committee in persuading the Congress and the executive departments of the Federal Government that this problem must have an immediate priority.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle,
Nov. 22, 1969]

PATMAN'S CURE—ROLL BACK INTEREST
(By Sidney P. Allen)

It has been indelibly established over a period of about 40 years now that Congressman Wright Patman (Dem-Texas) holds that "big banking" is basically suspect. In his view, it is responsible for many—maybe even most—of our troubles.

The old Populist, here to address the California Credit Union League, demonstrated yesterday that he hasn't changed his mind one bit. He flailed away at his favorite whipping boys with plenty of the old verbal vim. Remarking that he sees no signs of the Administration really checking the inflation trend, Patman declared:

"They'll never reduce the cost of living until they roll back interest rates. Interest rates are so high now they are really against conscience."

He was particularly critical of the big city banks that defied precedent and increased the prime bank rate from 7½ to 8½ per cent last June. To illustrate one effect of high interest he used this analogy:

"A 1 percent increase, if charged on all public and private debts in the Nation amounts to about \$12 billion a year . . ."

CXVI—44—Part 1

Patman wasted no time coming forth with two predictions:

(1) We're going to have a bad depression if we don't hold back interest; (2) If they attempt to raise the 8½ per cent prime rate (and there's talk of it) "I predict Congress will take some action toward a rollback."

Two other targets came into the Congressman's focus.

House approved banking control legislation (ushered through by chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee Patman) is "just about perfect." It would turn the clock back for one-banking holding companies, confine their activities to banking. (It has bankers up tight, even though the Senate has yet to approve the House legislation.)

Argues Patman: "Banks do have confidential relationships and information. They also have that most valuable franchise—the right to create money. We don't want them to be grabbing up all the businesses . . ."

He also took a dim view of bank operations on certain military installations, implying they took advantage of servicemen even though the U.S. Treasury subsidized their operations to insure them against losses. (He said the subsidy was \$10 million in five years and included \$1.4 million to Bank of America.)

The Congressman, who has made a career out of battling banks, lards his comments freely with phrases like "highway robbery" and "boardinghouse reach," and "swindlers." It helps to raise the hackles.

[From the New York Times, June 28, 1969]

CALIFORNIA BONDS ARE NOT SELLING
5 PERCENT INTEREST-RATE CEILING PUTS STATE
OUT OF MARKET
(By John H. Allan)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—California, which runs neck and neck with New York as the nation's biggest borrower in the tax-exempt bond market, has not been able to sell bonds since April 28 because of high interest rates, and it may not be able to sell any for another year.

This became apparent after talks this week with Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest, the state treasurer; Caspar W. Weinberger, director of finance, and investment bankers and bond analysts in Los Angeles and San Francisco.

California has a 5 per cent maximum rate on its general obligation bonds and similarly rated issues currently are being sold at borrowing costs three-quarters of a percentage point or more higher than that. Because of the high cost of special elections, a vote to lift or eliminate the 5 per cent ceiling is not likely to take place until next June 2, the date of a statewide primary election.

In the meantime, the continuously prospering state is being squeezed for capital to finance its huge water-resources development program and other projects.

At the beginning of September, the state will need funds to continue its water program, and it is planning to sell an issue of one-year or two-year bond-anticipation notes, a type of short-term financing used only rarely in the past in California. According to Mr. Weinberger, the size of the issue would be \$100-million.

Ordinarily, recently, California has been selling \$500-million to \$600-million a year of general obligation bonds. At least 60 per cent of this financing has gone to pay for the water program, a \$2.8-billion project to distribute water from the Sierras north of Sacramento as far south as the Mexican border.

So far in 1969, the state has sold only \$7.5-million of bonds to develop San Francisco's harbor; \$30-million for higher education facilities; \$94,995,000 for the water program, and a few small issues sold directly to the Federal Government under special programs

that charge rates well below the current market.

To sell the \$30-million, however, the state had to reduce the issue by \$10-million and shorten the life of the bonds.

The selling of the \$94,995,000 required an act of the Legislature lifting the interest-rate ceiling on revenue bonds of the Central Valley Project of the water program to 6½ per cent from 5½ per cent. The issue utilized all the available electric-power revenues from the project, preventing additional bond sales of the same type.

To get through the next 12 months until the 5 per cent ceiling could be changed, California is counting on several stratagems. The most important is the bond-anticipation note issue, which "very possibly" could be sold under the 5 per cent limit in the current tax-exempt securities market, according to Mrs. Priest.

In addition, the administration of Gov. Ronald Reagan has cut back spending "as much as possible," Mrs. Priest said. Schools have been able to borrow directly from the state's general funds to pay for capital facilities needed for the school year starting in September. Nearly \$30-million has been advanced so far, according to Mr. Weinberger.

The bond market also could change enough to permit bond sales under the 5 per cent ceiling. Mrs. Priest added hopefully, although investment bankers hesitate to predict rates will come down that much.

"I'm an optimist, I really am," she declared, "I look to see interest rates dropping toward the latter part of the summer . . . Toward the latter part of the year at least."

Mr. Weinberger mentioned two other "mechanisms" that might be utilized to bridge the gap until more bonds could be sold. At a meeting of the California Group of the Investment Bankers Association earlier this week (6-22-69) at Santa Barbara, he spoke of a system of exchanging state bonds for land acquisition and to pay contractors' bills. He also said construction programs were to be rescheduled.

Both state financial officials were optimistic about the chances for changing California's interest rate limit. "I can't really see the need for a ceiling," Mrs. Priest remarked, and Mr. Weinberger spoke out sharply at the investment bankers' meeting against "legislative log-rolling" that might impede getting the limit change on the ballot next June.

APPROVAL HELD LIKELY

California voters will most likely pass the change in the 5 per cent ceiling after the Legislature puts the measure on the ballot, asserted Mrs. Priest, who was Treasurer of the United States in the Eisenhower's Administration.

"The reasons for raising the ceiling must be very thoroughly given to the voters," she said. "It is very necessary to remove the 5 per cent ceiling, I think the voters will accept this."

Many California municipalities have also been impeded by a 5 per cent rate limit. The Bank of America so far this year has purchased 64 local bond issues that totaled \$52.7-million. These sales would otherwise have attracted no bids.

The purchases have been made, it is said, because of the bank's sense of civic responsibility and partly in hope of getting deposits from the localities selling the bonds. If the squeeze on the banking system is continued very much longer, however, it will become that much more difficult for such bond purchases to be continued.

[From the Wall Street Journal,
Aug. 29, 1969]

BANK OF AMERICA CEASES BUYING SCHOOL BONDS AT 5 PERCENT

Bank of America notified California school districts "about 10 days ago" that it would

no longer consider buying their bond issues at 5% interest.

In what officers had said was a goodwill gesture, the bank during the past several years acquired about \$100 million of bond issues at that rate, often bidding alone on issues other institutions wouldn't touch.

However, the California legislature recently removed the state's 5% interest ceiling on bond issues and permitted localities to re-submit bond issues for authorization to sell them at up to 7%.

That legislation and the continued "tight" money conditions led to the bank's decision. Leland S. Prussia Jr., vice president, investment and securities, said yesterday. "It was a great sacrifice on our part to support the 5% level," he said. The bank, the nation's largest, "really" doesn't "have the money" to continue the practice, he said.

Bank of America's practice of purchasing bonds at rates below market dates back to the Depression, when it began buying public works issues of various California localities. The bonds the bank currently would be buying under such a practice should be selling for "6% or more," Mr. Prussia said.

[From the San Francisco Examiner,
Oct. 19, 1969]

THE 1.3 BILLION IN BONDS GO BEGGING (By Harold V. Streeter)

California is banging its head so hard against a bond ceiling that it now has a \$1.3 billion headache.

That's the total, as of this past week, of authorized state bonds unsold because of a legal limit of 5 percent. This threatens a delay or slowup of such efforts as the \$2.8 billion State Water Project and new construction for universities, colleges and public schools.

With the national interest going rate closer to 7 percent, the water project has \$600 million in bonds it can't market. It is in such trouble that Governor Reagan is expected to have his director of finance borrow \$100 million from the general fund by year's end.

There's a \$275 million bond hangup for public school building which has its impact in the Bay Area. In San Mateo County alone, the high interest rates have blocked the sale of more than \$10 million in modernization bonds in 11 school districts. These are State bonds subject to the 5 percent limit.

The unmarketed water project and public school bonds are the biggest in the \$1.3 billion total. The remainder, in totals ranging from \$80 million down to \$50 million, encompass such areas as state building construction, the state part system and junior college construction.

TAX ABANDONED

San Francisco has been more fortunate. Its bond limit, imposed by municipal vote, is 6 percent, and despite the tight-money situation, it has remained among the nation's cities with top credit rating, according to William Dwyer, assistant general manager for financing with the Public Utilities Commission.

"The City will be marketing \$26 million in bonds for airport expansion next January and also \$3 million for the water department," he said.

"We expect no difficulty."

Dwyer said there were a number of reasons, including the recent decision of the U.S. Senate Finance Committee to abandon a proposal to impose a tax on municipal bonds.

Also Dwyer said the airport bonds were so strongly backed by City business interests that he anticipated no problem in selling the bonds within the present rate average of 5.95 percent interest.

SOMETHING NEW

That's below the 6.37 percent national average for such bonds reached last month as banks curtailed purchases of municipals to conserve funds for loans to corporate clients.

But the state bond limit of 5 percent has created serious problems. The state even considered issuance of bond anticipation notes for such programs as the State Water Project as recently as last summer.

"We have not issued any of these nor are there any current plans to do so," a spokesman in the office of State Treasurer Ivy Baker Priest said.

This month something new was tried to help break the logjam. Three school district bonds totaling \$5,975,000 were sold at 5 percent through land developers interested in having the new construction.

There are two alternative solutions to the situation. One, to raise the interest limit to 7 percent, already has passed the Legislature but, by constitutional provision, must be approved by the electorate next June.

The other alternative is for rising inflation to be halted and decrease the high interest. President Nixon says that is in prospect.

A Bank of America authority on the bond situation, Leland S. Prussia Jr., a vice president in the investment and security division, is inclined to agree.

"We have an overheated economy," he said.

WHAT SCHOOL BONDS COST

EXAMPLES OF A \$2,000,000 BOND ISSUE AND A \$16,000,000 BOND ISSUE FOR 20- AND 25-YEAR TERMS

	Repaid at 5 percent interest		Repaid at 7 percent interest		Repaid at 8 percent interest	
	Total	Interest	Total	Interest	Total	Interest
20-year bond issue:						
\$2,000,000.....	\$3,168,000	\$1,168,000	\$3,722,420	\$1,722,420	\$4,015,240	\$2,015,240
\$16,000,000.....	25,344,000	9,344,000	29,779,360	13,779,360	32,121,920	16,121,920
25-year bond issue:						
\$2,000,000.....	3,510,000	1,510,000	4,242,000	2,242,000	4,631,000	2,631,000
\$16,000,000.....	28,080,000	12,080,000	33,936,000	17,936,000	37,048,000	21,048,000

Source: Monroe Sweetland, legislative consultant, Western State National Education Association, Burlingame, Calif.

CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION 3-YEAR CHART OF TAX AND BOND ELECTION RESULTS TAX ELECTIONS

Year	Elections held	Passed	Failed	Percent passed	Percent failed
1968-69.....	237	121	116	51.1	48.9
1967-68.....	123	81	42	65.8	34.2
1966-67.....	240	128	112	53.3	46.7

BOND ELECTIONS

Year	Elections held	Passed	Failed	Percent passed	Percent failed	Amount passed	Amount failed
1968-69.....	227	81	146	35.7	64.3	\$280,076,335	\$862,268,430
1967-68.....	175	79	96	45.1	54.9	213,216,000	329,145,870
1966-67.....	207	85	122	41.1	58.9	175,852,750	375,588,748

SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
San Jose, Calif., November 21, 1969.

Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
Legislative Consultant, National Education Association, Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR MR. SWEETLAND: In reply to your communication of November 20 relative to the ability of this district to sell bonds, we can indicate that of a \$9,500,000 bond issue voted in February 1969, we have been able to dispose of only \$2,500,000. This bond issue was voted to replace schools that do not comply with the California Field Act. Consequently, failure to dispose of the bonds at the current five per cent limitation makes it impossible for us to proceed with the implementation of replacing these pre Field Act schools.

Obviously, the district would welcome any effort on the part of the federal or state gov-

[From the Salinas (Calif.) Californian,
Nov. 25, 1969]

WASHINGTON UNION BOND VOTE CALLED

Washington Union Elementary School District trustees last night called a \$200,000 bond issue election for Feb. 17, 1970.

If the bond issue passes, it will keep the state-aided district bonded to capacity through 1970-71 and enable it to build more classrooms to keep pace with enrollment growth.

Although the district is now eligible for four classrooms, it hasn't the money to build them, because \$70,000 in bonds voted in September, 1968, are unsaleable. The district put the bonds out to bid recently at five percent interest and got no bidders.

The bonds for which the board of trustees seeks approval on Feb. 17, 1970, will bear seven percent interest and will presumably be saleable.

The board last night decided to cancel the \$70,000 in unsaleable bonds if the bond issue passes in February.

Washington Union is a state-aided school district, which must keep itself bonded to capacity to continue receiving state school building assistance.

The district grew from 452 students on Oct. 1, 1968, to 507 last Oct. 1.

ernment that would make it possible to dispose of these bonds.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. DOWNING,
Superintendent of Schools.

RINCON VALLEY UNION
SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Santa Rosa, Calif., November 21, 1969.

Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
Legislative Consultant, National Education Association, Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR SIR: At the present time the district has authorized bonds that we were unable to sell at a bond sale that was conducted on August 19, 1969. No bids were received.

We are in the process of preparing a campaign to ask the voters to authorize bonds at no more than 7% interest. This election

will be held on February 10, 1970.

Our district is growing fairly rapidly, and our housing is falling behind this growth. We are using relocatable buildings which our operating budget can ill afford. We have a building program with plans, specifications and approval, all ready to go but no funds.

Sure hope we get some help from someone, as we are not sure we can continue to pass the same bonds the second time.

Respectfully,

DOUGLAS L. WHITED,
District Superintendent.

NEVADA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Nevada City, Calif., November 24, 1969.

Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
Legislative Consultant, National Educational Association, Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR Mr. SWEETLAND: The voters authorized \$900,000 in building bonds in an election held February, 1969. State Aid was approved for \$600,000 at the same election.

We have sold \$805,000 of the bonds and are now eligible to sell the remaining \$95,000 because of increased assessed valuation. We have not been able to find buyers at the present 5% interest rate.

Our assessed valuation has risen to an amount that might cause us to lose our eligibility for state aid if we can not sell the bonds soon.

We have sixteen classes in every type of structure we can cram them—three on auditorium stages, three in the auditorium, one in a book room, one in a teachers room, three in a cafeteria, two in a converted home, one in a library, and our remaining classes are overcrowded. We have problems!

We have started construction plans but without the remainder of the bond funds and state aid we will not be able to complete our school.

Anything that can be done will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

DAN C. WOODARD,
Superintendent.

PATTERSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Patterson, Calif., November 24, 1969.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Burlingame, Calif.
(Attention Monroe Sweetland).

DEAR SIR: The Patterson Unified School District voters approved a \$1,880,000 bond issue on May 20, 1969 at a legal maximum interest rate of 5 percent. In spite of every effort at our disposal, we have not been able to sell the bonds and there are no prospects that we will.

The situation in the District is serious. Classes are meeting in multipurpose rooms and other areas not adequate for classrooms.

Many of the buildings were constructed prior to the Field Act. As an example, the high school was erected in 1914 and a large elementary school in 1921.

When the high school was built in 1914, it contained eight classrooms. Today the same building houses fifteen classrooms in the basement and other areas not adequate for classrooms.

Yours very truly,

EUGENE MAXWELL, Ed.D.,
District Superintendent.

TEMECULA UNION SCHOOL, DISTRICT,
November 24, 1969.

MONROE SWEETLAND,
National Education Association,
West Coast Region Office, Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR Mr. SWEETLAND: On December 1, 1969, the bid opening on \$90,000.00 of approved bonds will be held. We are not optimistic about our chances since other recent attempts to sell school bonds in Riverside County have failed.

Please call us December 2, for the latest development in Temecula.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY R. SMALL.

CANYON UNION SCHOOL, DISTRICT,
Lakehead, Calif., November 24, 1969.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
West Coast Regional Office,
Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR SIR: The district has not sold any of the bonds. Our prospects for selling all of the bonds are nil. We are attempting to sell a small amount of the bonds to individuals that live in the community. However, our success of selling them is problematical.

The Canyon Union School District has grown from 98 students in the 1968-69 school year to 135 students in the 1969-70 school year. Therefore, we are in need of more classroom space.

Sincerely yours,

DON GOODYKOONTZ,
Principal.

LOMA PRIETA JOINT UNION
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Los Gatos, Calif., November 24, 1969.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
West Coast Regional Office,
Burlingame, Calif.

(Attention Monroe Sweetland).

DEAR SIR: The following letter is in regards to your letter of November 20, 1969 requesting information on the bonding for school construction.

"Have you been able to sell the bonds which the voters authorized?"

In July of 1969, Loma Prieta Joint Union School District sold \$175,000 worth of bonds at 5%. The sole bidder was Bank of America. On November 18, 1969, the Loma Prieta Joint Union School District attempted to sell \$40,000 worth of bonds on a nine-year sale, first year being deferred, the next eight years of \$5,000 per year. There were no bidders on this issue.

"Can you tell us briefly what needs of the children or other situation necessitated new bonding? Is your need urgent?"

The Loma Prieta Joint Union School District has one school. This school has a capacity of approximately 380 children and at the present time we have 480 students enrolled. The former cafeteria is being used for two classrooms, and the former kitchen has been changed into a school library. The District has been having an increase in school population from 10% to 14% per year. With this continued growth, I see the possibility of double sessions within the year. I feel I can say our need is definitely urgent. I do not feel that the children in the District will benefit either from double sessions or loaded classes.

If I can be of any further assistance, please contact me.

Respectfully,

JAMES HARRINGTON,
Superintendent.

VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Vista, Calif., November 24, 1969.

Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
Legislative Consultant, National Education Association, Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR Mr. SWEETLAND: Presently we are held up on the construction of an elementary building planned for 22 classrooms and a high school of 68 classrooms, both of which are qualified for State loans if we could now sell our local bonds up to the 10% of assessed valuation. We are now short of these sales by almost \$1,000,000 and the State would loan us \$5,500,000 if they could sell bonds.

Your help would be appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

G. C. EIKERMANN,
District Superintendent.

SONORA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Sonora, Calif., November 24, 1969.

Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
National Education Association,
Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR Mr. SWEETLAND: In answer to your query of November 20, 1969, we wish to advise that we did pass our bond issue, however, since we were unable to sell our bonds at the 5% interest rate, we are going to go back to the voters on December 16 for permission to sell the bonds at 7% interest.

We are presently leasing 19 relocatable classrooms to fill our present needs.

Sincerely,

PAUL MIEROP,
District Superintendent.

MURRAY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Dublin, Calif., November 24, 1969.

Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
Legislative Consultant, National Education Association, Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR Mr. SWEETLAND: In April, the voters of the Murray School District authorized the sale of \$750,000 in local construction bonds. These bonds were to bear an interest of 5%.

In August, the legislature authorized districts, by a vote of the people, to sell bonds at 7%. Shortly thereafter, we received a letter from the Bank of America announcing their decision to discontinue the practice of bidding on school issues. As they have been the only bidder on such issues, it was decided not to put the bonds on the market. Consequently, we have scheduled an election to authorize \$1,500,000 in bonds at a 7% rate. This election is scheduled for December 16.

The Murray District is a rapidly growing suburban district. Our growth has been about fifteen or twenty per cent each year. We have grown from 50 students to over 5000 in eight years. Currently, we have twenty rooms of children in rented facilities, some of them substandard. Our projections indicate that we will need at least one new school per year for the next five or six years.

Our Board and Administration have worked hard to remain off double sessions. Being a low-wealth district, we are dependent upon State School Building aid. The State's inability to sell bonds has caused State funds to be unavailable.

At the present time, we have two complete schools qualified that we cannot build, due to a lack of State and local funds. I estimate that our program has been set back at least eighteen months and, perhaps longer. The situation is black, indeed.

Sincerely,

KENNETH D. BRADSHAW,
Superintendent.

SAN PASQUAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Escondido, Calif., November 24, 1969.

Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
National Education Association,
Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR Mr. SWEETLAND: The following information is submitted in reply to your letter of November 20, 1969:

1. Have you been able to sell the bonds which the voters authorized? If not, what are your prospects?

Answer: No, we are having another bond election on Dec. 9.

2. Can you tell us briefly what needs of the children or other situation necessitated new bonding? Is your need urgent? (We want to inform the Congress of the nature of the local need for new construction.) Copies of the campaign folders or letters from the Bond Campaign might be useful in this connection.

Answer: Increased enrollment. We have 3 teachers and only 2 classrooms.

SANTA BARBARA JUNIOR CITY COLLEGE,
Santa Barbara, Calif., November 24, 1969,
Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
National Education Association,
Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR MR. SWEETLAND: The following information is submitted in reply to your letter of November 20, 1969:

1. Have you been able to sell the bonds which the voters authorized? If not, what are your prospects?

Answer: \$1,500,000 Bank of America, August 1969, 5%.

2. Can you tell us briefly what needs of the children or other situation necessitated new bonding? Is your need urgent? (We want to inform the Congress of the nature of the local need for new construction.) Copies of the campaign folders or letters from the Bond Campaign might be useful in this connection.

Answer: \$4,000,000 outstanding. Urgent need to meet union enrollment requirements. If interest rate does not recede below 5%, will have to submit 7% interest rate to the people.

Sincerely yours,

JULIO BARTOLAZZO,
Superintendent.

EVERGREEN SCHOOL DISTRICT,
San Jose, Calif., November 24, 1969.
Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
Legislative Consultant, National Education
Association, Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR MR. SWEETLAND: In answer to the questions in your letter of November 20, 1969, regarding the delay in needed school construction due to the inability to sell school bonds at the current interest rate, I submit the following:

1. We have not been able to sell the bonds which the voters authorized by an 84% approval at the April 15, 1969 election due to the fact of the limit of 5% interest. However, we are holding an election on December 9 asking the voters to increase the interest rate of 7% on those bonds authorized at the April 15 election.

2. Our construction needs are very urgent. We are a fast growing school district experiencing additional enrollment of 500-600 children each year. Therefore, we need to build a minimum of one school building or 30,000 square feet of classroom space per year. Currently, we had planned to call for bids on 30,000 square feet of space in October or November, but unfortunately, due to the inability to sell local school bonds and the State's inability to do the same, our school building program is at a standstill.

Our District is located on the southside of San Jose in an area which has been primarily agricultural oriented, however, it is rapidly becoming a suburban area of San Jose. In the past 7 years we have constructed 6 schools and during the periods of 1970-1975, we expect to build or have need to build an additional 10 schools. Our enrollment is estimated to be 9,416 in September 1976.

Enclosed is a copy of our letter to Parents and Voters used in the April 15, 1969, Bond Election Campaign.

Sincerely,

GEORGE V. LEY, VA,
District Superintendent.

SCHOOL BOND ELECTION, TUESDAY, APRIL
15, 1969

DEAR PARENT AND VOTER: The purpose of the information included in this printed material is to better acquaint you with the School Board Bond Election to be held Tuesday, April 15, 1969.

1. To permit the District and Board of Trustees to issue and sell Local School Bonds

up to \$2,000,000 for the construction of elementary school buildings and the purchase of land for school sites.

2. To authorize the District to accept State Loans up to \$8,000,000 (as needed) for school buildings and land.

WHY IS THIS BOND ELECTION NECESSARY?

Evergreen School District has had increased enrollments of 19.5% to 27% over the past three years, or a total of 1150 youngsters.

New construction of subdivisions and the Eastridge Shopping Center is expected to increase our Assessed Valuations by 20-25%.

Evergreen School District will continue to qualify for State Loans up to \$8,000,000 as needed; ONLY if the District remains Bonded to Capacity as required by law.

Increase in home construction is currently requiring your DISTRICT to plan and build 1½ schools per year to accommodate Pupil Enrollment.

It is predicted that by 1970 your District will have to build 2 to 3 new schools per year.

Therefore, ten new K-6 schools and another 7th-8th intermediate school will be necessary to accommodate expected enrollments of 9100 youngsters by September 1975.

Purchase school sites in advance of construction will result in substantial Savings to Taxpayers.

BONDS ARE THE FAIR WAY

School bonds are the fair way to finance and provide schools for your children, now and in the future. The only other way to finance the construction of schools is a "pay as you go" tax increase plan. This certainly would be an "unfair" financing plan for it would place all the burden on current residents, and would not allow for fair sharing of costs of schools by the thousands of people who will move into the Evergreen Area in the next few years.

LOCAL SCHOOL BOND REQUIREMENT

For school construction and school site acquisitions, State Law only allows taxpayers of a school district to bond the district up to a maximum of 5% of the district's Assessed Valuation.

Therefore!! If we apply the 5% law to our estimated assessed valuation, we could realize approximately \$315,000 per year.

However, to provide school sites and buildings for two schools per year, it will cost approximately \$1,430,000.

Therefore, you can see Local Bonds on a pay as you go basis would not allow the District to construct the necessary school facilities needed in our growing District, and would force us to go on "Double Sessions."

But, by passing the State Aid Building Loan (proposition 2 on your ballot) along with the Local Bonds, the State of California will allow us to borrow the additional funds needed and provide the necessary schools.

WHAT IS THE STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LOAN?

The State School Building Fund is the result of a State Bond Election of \$250,000,000 approved by the voters of California. This money is available to districts who are unable to finance their own school construction and purchase school sites from the revenue from local bonds. The Evergreen School District is unable to finance the building of new schools and acquire sites from local bond sales; therefore, we must depend on the State School Building Loan Program.

In order to provide the necessary school facilities for the children of Evergreen School District, we ask you to authorize your Board to borrow up to \$8,000,000 of State Funds.

A yes vote is needed on both issues so that your children may benefit from available State Funds already approved by You!! A ½ vote is necessary!!

HOW WILL THE DISTRICT SPEND AUTHORIZED BOND AND STATE AID?

Immediate needs

1. Continue to sell required "Local Bonds" to maintain the District's eligibility for State Loans.

2. Construct the District's eight K-6 school by May 1970. Also, provide 12 additional classrooms, lockers and showers and a multi-use facility at Quimby Oak Intermediate School.

3. Purchase three additional K-6 school sites, and develop working drawings for two more K-6 schools to be constructed by August 1971.

Future needs to 1975

1. Construct eight additional K-6 schools and one intermediate 7th-8th grade school.
2. Purchase additional school sites in advance of construction schedule.

HOW MUCH WILL IT COST?

The present tax rate for the repayment of Bonds is 46¢ and 15¢ for State Loans. These figures should remain fairly constant because the formula for State Aided School Districts set a "Maximum" tax for repayments of loans and bonds. However, we estimate a 4¢ increase per \$100 of Assessed Valuation.

EXAMPLE

Four cents per \$100 of Assessed Valuation = Increased in Taxes Per Year
\$18,000 Home assessed at \$4,500 × .04 = \$1.80 tax increase
\$28,000 Home assessed at \$7,000 × .04 = \$2.80 tax increase

YOU HAVE ASKED?

I thought I just voted on a Bond Election February 11, 1969?

Answer: Yes, you did vote for the East Side High School District Bond Election, February 11, 1969. However, these bonds approved by the voters were for the construction of high school facilities only.

What happens if the School Bond Election fails to pass?

Answer: The building program will be delayed longer and schools will not be built at our present schedule. This would result in half-day sessions in the future, which would harm your child's "Educational Opportunity."

Why does it take so long to build schools?

Answer: The State building program is conservative and schools cannot be built before children are enrolled or houses in the district are under construction. Also, your approval of Local Bonds and State Loans is necessary to continue the District's Building Program.

What happens if Evergreen doesn't grow as predicted?

Answer: The Local Bonds will not be sold and we will not borrow any money from the State School Building Fund until the need exists.

WHEATLAND HIGH SCHOOL,

Wheatland, Calif., November 26, 1969.
Mr. MONROE SWEETLAND,
National Education Association,
West Coast Regional Office,
Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR MR. SWEETLAND: 1. Wheatland Union High School District passed its third bond issue in the past ten years in May of 1969.

2. Bids were not received at the time of the called sale which was August 1969.

3. Our prospects to sell these bonds at the present time appear to be very dismal.

4. What are our needs? The need of this district is most urgent. We have No. 1 priority under School House Building laws of the State of California with 221 points. What this means is that currently the district is the highest rated district in the State of California by the State system of rating. (In need for building.)

5. Our need is urgent! We are on a triple session schedule with students coming to school at 8:00, 9:00 and 10:00 in the morning and going home beginning with 2:00 p.m. and at 3:00 p.m., 4:00 p.m., and 5:00 p.m.

6. In our case 78 students out of each 100 are connected with the military base. The Congress has appropriated no money at all to pay their share of the bill under Public Law 815. The State of California has approved us for \$1,400,000 when and if we can sell our bonds.

With our school 78% impacted why should the remaining 22% who are the property owners in the district vote bonds to build a school? Well, the people did vote them and they passed by five votes; despite the 2/3 majority necessary and now—we cannot sell the bonds.

Very sincerely,

VICTOR C. LEDBETTER,
Superintendent.

SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Santee, Calif., November 25, 1969.

MONROE SWEETLAND,
National Education Association,
West Coast Regional Office,
Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR MR. SWEETLAND: In reply to your November 20, 1969 letter requesting facts relative to the recently approved Bond Authorization, the Santee School District held a bond election on April 15, 1969. This election was successful in that 75% of the voters authorized a \$3,000,000 bond issue to cover construction in the school district for a period of eight to ten years. This bond issue was at 5% and we were suddenly faced with the situation that bonds could not be sold at this interest rate.

The Santee School District is located approximately twenty miles east of San Diego City in San Diego County. It is considered a bedroom community with very low assessed valuation (\$4.00 per a.d.a.) and is unable to provide the necessary construction for school facilities without help from the State of California. Even by bonding to capacity the district does not have sufficient funds to construct needed school facilities. There is tremendous growth in the area in that 300 new students have enrolled since the last day of school in June. We expect another 500 students prior to the end of the 1969-70 school year.

The District Board of Education, realizing the problem that we are faced with, has ordered another bond election to be held on December 9 to authorize a \$3,000,000 bond issue at 7%, hoping that we can be successful and thereby put the district in the position to start construction of schools as soon as the state can solve its problems of providing bond money. As you know, the state has an issue on the June 2 ballot to raise the interest rate to sell state bonds. However, the district feels helpless in trying to solve the problem of providing facilities for school children in the area in that if the State Proposition is successful it is our understanding that a school district such as ours could not receive the state aid that is necessary for the construction of facilities prior to September 1971.

With the type of growth we are experiencing in this small school district, you can understand that the problem has just begun if we are forced to wait until September 1971 to build any new facilities. We currently have one school on double session and will most probably establish double sessions at two other schools prior to February of 1970. I think you can quickly see the difficult position that our school district is in and can appreciate the hardships the students in our district will have to experience during the next two years, which should be avoided, if at all possible.

If there is additional information needed to support your request for federal action to assist public agencies to finance needed improvements, we will be happy to provide it. You can see that our need is urgent.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. SKIDMORE,
District Superintendent.

ESCONDIDO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Escondido, Calif., November 25, 1969.

MONROE SWEETLAND,
National Education Association,
Burlingame, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: Following are our answers to the two questions asked in your letter of November 20:

1. We have \$2,000,000 of unissued five percent interest bonds, passed by the voters April 15, 1969. We are presently attempting to sell through the San Diego County Board of Supervisors \$385,000 of these bonds.

The Bank of America, our only buyer, has written a letter saying they will not bid. The Board of Supervisors has tried to discourage us, but our Governing Board is going ahead, mainly to prove to the voters that five percent bonds will not sell.

2. The Escondido Union School District is growing at the rate of about one school every eighteen months. We are already six or eight months behind in our schedule, due both to our and the State's bond selling ability.

Our need for new bonds (seven percent interest bearing) is urgent. We intend to have another bond election on March 17, 1970, probably for \$2,000,000 again. We must have salable bonds in order to stay bonded to capacity (five percent of our assessed valuation) in order to qualify for State Aid funds.

By the time our bond issue is passed and the bonds have been sold we will be over a year behind our building needs, and we will have additional double sessions above the 35 or 40 we now have.

Very truly yours,

T. F. MILLER,
Financial Director.

NEWPORT-MESA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Newport Beach, Calif., November 26, 1969.

MR. MONROE SWEETLAND,
National Education Association,
Burlingame, Calif.

DEAR MR. SWEETLAND: The following information is submitted in reply to your letter of November 20, 1969.

In February 1969, voters of the Newport-Mesa Unified School District approved a fifteen million nine hundred thousand dollar bond issue. Since that time, the district has been able to sell only six million nine hundred thousand dollars and this on a single and, we believe, somewhat gratuitous bid from the Bank of America of exactly 5%, the maximum authorized interest rate. We now see no possibility whatever of selling the remaining nine million dollars at 5% interest in the foreseeable future.

This is a growing school district and sale of the remaining bonds in the immediate future is essential if the district is to provide adequate facilities for a steadily growing enrollment.

On February 10, 1970, the district is going to seek voter approval for the sale of the remaining nine million dollars in bonds previously approved at an interest rate not to exceed 7%, the newly established maximum allowable in the State of California. Should voter approval not be forthcoming, the district's ability to meet the educational needs of the community in the near future will be severely impaired.

Sincerely,

ROY O. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant,
School Facilities.

TRUCKDRIVING PROGRAM

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1970

MR. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, there are so many discouraging notes sounded these days about the future of America's cities, that it is always refreshing to see and be a part of a vigorous, young project that seems destined to succeed in assisting in the solution of these multifarious ills.

Such a project will be beginning soon in Cleveland. It is a job-training program in truckdriving for young inner-city men. The idea was conceived by Mr. George Purefoy, a Cleveland postal official, and the program will be directed by Mr. Craft Carter, Jr., a former city councilman. It will be located at Cleveland's Cuyahoga Community College, and has the complete cooperation of the school, the trucking industry, and the Teamsters Union. Joint funding from the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare should be announced in the near future.

I relate the parties involved, Mr. Speaker, because I want my colleagues to note the diversity of men and groups dedicated to making this project a success. My congratulations and best wishes to each of them. If more projects in our urban areas could elicit this kind of total cooperation, I am certain we would all have a greater amount of good news to report.

The following is a radio and television editorial concerning the school recently broadcast by WJW in Cleveland. I include it in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

A CLASSIC EXAMPLE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING

In a recent editorial, we called for greatly increased vocational education in Ohio to prepare our young people who don't go to college for the countless skilled jobs that are available.

A classic example of the importance of training people for jobs that require special skills can be found at Cuyahoga Community College. About 20 young men are currently enrolled in a truck driver training program that will last two months and will lead to a union job in the trucking industry at a starting salary of about \$10,000.

This new course, the only one of its kind in Ohio, is the brainchild of George Purefoy, an official of the U.S. Post Office in Cleveland. We commend him for his efforts, and former Cleveland city councilman Craft Carter, Jr., who directs the program.

The cooperation of the trucking industry, the Teamsters Union and Cuyahoga Community College also is noteworthy. Vocational training programs of this nature are essential in the fight against unemployment.

At a time when thousands of skilled jobs go begging, every effort should be made to provide the training that is necessary to fill these jobs. Effective vocational education in our high schools can open the door to a meaningful, good-paying job for the student who cannot or does not want to go to college.

Because our society is essentially college oriented, we are faced with a great shortage of skilled workers in dozens of different trades, many of which now pay far better than some of those prestige white-collar jobs.

In short, vocational training should be im-

proved and expanded in Ohio. It must become a major part of our educational system.

HOUSING CRISIS—30 YEARS OF SOCIALIST FAILURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our people are being deluged with propaganda to the effect that there is a desperate housing shortage, especially in the cities and in the so-called ghettos which we used to call slums. The same propaganda barrage calls for the expected solution—huge expenditures of taxpayers' funds from the Federal level. The theory seems to be that honest citizens who are working for a living have an obligation to house the parasites in the style to which they would like to become accustomed, even if it means that the workers themselves cannot afford to care for their own homes.

It is about time that someone is honest enough to tell the American people that economics is governed by definite laws and that the violation of those laws results in disaster. When we violate any natural law, we pay the price. There are no smart words which will make water run uphill and there are no clever schemes which will produce something for nothing.

The physical deterioration of the housing in our cities is the direct, expected, and oft-predicted result of such dishonest economics as rent controls, rattle-rousing demagogues, subsidized dwellings, and planned obsolescence. Urban renewal and the ward politics of the cities play their role. More infusion of the hard-earned dollars of working citizens will not extinguish the flames, but will only make rich politicians worsen the real problem.

While free enterprise is admittedly not perfection, it has always proven to be infinitely superior to socialized housing under any name. I include newspaper clippings which show the total failure of the very measures loudly proposed to correct the same conditions which they caused:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 19, 1970]

HOUSING SHORTAGE BECOMES PROBLEM FOR MANY IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Leroy Pope)

NEW YORK.—A generation ago finding a place to live was the least of the average American's worries. Today it's likely to be his biggest headache.

The reason is that housing has become the nation's sickest industry. It is falling short of meeting pent up demand by an estimated 1 million units a year and many in the business blame the federal government.

No one appears to believe the private building industry can do anything to cure the housing shortage in the face of inflation and tight money without federal subsidies and government leadership.

The criticism falls on Congress and on

George Romney, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who only recently got around to serious negotiations with prospective mass producers of modular housing.

Typical is the view of Samuel Paul, a New York architect. He presently has in the works public and private apartment building projects which will house 25,000 persons in the Northeastern and Middle Atlantic states.

Paul says Romney's long range policies are commendable but that he is putting too much faith in prefabricated and factory-built modular housing and in radical changes.

"What is needed from Washington is more funding and less red tape for immediate projects under Sections 235 and 236 of the housing code, which provide interest subsidies on mortgages of new homes and new rental properties," Paul said.

HUD DENIES PREFAB BIAS

At least 40 percent of urgent housing demand not being met is in lower middle class brackets, houses and apartments in the \$17,000 to \$22,000 range, to be built by traditional methods, he said.

HUD denies it is putting too many eggs in the prefab or very low income housing baskets. For the fiscal year that began last July 1, the authorization for public housing is \$473.5 million. For rent subsidies, it is \$50 million. For interest subsidies under Sections 235 and 236, the authorizations are \$90 million and \$85 million, respectively.

On the other hand, only \$15 million has been authorized for operation breakthrough Romney's long range plan to turn out mass produced low cost factory housing. "So," said a HUD spokesman, "the bulk of our money is going into low-and-middle-income housing."

This doesn't satisfy critics like Paul. They think the Nixon administration should break out a crash program to build interest subsidized rental housing because anything like a reasonable supply of rental housing is fast becoming only a memory in much of the country.

BRITISH TOWNS CITED

Another critic of HUD is Joseph Timan, head of Horizon Corp of Tucson, a major developer. Timan blames Congress more than Romney. "Our whole national housing and taxing policy discourages the building of rental housing for the poor and lower middle classes," he said.

Timan would like to see the Nixon administration do more to push federally subsidized rental housing and follow the example of the British in developing towns complete with industries.

"We should move the industries into the new towns and create one or more permanent jobs right in the community for each new housing unit put up, as the English do," he said. "Instead we are building luxury communities for the rich."

The sickness of the housing industry hinges on high interest. The National Association of Home Builders points out that a 5½ percent mortgage a few years ago with a monthly payment of \$100 would buy a \$16,280 house. At today's rate of 9 percent, the \$100 a month will buy only \$11,916 worth of house. This falls 25 to 50 percent short of meeting the needs of a lower middle class family.

[From Newsweek magazine, Jan. 12, 1970]

HOLLOW SHELLS

"It used to be," said one Atlanta landlord, "that you could make a fortune in slum housing. But now the tenants tear up the place as fast as you fix it up. The city gets

on your back and you just can't afford to keep it up. Every time you fix up a place the insurance and taxes go up. You've only got two choices: either raise the rent—and then people have to move out—or tear it down."

To most people, such a view of housing the poor is cynical in the extreme. But to knowledgeable real-estate men, the Atlanta landlord is simply retelling a truth that has been apparent for years: it is no longer profitable to house the urban poor—even by housing them badly. In the face of the worst housing crisis in history, the number of slum buildings abandoned by their owners as a bad investment is reaching catastrophic proportions, and the trend has yet to reach its height.

In Chicago, 140 landlords walk away from their buildings every month. In Baltimore, 4,000 structures now sit idle. In Boston, 1,000 dwelling units have been abandoned. In New York, where whole stretches of the Bedford-Stuyvesant ghetto look like Berlin the day after World War II, 100,000 individual apartments were left to rot in the years between 1965 and 1968. Since then, the rate has increased to a point where each year landlords jettison enough buildings in New York to house the entire population of Jersey City—275,000 people. "We've thrown away more housing in the past few years," says Frank S. Kristof, director of housing research for the New York State Urban Development Corp., "than we destroyed in twenty years of slum clearance."

Reasons for the increase in abandonment become quickly apparent from the economics of slum ownership. According to housing experts, the big operators left the slums ten or fifteen years ago, turning over to small-timers a dilapidated supply of housing that had already been milked dry. At the same time, cities began enforcing housing codes more stringently, and the new owners found themselves financially unable to keep up. Costs of rehabilitation have skyrocketed (a Rand Corporation project director estimates that in New York it takes \$24 a room a month to keep a slum tenement up to snuff), while rent control or ghetto economics make rental income a static figure.

As a result, many slum landlords resort to what is called "dead ending" their buildings—stopping all repairs, failing to pay taxes and hoping the city will delay taking over the building until they recoup their investment from rents. In Boston, this means three years; in New York, four. "I haven't paid taxes on some of my buildings for two years," says Bronx landlord Jacob Haimowitz. "Now I'm beginning to get my original investment back, since I don't plan to make any repairs. As far as I'm concerned the city can take them after another two years."

Abandonment, thus, is the final step, a circumstance that leaves hapless tenants high and dry without essential services. Until they can find other quarters, some residents of abandoned tenements in New York have been known to descend to the street every day to draw water from fire hydrants. Those who have no place to go often hang on, enduring the vandals who rip up vacant apartments for the valuable brass and lead plumbing, the junkies who haunt the deserted hallways and the rats and vermin until they can stand it no longer.

HULKS

Solutions to the problem are woefully inadequate. In Chicago, a nonprofit organization has begun taking over abandoned buildings and fixing them up. But while the Chicago Dwelling Association started renovation work in 247 structures last year, 1,000 more were plowed under. Other cities are trying to fix the buildings themselves. Baltimore is using Federal money to renovate 1,400

deteriorated houses at a cost of \$13,400 each. But skeptics see little future in spending that much money on isolated houses when surrounding hulks sell for \$3,000 and the economics of the surrounding slum continues to drag down the whole area.

As some experts see it, one possibility for relief lies in a sort of urban homesteading law, similar to one proposed last year by Sen. —. Under this proposal, poor people themselves could take over abandoned buildings, and with low-cost government construction loans and looser housing-code enforcement, make them reasonably fit for human habitation. As it stands now, money can often be found for buying buildings, but precious little is available for renovation.

Few housing experts, however, see even a homesteading act as a permanent solution. "The bulk of improved housing for the poor," says George Sternlieb, director of the Urban Studies Center at Rutgers University, "has always come in a trickle-down way from increased housing for the middle-class, and I'm afraid it will always be that way. When you try to provide new housing for the poor, you either end up with prohibitive costs or high-rise jails."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 16 1969]

PUBLIC HOUSING: IT MAKES ANIMALS OUT OF PEOPLE

(By Robert C. Maynard)

Garbage is scattered in the stairwells. Acres of windows are broken. Even at noon there is an empty silence.

The place is the Pruitt-Igoe Public-housing development, home to more than 4,000 St. Louis poor people who say they are ashamed of where they live but they can find no better place.

Often the water pipes burst because large portions of Pruitt-Igoe are unoccupied and therefore heatless. Sometimes, when the pipes burst, two inches of water stand on the floors of some apartments and the garbage-laden staircases become totally impassable.

Pruitt-Igoe was built in 1954 as a series of modern high-rise towers to house low-income families. Today it has become synonymous with the worst of public housing in the United States.

EFFECT ON TENANTS

It is not just the physical appearance of the place (not more than a dozen window panes are intact in some buildings). It is also the effect the atmosphere has on the residents of Pruitt-Igoe that has caused deep concern in St. Louis and elsewhere among those who know public housing.

St. Louis Mayor A. J. Cervantes has called the housing complex "a terrible mistake."

But there are others who argue that what has happened to Pruitt-Igoe happens in one degree or another to just about all public housing in this country, that public housing bears in its design and population pattern the seeds of certain social disaster.

Jean King, the brilliant black woman who led the successful rent strike against the St. Louis Public Housing Authority, dismisses those who deplore Pruitt-Igoe with an impatient wave of the hand.

"The rest of them," Mrs. King says, "are just as bad as Pruitt-Igoe. It's a concentration camp. They all are. It's wrong for people to be stocked up like that."

A SERIES OF ZOOS

And Chicago Judge Franklin I. Kral, a specialist in urban housing problems, says:

"Just about all public housing is a series of zoos. It makes animals out of people."

George Orwell in England and Hubert Selby in the United States are two of the writers—from vastly different perspectives—

who have decried the effect of public housing on the spirits of the inhabitants, but the issue has only recently surfaced in this country.

The issue is likely to grow for several reasons.

One of them is the emergence of the tenants' rights movement, many of whose members are living in public housing and are demanding that it should be much more like home than it is. For one thing, public housing costs a minimum of a fourth of the income of its residents, about the proportion of income that middle class people pay for rent.

NIXON HOUSING AIDE

Another reason public housing is gaining attention is Lawrence Morgan Cox, President Nixon's director of renewal and housing assistance, which covers public housing. Cox, a Norfolk native, is a public housing administrator of years' standing, mainly in Norfolk.

He is a man with some very definite ideas about public housing and most of them bring the blood of tenant activists to a vigorous boil.

Tony Henry, long a social action organizer in Chicago and for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, has some ideas of his own on public housing. Henry is director of the National Tenants Organization, the umbrella for the growing tenant activist movement.

WHO SHOULD BE ACCEPTED?

The two disagree most vigorously over the question of who should be permitted to live in public housing.

Cox first:

"St. Louis had the policy of accommodating the lowest of the low in its public housing, and you can't disassociate that fact from what happened to Pruitt-Igoe.

"I cannot find any hope for a public housing community to be comfortable as a place to live if it is going to bear the stigma of being a welfare concentration camp. Why should people have to bear that stigma? Why do we have to put them all together?"

"With the tremendous demand for housing in St. Louis, 900 units of housing in Pruitt-Igoe were vacant. I suggest to you that these units were less desirable because of the conditions in the project.

"Now, what relationship did the high percentage of abnormal families have to those conditions in that project?"

Tenant organizer Henry:

"He is correct, public housing was not originally aimed at the permanently poor class, which is a class that is newly recognized in this country. Initially, the program was for upwardly mobile whites, temporary people. As the housing authorities began to admit low-income blacks—not "abnormal" families—they began to realize they were dealing with the permanently poor."

STIGMA FROM POOR

Cox feels the "permanently poor" should be only a portion of the public-housing mixture, that too many of them—he doesn't specify—will bring a stigma to the housing project and lower the incentive of those living there to find decent housing elsewhere.

Henry feels:

"There should be some economic mix in all neighborhoods. For example, Watergate should be 20 per cent poor. However, since that concept has not developed yet, poor people have to be housed somewhere and the only program, inadequate as it is, that comes anywhere near meeting the need is public housing."

Henry's solution is a massive building program coupled with a requirement that all newly constructed housing complexes be required to provide a fifth of their units to

poor people, subsidized by the government if the rent exceeds 25 per cent of their income.

"When that kind of commitment is taken on by the nation," Henry says, "then we can talk about diversifying the income of people in public housing because there will be adequate housing for the poor elsewhere."

THREAT TO STABILITY

Until then, Henry argues, the major concern should be on housing poor people because the lack of housing is "merely aggravating the social stability of the community as a whole."

Cox points out that the fiscal soundness of public housing—the need to charge adequate rent and the ability of the tenant to pay it—would be enhanced by having some solvent tenants among public housing residents.

The adequate rent problem may be on the way to a solution. A House-Senate conference has accepted an amendment by Sen. — that provides a federal payment to housing authorities for those tenants whose rents exceed 25 per cent of their income. Until the Brooke amendment, housing authorities either took the loss or charged rents that often far exceeded 25 per cent of the incomes of many of their tenants.

Cox maintains that public housing "is not welfare and was never intended to be welfare. That was not the intent of the legislature when they created public housing."

There is some evidence that public housing is beginning to be accepted as the servant of the permanently poor. Its quality and the quality of its maintenance, first of all, give every evidence of being geared to those who must take what they can get. Whether public or private, the low-income housing market in the United States is one in which competition by raising the quality and lowering the cost is unheard of.

Further evidence of the accommodation of public housing to the permanently poor is the extent to which the poor are clamoring for a voice in policy-making—and beginning to get it. Boston has a majority of tenants on its public-housing board and other cities are considering similar moves. St. Louis, however, is the most cited example because it is the scene of the most dramatic housing stories of the century.

INCREASE SPARKS STRIKE

A rent increase last January that would have carried rents for some families to 72 per cent of their income was the last straw for tenants who said they had been putting up with very haphazard management in any case. The rent strike in St. Louis went through most of October, but in the last couple of days of that month, Mayor Cervantes announced the strike was over and the tenants and their supporters were in charge of the board of commissioners of St. Louis Housing Authority.

Not surprisingly, the first move of the victors was to lower their rents, where applicable, to 25 per cent of their incomes, and less for unemployed people.

But after the exultation, the serious question remained whether local control of public housing will solve any of the problems.

CONDITIONS ARE DISCOURAGING

Conditions at Pruitt-Igoe are discouraging to consider in that regard.

Ivory Perry is a tenant organizer with a St. Louis community center. Ruth Thomas is the mother of four sons and a part-time tenant organizer. She lives in Pruitt-Igoe. So does Mattie Mason, another tenant organizer.

They took a newsman on a tour recently. It began at noon on a grey fall day. The wind had a mean kick to it. Trash and dust swept across the vacant front parking lots and drives.

But the big first impression is of the enor-

mous number of broken windows, hundreds and hundreds of them.

As the visitor stood staring at the acres of broken glass, Ivory Perry tugged at his arm. "Don't stand out there like that in the open, brother. These dudes'll start snipin in a minute." Several persons, for reasons that are not altogether clear, have been shot on Pruitt-Igoe's grounds.

ASSAILED BY ODOR

In a vestibule the first of the odors assailed the visitor, a mixture of garbage, urine and other decaying things. The hallways, the stairwells, the doorways, all of them crammed with refuse.

"My sister lives on the eighth floor," Ruth Thomas said in a soft voice. "Wanna go see her?"

The group started for the stairway that leads to the sister's apartment and stopped cold, literally. Water was pouring from everywhere. A water main had been broken for days, making the stairway impassable without full flood gear.

"On my sister's floor," Ruth Thomas announced, "there is two inches of water on the floor. I mean you have to walk around in rubbers all of the time."

Mattie Mason had heard all of this before and she was bitter. "People don't have no place to go, no place. It's live here like an animal or don't live nowhere," she said.

Mattie Mason is what the old folks used to call "stout," solidly built and obviously a veteran of many troubled scenes. "I was here when it was mostly white," she said in her heavy voice. "They took pretty good care of it then, but then it got to be mostly colored, seemed like they didn't give a damn no more."

[From Life Lines, Jan. 21, 1970]

HOUSING IN A WELFARE STATE: HOW SOCIALISM DEPRIVES THE PEOPLE (By Nils-Eric Brodin)

(NOTE.—Swedish-born Nils-Eric Brodin has written widely on social, religious and political topics in both Swedish and American journals. He is Founder and former Director of the Center for Conservative Studies at Stanford University, and a former Western Director of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute.)

One of the first things young men and women will do in today's Sweden on going to work after graduating from high school is to place their names on a waiting list for an apartment. There are in Sweden today more than 400,000 persons on such lists. In Stockholm the waiting time may be 10 or 11 years. This long wait may be responsible for the relatively late age at which Swedish couples get married.

During their waiting period they live in crowded conditions with their families, or they rent rooms at high prices, or they occupy wholly unsatisfactory housing units. It is significant that the housing shortage primarily hits the young families.

But the old are also affected. Of the 800,000 pensioners in Sweden, no less than 130,000 are living in apartments or rooms without a bath. Forty percent of these apartments do not even have a flush toilet. Every third Swede wants to move away from his present apartment, often into something larger or more modern. It has been estimated that the size of apartments in Sweden is smaller than anywhere else in Europe. No less than 450,000 families with more than one child are living in apartments with only two rooms and a kitchen. As a result of the housing shortage the black market is flourishing with an "under the table" tab of more than \$2,000 per room for a tenancy lease.

There is a new aristocracy in Sweden, a so-called housing aristocracy. These "aristocrats" own homes or apartments, which they can sublet or rent at a tremendous profit

while they themselves live elsewhere, often in other countries. In fact, rental of rooms in apartments has become such a big business that in central Stockholm there are 22,000 persons whose rental payments for a room cover the rent for the entire apartment. Thus, 23,000 landladies and their families live free free of charge.

How could conditions such as these arise in a modern society with no lack of building material, or skilled labor, and which suffered no damage as a result of the last two wars?

The answer is to be found in the socialists' dogmatic insistence that housing is within the jurisdiction of the state, or possibly some cooperative organization under the control of the central government. It has recently been restated that it is still a socialist policy that private ownership of land is inherently evil. The central government has encouraged municipalities to take over land wherever possible. A recent law has been passed which demands that any sale of property be first submitted to the municipality if it is valued at over \$40,000 or exceeds a size of 3,000 square meters.

The continued government interference in housing has brought about a reduction in housing built by the private sector from 80 percent to less than 20 percent. The government is also discouraging the practice of owning one's own home, and privately owned units have declined from 80 to 55 percent of the total. The government would rather have the people rent units which are owned by municipal or central governments, or owned by the cooperatives, or other so-called "non-profit" housing-owners. Many of these "non-profit" organizations are owned by labor unions, especially in the building unions. With the majority of the renters associated (often compulsorily) with the Renters' Association, which has ideological ties with the socialist government, it is understandable why the socialists are discouraging privately owned and privately built housing units.

The state has extended its control over the building industry through stiff rental control laws in effect since 1942 and by a stiff licensing system. The system of double licensing required hard-to-get permission from the government for a building permit and then for permission to employ labor. Finally, since the government has close control over all loans for building, including those issued by private banks, it can select those projects which may be financed through loans. At its annual meeting in June, 1968, the Socialist Party proposed to establish a state-owned, building-credit bank, taking financing for housing completely away from commercial banks and thus assuring even greater control by the state over housing.

Recently, after two decades of pressure by the democratic opposition, the socialists agreed to submit a bill to the parliament revoking the unrealistic and unpopular rent controls. Then at the last moment, at the behest of the Communist Party, on whom the socialists are increasingly dependent, the bill was removed.

The critical housing situation has greatly aggravated the already existing social ills in Sweden. Overcrowded family dwellings have pushed young people into the streets, and it is no accident that Sweden has the highest increase in juvenile delinquency and crime in the world. Tight housing has also caused severe domestic tensions. The divorce rate rose from 26 per 100,000 in 1925 to 119 in 1964. In the case of divorces or separations, the husband has often been forced to accept housing in so-called "bachelor hotels," a euphemistic name for a mission dormitory. The prevalence of narcotic addicts and alcoholics in these hotels has contributed substantially to the soaring crime rate.

Another curious side effect of the housing

situation is what in effect amounts to religious discrimination. Long committed to the total secularization of the state, the socialists are practicing a policy in which they regard churches and chapels as "nonessential" buildings. Recently, because of the rights of municipal pre-emption, a Free Evangelical Church and a Roman Catholic Church were forced to vacate buildings and sites they had occupied for a hundred years. They were each given choices of two sites outside of the city on which to build. A 25 percent tax of the value of the new edifices was imposed, making it impossible for them to build. This high tax apparently does not affect the State Lutheran Church. They have recently built four new churches in the Stockholm area alone, but there are also complaints among the State Lutherans of inadequate and antiquated church facilities.

It is a conscious policy of the government to discourage private ownership of housing and of land. The municipal pre-emption rights have recently been extended, and in the case of one denomination in Sweden, no less than seven chapels have thus been "expropriated." Older villas in central areas are also a favorite target of this type of "urban renewal." Checking the largest daily newspapers in Sweden, one will find perhaps no more than 10 apartments and houses for sale or rent, with purchase prices quoted much higher than for comparable property in the United States.

The right to one's own home is further delimited. If one buys a villa, for example, in which a previous owner has rented out a room, he is not able to take possession of that room until he has supplied the renter with a room or apartment meeting the renter's approval. Thus, in a variety of ways, the socialists are able to undermine what the late Professor Richard Wheeler has called "the last metaphysical right."

The right to own property and the right to feel that one can be "king in his own castle" is an essential part of freedom. The political dissatisfaction which the socialists are currently facing, and which might yet bring down their government, has not induced the socialists to abandon their ruinous policy of socialist control over housing. It is peculiar how they will hold on to this socialist cliché even in the face of its obvious impracticality.

If we are wise enough to learn from the mistakes of other nations, we might well take warning from the signs we see of a similar development in the United States. Urban Renewal and municipal pre-emption are to be found also in our cities. The rules and regulations by the government in their so-called "anti-discrimination clauses" for all housing built by federal subsidies are more subtle, but no less real than the restrictions placed on the private sector and the individual citizens in Sweden.

The inviolate right to own, protect, and dispose of one's own property is a proper part of the American tradition and heritage. Let us protect this privilege which may indeed be "our last metaphysical right."

APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA: A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as the world embarks upon a new decade and as we convene a new session of Congress, we are all nevertheless confronted with our old sins and inhumanities. The poison

that has plagued mankind the longest is the virus of racial discrimination. South Africa is a nation where injustice triumphs over justice; where honesty, freedom, and equality are the forgotten, unwanted, and unnecessary virtues. South Africa is the only sovereign state in our world where doctrines of race superiority have been elevated to the status of constitutional dogma. The United Nations General Assembly has declared apartheid and the philosophy underlying it to be a crime against humanity. If our society ever hopes to achieve peace we must recognize apartheid as a perverse and twisted system—a system that denies the common dignity of the human race.

I am thus including in the RECORD two articles from the January 1970 United Nations publication entitled "Objective Justice" which both succinctly and accurately reveal the evils of apartheid. In the words of the editors of this periodical:

Objective Justice seeks to delineate the various features which go to make up the physiognomy of apartheid and which reveal the spiritual deformity of any society which proclaims and practises it.

The articles follow:

APARTHEID: SLAVERY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

(By Ambassador Abdulrahim Abby Farah, U.N. Permanent Representative of Somalia and Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid)

It is now 17 years since the United Nations established its competence to take action against apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa and to bring to world attention one of the most challenging moral issues afflicting the 20th century. It is reminiscent of the persecution of Jews in Europe under the Nazi regime, if one seeks a parallel situation. But perhaps a more apt comparison can be made between apartheid and slavery in the 19th century.

After all, in the case of the abominations committed under Hitler, the full extent of that crime against humanity was not generally known until the liberation of Nazi-occupied territories. It is true also that when slavery was a flourishing institution, there was no world Organization which could bring an issue directly before its Member States; nor were there mass communications media which could bring into homes all over the world details of suffering endured on the "middle passage" of the slave trade triangle or in the plantation barracks.

But there are fundamental similarities between the campaign that eliminated slavery and the United Nations endeavours against apartheid. There was then, and there is now, a group of people committed to opposing a system that denies common humanity binding all men, regardless of race or colour, and which denies the most elementary human needs of one group of people in order to cater to the convenience of another.

Let there be no mistake about the nature of apartheid. If we think that slavery was an evil of the past, overcome and shelved into history books, we are wrong. Apartheid is slavery in twentieth century dress transported to new surroundings. And this fact presents us with a great irony. Here we are in the second half of the twentieth century, when the concept of human rights has been articulated in more detail and is almost universally accepted. Yet, if the experience of the past 17 years is any indication, it seems that in spite of our United Nations Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights—with all the sophisticated media of persuasion at our command—we are not likely to be

as successful against apartheid as those nineteenth century evangelists who led the campaigns against slave trade and slavery.

Of course they were greatly helped by the fact that the slave trade and the plantation system had declined as sources of wealth for influential people who had the power to end those institutions. Unfortunately in the case of apartheid, the opposite is true. Three of South Africa's main trading partners—who find it increasingly profitable to continue and augment their trading connexions with South Africa—sit on the Security Council which alone has the authority for mandatory economic sanctions, or for any other forceful measures which are available under the Charter to combat apartheid.

There are also other Member States of the United Nations that, together with the United Kingdom, France and the United States, not only continued their economic co-operation with the Government of South Africa, but by 1966 had increased their total investments in the country from \$4,434 million to \$5,313 million. Reports indicate that in the past three years that figure has been greatly exceeded. A recent study shows that the United Kingdom, the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan, between them, provide markets for approximately 60 per cent of South Africa's exports and supply it with 60 per cent of its imports. At the same time the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany have provided 80 per cent of the increase in foreign investment in South Africa since 1964.

The General Assembly resolution calling on all States to end economic cooperation of any kind with South Africa does not have the mandatory force of a Security Council resolution, but the resolution adopted in 1964 calling for an arms embargo is a Security Council resolution and is mandatory. Yet, despite the embargo, the South African newspaper the *Cape Times* of 25 April 1969 reported that "South Africa is beating the arms ban. This is one of the most heartening things to emerge from Mr. P. W. Botha's White Paper on Defence. What we are not building ourselves, we are successfully buying from countries with a more realistic attitude than Britain".

The report went on to show how the close economic co-operation of certain Powers has enabled South Africa to move towards independent production of conventional armaments. In the meanwhile this co-operation has ensured a steady supply of conventional and more sophisticated weapons; for example, helicopters and supersonic jet fighters, submarines, and financial support for a ground-to-air missile installation have been procured from France.

PROFIT OUTWEIGHS PRINCIPLE

To these States, and particularly to those whose national economies would not be disrupted by a cessation of trade with South Africa, profit is more important than principle. By their trade, their investment and their supply of arms, they are contributing directly to the subjugation of the African majority in South Africa, to the extension of apartheid beyond the borders of South Africa to Namibia and Southern Rhodesia, and to the suppression of the movement for self-determination in the territories controlled by Portugal.

It was probably true in the nineteenth century—and it certainly seems to be true now—that moral considerations alone will not persuade Governments to take actions which would entail financial sacrifices. In the case of apartheid, the moral considerations are clear. We cannot claim ignorance today of what apartheid really means. It has been condemned by all United Nations Member States—with the obvious exceptions of South Africa, and Portugal, the other bastion of colonialism. Apartheid, like slavery, denies the humanity of those against whom it is directed.

Slavery involved the uprooting of people against their will; thereafter, they were used and exchanged at the will and convenience of their masters. Since the Group Areas Act of 1950 was passed in South Africa, hundreds of thousands of Africans have been forcibly moved from their homes to tribal areas with which they had little or no contact in the past, or to other areas where they have been relocated against their desire or interest.

Pass laws and the system by which Africans are allowed into "white areas" on sufferance only and are at any time liable to be forced out of the area, afflict their lives with a permanent element of insecurity.

Under slavery, family life was destroyed. Similarly, under apartheid, the family life of millions of Africans is being destroyed by the regulations controlling African residence in white areas. An African has the right to live with his wife and family only in the particular areas reserved for his tribe. If his work takes him elsewhere, his wife may not join him. Even if he was born in a town, has lived there continuously for 14 years, and has worked continuously with one employer for nine years, neither his wife, his unmarried daughters or his son aged 18 is entitled, as of right, to live with him for more than 72 hours. These are only a few of the restrictions that have been imposed on African family life.

Basically, the African has two choices under apartheid: either to live on the fringe of a white urban or industrial area where his existence has no validity except in so far as it provides a service for white men and where the most ordinary arrangements of his daily life and his most fundamental aspirations as a human being are all restricted and hemmed in by the laws which subjugate him and provide for the white man's comfort. A complex of laws dictate to him where he can live, where he can work, what education and what skills he can acquire, what friendships he can make, how he can worship God, and most inhuman of all, what family life he can have. The consequence is a restricted standard of living which gives rise to such statistics as a 25 per cent higher death-rate among black than among white children. The other choice is to live in a reserve or in a Bantustan which is poor in natural resources and where, on only 13 per cent of the total area of South Africa, it is planned to relocate those of the 14 million Africans who are not engaged in the white man's service. It is estimated that these areas could only support 30 per cent of the African population.

The slave in the nineteenth century could not hope to change his situation by political, legal or any other peaceful means. Whenever he could outwit the system and plan rebellion he did so. This resulted in degrading punishment, increasingly restrictive laws and sporadic outbreaks of savage violence which reflected the unendurable frustrations of the slave's existence.

In South Africa today there is no redress possible for the black man's situation as he has been deprived of political rights and his legal rights have been reduced to a sham. Numerous provisions introduced by the South African Government authorize arbitrary arrest and arbitrary detention with no means of recourse to the courts. Freedom of association is severely restricted by law. The recent trial of South African journalists who criticized the prison system gave substance to the growing body of evidence that Africans in prison are subjected to cruel and inhuman punishment.

It is not only the lesson of history, but also of our own times, that failure to bring about social change in a society which is suffering from the cumulative effect of long standing injustices, results in revolution and violence.

There are those who argue that social change will be brought about in South Africa through the present expansion of the

country's economy. They point to the many instances when leaders of industry in South Africa have called for an upgrading of the level of technical training for Africans which is presently restricted by law.

This argument ignores the fact that the South African Government has clearly made the choice between logical procedures which will support the country's fast moving economy on the one hand, and its ideological position on the subjugation of the black people on the other. The continued development of *apartheid* policies is evidence of which alternative has been chosen. Unfortunately it is an alternative which will lead inevitably to bloodshed and racial conflagration.

Apartheid has been applied in equally virulent form to the illegally held territory of Namibia, for which the United Nations has assumed legal responsibility. Its application in Rhodesia by the illegal Smith régime is being supported by South Africa to the extent that South African police and military units are helping the Smith régime to maintain its position. South Africa's support of the Portuguese authorities in their attempt to suppress the desire of the African people of Angola and Mozambique for self-determination completes the picture of racism allied to colonialism in southern Africa.

Thus, all the ingredients for a violent explosion exist in that large area. The black majorities in South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia, faced with the alternative of remaining permanently enslaved in their own countries or opposing the situation by resorting to force have made their choice and have set in motion resistance campaigns.

The people of these territories would prefer to achieve their liberation by peaceful rather than by violent means. This is very much the view of the African nations, but as the Organization of African Unity recently stated in its Manifesto on Southern Africa: "While peaceful progress is blocked by actions of those in power in the states of southern Africa, we have no choice but to give to the peoples of these territories all the support of which we are capable in their struggle against their oppressors."

The international community has formulated a third alternative which is also described by the Manifesto when it says that South Africa "should be ostracized by the world community until it accepts the implications of man's common humanity. It should be isolated from world trade patterns and left to be self-sufficient if it can. The South African Government cannot be allowed both to reject the very concept of mankind's unity and to benefit by the strength given through friendly international relations."

Speaking of slavery, Thomas Jefferson said: "The hour of emancipation must come; but whether it will be brought on by the generous energies of our own minds, or by the bloody scenes of St. Domingo is a leaf of our history not yet turned over."

It is this same challenge which *apartheid* poses for us today.

THE LAWLESS LAWS OF SOUTH AFRICA

Like other modern States, the Republic of South Africa is a country governed by laws. And the laws by which a country chooses to live are normally matters with which the United Nations not only does not concern itself, but which, in fact, it is expressly forbidden from interfering with by its own Charter.

However, a feature that gives to the laws of South Africa the character and dimension which have caused concern throughout the world and which have made them the subject of formal denunciation by the world Organization can be simply stated: while these laws apply to all the people of South

Africa—white and non-white alike—they are laws of the white man alone, enacted by the white man alone, for the benefit of the white man alone. Neither in the formulation nor in the execution of these "laws" do the Africans, who form 70 per cent of the population, nor the Asians and the Coloured, have any voice or influence.

It is this character, according to the United Nations, which makes many of the "laws" of South Africa, in effect and in reality, instruments of inequity and oppression.

The following examples are drawn from a study prepared by Professor Leslie Rubin of Howard University, Washington, D.C., a former Senator in South Africa, representing Africans, for the United Nations Secretariat's Unit on *Apartheid*, showing how legislation described by the South African Government as being designed to promote "separate development", amounts in reality to a legalized contempt for all human beings of the non-white races.

The case-laws cited derive, for the most part, from the Bantu (Urban Areas Consolidation) Act No. 25 of 1945; the Bantu (Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents) Act No. 67 of 1952; the Bantu Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act No. 48 of 1953; the Bantu Building Workers Act No. 27 of 1951; the Workmen's Compensation Act No. 30 of 1941; the Bantu Education Act No. 47 of 1953; the Extension of University Education Act No. 45 of 1959 and Proclamation No. 333 of 1 November 1957 issued under the Group Areas Act No. 77 of 1957.

HOME, FAMILY AND RESIDENCE

An African who was born in a town and lived there continuously for 50 years, but then left to reside elsewhere for any period, even two weeks, is not entitled as of right, to return to the town where he was born and to remain there for more than 72 hours.

An African who has lived continuously in a town for 20 years and is still living there, has no right to remain there for more than 72 hours, once he has accepted a job outside that town.

An African who has, since birth, resided continuously in a town is not entitled as of right, to have living with him in that town for more than 72 hours, a married daughter, a son who has reached the age of 18, a niece, a nephew or a grandchild.

If an African was born in a town, has lived there continuously for 14 years and has, during that period, worked continuously for the same employer for nine years, his wife commits a criminal offense by living with him for more than 72 hours, if she had not received a permit to do so.

Any policeman is entitled, without warrant, to enter and search "at any reasonable time of the day or night" premises on which he has reason to suspect that an African boy 18 years of age is committing the criminal offence of residing with his father without having been issued with the necessary permit to do so.

MOVEMENT

A proclamation in the Government Gazette may, at any time, prohibit any African from being in any town during such hours of the night as are specified, unless he is in possession of a written permit signed by his employer or by an authorized official. The permit must be produced on demand made by any policeman.

Unless he has been issued with a Certificate of Exemption, an African who is a University graduate, must have his fingerprints taken and may not, instead, furnish his signature to the appropriate official, when he applies for a Reference Book.

A visiting American Negro walking in a street in a city in South Africa may be stopped by a policeman who believes that "he in appearance obviously is a member of an aboriginal race or tribe of Africa". Re-

quired to produce his Reference Book, he will be presumed to be an African and therefore liable to arrest for failure to produce it, unless he proves that "he is not in fact and is not generally accepted as" a member of an aboriginal race or tribe of Africa.

WORK

A labour Officer may, at any time, cancel the employment of an African who works in a town, no matter how long he has been employed, even though his employer opposes the cancellation. An African whose employment has been cancelled, may be removed from the town where he worked, and prohibited from returning to that town for such a period as the Labour Officer specifies.

It is unlawful for an African worker to take part in a strike for any reason whatsoever.

An African factory worker who calls on other workers to strike for an increase in pay commits a criminal offense.

An African who, as a personal favour and without receiving payment, repairs a defective electrical fitting in the living quarters of a friend who resides on his employer's premises in a town, is guilty of a criminal offense.

An African is prohibited from doing skilled work in the building industry in any town in white South Africa, but a white man may be employed in skilled work in a Bantu village as a supervisor of Africans who are working on a building.

An African factory worker who is absent from work for 24 hours without permission, in addition to being dismissed, is guilty of a criminal offense.

A white workman who is permanently 100 per cent disabled is entitled to a monthly pension based on his earnings; an African similarly disabled is entitled to a lump sum based on his earnings, but not to a monthly pension.

If a white workman dies as a result of an accident, his dependents are entitled to a lump sum and a monthly pension based on his earnings; the dependents of an African workman who dies as a result of an accident are not entitled to a monthly pension, but only to "such lump sum as the Workmen's Compensation Commissioner deems equitable."

EDUCATION

No school for the education of African children may be conducted anywhere in South Africa unless it is registered by the Government, and the Minister of Bantu Education has an unfettered discretion to refuse to register it.

The Minister of Bantu Education may at any time, and without being required to give any reason for doing so, withdraw any subsidy previously granted by him to a school maintained by an African tribe or community.

An African living in a town who, without being paid for his services, conducts in his own home, a class in reading and writing for a few of his African friends, is guilty of a criminal offense.

A white man who spends a few hours each week, in his own home, teaching his African servants to read, is guilty of a criminal offense.

An African student who attends even a single lecture in a course at the University of Cape Town, is guilty of a criminal offense.

MARRIAGE, ASSEMBLY AND ASSOCIATION

An African born in a town, who has lived there continuously for 50 years, is not entitled as of right to have an African friend visit and remain with him more than 72 hours.

It is unlawful for a white person and a non-white person to drink a cup of tea together in a cafe anywhere in South Africa unless they have obtained a special permit to do so.

If an Asian (or a Coloured person or an

African) sits on a bench in a public park (the bench being set apart for the exclusive use of white persons), by way of protest against the *apartheid* laws, he commits a criminal offence.

If there is only one waiting-room in a railway station, it is lawful for the station-master to reserve that waiting-room for the exclusive use of white persons, and any non-white person wilfully entering it commits a criminal offence.

An unmarried man who "in appearance obviously is or who by general acceptance and repute is a white person" and who attempts to have sexual intercourse with a woman who is not "obviously in appearance or by general acceptance or repute a white person", is guilty of a criminal offence punishable by imprisonment with compulsory hard labour for not longer than seven years.

TAXATION

Every African, male and female, who has reached the age of 18 years is liable to pay an annual tax (known as the "general tax") of at least \$4.90, in addition to the ordinary *Income Tax payable by all South Africans*, unless he satisfies the authorized official that he has reached the age of 65 years.

Every African who is the occupier of a dwelling in an African township is liable to pay an annual tax (known as the "local tax") of \$1.40.

In certain defined areas, any white policeman may, at any time, stop an African walking in a city street, if he believes him to be liable to pay these taxes, and ask him to produce a receipt for his general tax or local tax, and inspect such receipt.

If the African fails to comply with such demand, the policeman may arrest him and have him brought before a Bantu Affairs Commissioner who may then order his detention until arrangements have been made for payment of such tax as may be due.

OWNERSHIP OF LAND

No African is entitled as of right to acquire freehold title to land anywhere in South Africa, nor is it the intention of the present Government ever to grant such right to the African, even in his own Bantu areas.

RELIGION

The Minister of Bantu Administration and Development may, provided that the urban local authority concurs, by notice in the Gazette, prohibit the attendance of Africans at a Church service in a town.

No church may be established for Africans in any town without the prior approval of the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development.

OPINION AND EXPRESSION

A white man who tells a group of Africans that the *apartheid* laws are unjust and should be disobeyed, is guilty of a criminal offence.

The South African Publications Control Board consists of nine persons (all of them white) appointed and paid by the Government. The function of the Board is *inter alia* to prevent the showing of any film which depicts white and non-white children sharing the same classroom; or white and non-white adults dancing with one another; or white and non-white men and women embracing and kissing one another.

Another function of the South African Publications Control Board is to prevent the showing of any educational documentary film which expresses approval of racial integration or disapproval of discrimination based on race or colour.

It is a criminal offence for a newspaper to publish an article which is held by the Court to have harmed relations between whites and Africans because it used strong language to assert that *apartheid* is unjust to the African people.

A photographer who—without the au-

thority of the Commissioner of Prisons—photographs any prison or any group of prisoners, is guilty of a criminal offence.

An African who writes "Down with *Apartheid*" on the wall of the house of any other person, is guilty of a criminal offence.

In certain specified areas throughout South Africa, any person who, without the written approval of a Government official, addresses any meeting at which more than 10 Africans are present, is guilty of a criminal offence.

LEAVING AND RETURNING

An African may not leave South Africa to take up a scholarship at an American university unless he is in possession of the permit required by law. The Secretary for the Interior may refuse to issue the permit unless the applicant undertakes to leave South Africa permanently.

RULE OF LAW

An African who has been required by an order of Court to leave a certain area must do so, and no Court of law may grant an injunction preventing such removal, nor may appeal or review proceedings, stay or suspend such removal, *even when it has been established beyond all doubt that the order of Court was intended for some other person and was served upon him in error.*

If an African ordered to leave an area, refuses to do so, the State President has an unfettered discretion to order that, without trial in a Court of law or further investigation of any kind, he be summarily arrested, detained, and removed from that area.

Any person who breaks the window of a building in the course of a demonstration calling for the grant of increased rights to the African people, is guilty of the offence of *sabotage*, unless he proves that his act was not calculated or intended to encourage feelings of hostility between white persons and Africans. The offence is punishable by a sentence of death.

No African may serve as a member of any jury empanelled for any criminal trial, even where the accused is an African.

Any police officer of or above the rank of Lt. Colonel who has reason to believe that a person is withholding from the police information relating to "terrorists" may arrest and detain such person for an indefinite period.

No person other than the Minister of Justice or an official may have access to such detained person, *nor is any person (not even members of his immediate family) entitled to any information as to what has happened to him or where he is.*

No court of law may order the release of such detainee or pronounce upon the validity of any action which has been taken against him.

An African living in a Bantu area may not, without special permission to do so, carry a knife whose blade is more than 3½ inches long, while outside the allotment of which he resides.

BAN HANDGUNS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, assassinations of great Americans, robberies of retail stores, and assaults in streets have not eliminated the "frontier mentality" from the U.S. citizenry. Apparently, too many Americans harbor the outmoded belief that everyone is solely responsible

for his own protection. That premise may be true in a society without law. But in a nation governed by laws, which are enforced by constitutional authorities, the citizen's responsibility should be shared with the authorities. And what is the proper division of responsibility?

The citizen bears the responsibility of living vigilantly and lawfully and of cooperating fully with law enforcement officers. The latter, in turn, serve with the charge of protecting society—with guns, if necessary. Handguns owned by private citizens "are the inevitable companions of crime, violence, and death." In the hands of law enforcement officers, however, weapons can be the instruments of protection, enforcement, and tranquillity.

It is my earnest conviction that Congress must ban handguns from private citizens before handguns banish us from our own society. In this line, I commend to my colleagues the eminently sensible editorial, "Ban Handguns," which appeared in the December 18, 1969, issue of the *Christian Science Monitor*.

The editorial follows:

BAN HANDGUNS

The time will come when a civilized nation like America will find it incomprehensible that it ever let private citizens own tackle specifically designed to cause death. To Milton Eisenhower, chairman of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, that time has already come. It has also come with us. We thus fully and enthusiastically endorse Mr. Eisenhower's demand that pistols be taken from everyone in the nation other than those "who need them."

The former president's brother, and in his own right one of America's most thoughtful and distinguished citizens, calls for a system of restrictive licensing. The result would be that pistols, the main standby of today's criminal, would be fully and forever stripped out of the hands of private citizens.

We have not in the past, and we cannot today see a single valid argument against such a step. No one, but no one, other than the lawfully designated guardians of public order need handguns. In the hands of such wardens pistols are, at the present state of affairs in the United States, a necessary and valuable instrument of public protection. In the hands of private citizens they are the inevitable companions of crime, violence, and death.

Mr. Eisenhower exempted both rifles and shotguns from his plea. He did so almost certainly out of deference to farmers' needs and hunters' desires. This, at the present time, is a valid exemption. But if, once a ban on handguns took place, criminals turned to the use of longguns, then public welfare might necessitate a like action against them. But we call for one step at a time.

In the meanwhile, however, there should be stricter action against the unlawful possession of sawed-off shotguns, hand grenades, and machine guns. The arsenals collected by the Black Panthers—regardless of the rightness or wrongness of police methods taken against this group—are totally impermissible and should be seized and their possessors punished.

America is a gun-ridden, gun-terrified, gun-oriented, gun-wounded, and gun-slaughtered society. This is a disgrace which stinks to high heaven. It is something which every homeland-loving American should be bitterly ashamed of. It is something which any public official worthy of holding office should seek to mend. It is a moral imperative.

WILBUR D. SPARKS, HEAD OF
BARBERSHOP HARMONY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 20, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the 10th District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, will be the world capital of barbershop harmony singing during 1970, and the sovereign ruler will be Wilbur D. Sparks, 6724 26th Street North, Arlington.

After the past 2 years as international vice president, Sparks assumed the office of international president on January 1 of the 32,000-member Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.

He is the first personality on Capitol Hill ever to receive this distinction. Mr. Sparks was named assistant counsel of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee in 1956, and has continued until today as a specialist in Federal antitrust legislation. He originally came to Capitol Hill in 1941 when he joined the staff of U.S. Senator Harry S. Truman, whose Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program was making World War II headlines, serving to 1946.

During 10 years in private law practice in Washington, the year 1954 has a special significance for my constituent as well as the society he now leads, for he joined the Alexandria chapter on that date, and almost immediately joined his first quartet, the Professors of Harmony. Sparks, Oz Newgard, and Don Braisted formed the Harmoni-Chords with Burt Young as lead in 1958, and were enjoyed by scores of audiences with seven leads altogether until 1967.

Wilbur helped make the Alexandria Harmonizers tick as vice president, president, bulletin editor, newsletter publisher, assistant chorus director, baritone section leader, coach of quartets, as well as a myriad of other tasks.

In 1959 he was certified as a society judge in voice expression. Mid-Atlantic district, the society's largest, with 5,000 barbershoppers and 95 chapters, put Wilbur to work in 1958 as historian and archivist, and later elected him successively district secretary, vice president, executive vice president, and president for 2 years. He started international service with the society's 750 chapters in the United States and Canada as vice president and later president of PROBE, composed of public relations officers and bulletin editors. He was also editor of Probemotor, and took on various committee tasks.

Born in Savannah, Mo., in 1918, Wilbur was educated in Savannah public schools, and became a champion trumpet player. At the University of Missouri at Columbia, he not only earned A.B. and LL.B. degrees but also sang in college and fraternity glee clubs and quartets, and played in marching, concert, and dance bands. Married to Elizabeth Hartley, also of Savannah, in 1942, they have two daughters, one in college and the

other married and living in Louisville, Ky. Wilbur and his family are members of the Columbia Baptist Church, Falls Church, where he is a deacon, has served as chairman of the music committee several times, and has sung in the chancel choir since 1957.

Two of Wilbur's big responsibilities in 1970 will be staging the annual international contest and convention in Atlantic City, June 22-27, and helping build the society's contributions for the Institute of Logopedics in Wichita, Kans., beyond the half-million-dollar mark. SPEBSQSA has always had the motto "Keep America Singing," but in 1960 added "We Sing That They Shall Speak" when the society chose a major charitable cause.

Barbershopping is flourishing in the Metropolitan Washington area, which now has eight chapters with the new Bowie, Md., contingent, others being Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax, Manassas, Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, and the daddy of them all, the District of Columbia.

Washington public relations man Ed Place, who transferred from Louisville, Ky., chapter to the District of Columbia early in 1946, worked on Capitol Hill for the Republican National Committee before and during the 80th Congress, and quartets were bombarding each other with chords and swipes in all directions. Ed staged a contest at the Statler Hilton Hotel for the Republic House quartet, led by Whip LES ARENDS of Illinois as tenor, and the Democratic House quartet led by its then Whip Percy Priest of Tennessee, also a tenor. Representative Samuel K. McConnell from Pennsylvania was the master of ceremonies, and the contest was a draw, but the quartets were on a nationwide radio hookup later.

Ed's own quartet, the Diplomats, scored a big victory in Carnegie Hall, New York City, and qualified for the international quartet championship at Oklahoma City in 1948. While competing at Oklahoma City, the Diplomats were selected by the entertainment committee of the Republican National Convention to be held in Philadelphia a few weeks later to be the first barbershop quartet ever to sing at a national political convention. Tenor of the Diplomats was Howard Cranford, the assistant supervisor of English in the District of Columbia schools. Place and Cranford were called one morning to Vice President Richard Nixon's office to harmonize with the Vice President and Howard Mitchell, conductor of the National Symphony Orchestra, to publicize an attraction at Constitution Hall.

During December when Ed Place was again working on the Hill as a press assistant, he was asked by E. Homer McMurray, who presides at the House staff members' prayer breakfasts in the Capitol, to organize a musical program for Wednesday morning, February 4, and get his District of Columbia Keys quartet if possible.

The Keys will be there, with International President Wilbur Sparks and Ed Place, both Baptists, as baritone and bass, respectively. Howard Cranford, a Methodist, will sing tenor with another Methodist as the other tenor, Millard—Mickey—Beall, soloist for the 34th year

with the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. Glee Club. This foursome represents a total of 86 years of SPEBSQSA quartet singing and as much or more choir singing. They are confident of getting all those present singing and, perhaps, forming gospel and barbershop quartets the coming year all over the Hill as in 1948.

TRIBUTE TO WOMEN

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in my State of Arizona we are favored with the presence of a most remarkable and wonderful woman in the person of Miss Bess Stinson, a member of the Arizona House of Representatives.

Miss Stinson, from District 8-M of Maricopa County, is serving her second term, having been elected from a district in which the registration runs 3 to 1 in favor of the opposition party. I think this is a tribute to her well recognized sense of fairness and the outstanding contributions she has made to her community, her State, and the Nation over the years.

She has been active in public and community relations for one of the major banks in Arizona; she has been active in church and civic life; and has served her country well as a member of the Armed Forces.

She is an active member of the Cactus Wren Club of Republican Women, and in addition has been nationally recognized as the featured speaker during the awards luncheon of the National Federation of Republican Women.

Mr. President, Miss Stinson's speech has received wide acclaim as a tribute to women. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Republican Arizona,
December 1969]

TRIBUTE TO WOMEN

"For everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under heaven . . . a time to plant and a time to harvest . . ."

Women have waited the long, bleak centuries through, but there has been little harvest for them. Theirs was the role of planting, cultivating, tending and enduring. The wheels of time turn slowly, but they do turn, and today the star of women is in the ascendancy even though we still have a long way to go.

At times in history the strong winds of change alter the world's course. Such a period followed the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock. The winds then blew for freedom and in the next century the first government based upon the proposition that governments derive their just powers by consent of the governed was launched.

It began with a virgin country, the wealth and extent of which the founders were unaware. They only knew that theirs was the opportunity to choose the essence of the best that the science of government had produced and give it to a new land.

And it began with a virgin society which keenly felt its moment in destiny.

Before the next hundred years had passed, miracles had been wrought, and man's horizon of freedom and the new world had dramatically widened. Slaves were freed and in 1869 were enfranchised.

Nothing was done about women. But the spirit of freedom and the winds of change had touched them too—and the wind came from the West, although the movement had started at Seneca Falls, New York in June 1848 with the first national convention for women's suffrage. Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton were its prime movers. They were determined to change the statutes which bound women in legal, financial and voiceless servitude.

The road to emancipation was long and heartbreaking. Its foremost heroines did not live to see its full achievement, but rejoiced in the small victories and exciting anticipation of things to come. Against the opposition of the clergy, ridicule by the press, and unyielding political hostility the pioneers endured, sacrificed and persevered. They were magnificent!

And it finally came to pass that in the Territory of Wyoming, in the year 1869, the first victory was won. Women were acknowledged as separate independent beings. It was a victory guided by the determined efforts of Mrs. Esther Morris of South Pass, Wyoming, who was shortly afterward appointed justice of the peace of South Pass—a truly Western salute to what the West always admires—sheer grit.

Hard on the heels of Wyoming, the Territories of Utah and Washington granted women suffrage. The ladies fought on—Colorado, Idaho and California joined the ranks, then Arizona, Kansas and Oregon. It was almost a phenomenon of the West—and with good reason. Nowhere had women worked, struggled and borne misfortune with the tenacity, fortitude and endurance that this part of our Nation demanded of its women.

They could look back on generations—on sod dug-outs, on mere shells of cabins, on Indian wars—years of living in apprehension, most of them fighting—the droughts, the locusts, the snows, the prairie fires, the blizzards, and all of this under a crushing burden of toil. Some broke under the strain. There was not very much to eat and no money, but there was always the indomitable spirit, always the love that kept families together and made do, always the dreams of a better day. The dreams lived on in the hearts of the children and eventually they carried them out.

The settlement of the West, or any other part of this country for that matter, owes more to the endless toll of pioneer women than to all other factors in its history. A character in Edna Ferber's *Cimarron* tells it this way:

"You can't read the history of the United States, my friend . . . without learning of the great story of those thousands of unnamed women . . . women in mud caked boots and calico dresses and sunbonnets, crossing the prairie and the desert and mountains, enduring hardship and privation. Good women with a terrible and rigid goodness that comes of work and self-denial. Nothing picturesque or romantic about them, I suppose . . . No, their story's never really been told, but it's there just the same. And if it's ever told straight, you'll know its the sunbonnet and not the sombrero that's settled this country."

That is how it was, and how America was built. No one stopped to count the cost—they threw themselves blindly into the impossible, accomplished the unbelievable. The human race has not known such faith and self-confidence since history began. America! No other land can match this conquest of the unknown, the untried—and the major role of its women.

The greatest of all observers of the American scene, de Toqueville, agreed. Over 100

years ago he said, "If I were asked . . . to what the singular prosperity and growing strength of the United States ought mainly to be attributed, I should have to reply 'To the superiority of its women'."

This was a great man's highest tribute, richly and nobly deserved by women who were more than great.

Today we celebrate the 100th anniversary of that victory in Wyoming and the 50th anniversary of the passage of the 19th Amendment by Congress. In the interim, life has greatly changed in America, but the quest goes on. Equality now is the goal—not just the vote, but equal rights.

No one knowledgeable in the history of America's women, their triumph over adversity, steadfastness in character and fidelity to purpose doubts the outcome.

And so, we pay tribute to American Women, past and present. We honor all that they have been, take pride in all that they have become.

The slogan of those early, intrepid leaders has the same meaning, the same validity today:

"Principles, not policy; justice, not favor; men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less."

It is still a time for planting that the harvest may be more bountiful for all and Freedom more secure.

Our Country still needs the devotion, the effort, yes—even the sacrifice—of women to insure that "this Nation under God shall not perish."

BURDEN NAMED

Arizona Third District Congressman Sam Steiger has announced the appointment of Dana Burden to serve as a regional technician for the 1970 census in Utah and Arizona. Burden will take a six months leave of absence from Steiger's staff where he has been serving as an Arizona aide.

The 36 year old Wickenburg resident is one of the former owners of the Remuda Guest Ranch. He attended Wickenburg High School, Phoenix College and the University of Arizona.

Burden will resume his duties on Steiger's staff as soon as the census in the two states is complete.

THE ESTABLISHMENT

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, so often today we hear comment about the "establishment" which is allegedly running or ruining our society depending upon who you are talking to. Just what the establishment is, what are its aims, what are its strengths and weaknesses are discussed in the following speech delivered by the Honorable J. V. Clyne, chairman, MacMillan Bloedel Ltd.

In his speech, Judge Clyne, who was a justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia from 1950 to 1957, characterized the "establishment" as a group in the vanguard of change, attuned to all the ideas of a rapidly changing age yet subject to more gratuitous insults than any other group. I highly recommend the following text to my colleagues:

"THE ESTABLISHMENT"

(By the Honorable J. V. Clyne)

I have come here today to say a few kind words about a very much maligned group

of people—the members of the Establishment, many of whom are probably in this room. They are subjected to more gratuitous insults than any other group I know, yet they are often loath to answer their attackers. Nothing I can say is likely to dam the flow of abuse that is directed at the Establishment because Establishment-sniping is a very popular pastime. However, I think it is about time someone spoke for the defense and that is what I intend to do with the time you have given me today.

You need not look very far today for examples of the anti-Establishment attitude. It is in front of you all the time, as the subject of television talks, in the press and periodicals, and on the signs that are carried through the streets in such large numbers nowadays.

The Establishment I refer to is in the vanguard of change . . . change that is human and vital because it is based on law rather than nihilism. I am speaking of an Establishment attuned to all the ideas of a rapidly changing age, ready to seize on the best the current ferment produces and to implement it. No Establishment worthy of the name ever rejected an idea merely because it was radical and what I am about to say to you is based on a philosophy of affirmation, not of rejection.

It has become fashionable to attack the Establishment without knowing what the term means . . . and it is dangerous to use terms having a social significance unless you have an understanding of their true meaning. Confusion in thinking leads people to attack the wrong targets. The Prime Minister of Australia, for instance, on becoming elected recently, said, "I am not of or in the Establishment." If a Prime Minister is not a member of the Establishment, in its true sense, I don't know who is, and the fact that he made such a statement indicates the extent to which the concept has been discredited and misunderstood.

If instant reforms are not provided for all mankind's chronic ills, it is alleged to be the fault of the Establishment which is seen as standing four-square against progress, freedom, peace and all things good. One of the conveniences of using the Establishment as a whipping boy is its characterization as a great impersonal "they" to whom all sins can be ascribed without the necessity of a bill of particulars. Arrayed against this wicked "they" is a great collective "we" who are invariably righteous and noble-minded. This is according to the popular liturgy.

In order to see beyond this rather naive view of life, it might help to stop and consider just who the Establishment are. The term itself is presumed to have come from England where the established families traditionally placed their sons in the service of the church or the State. Since those families formed a relatively close-knit segment of the community, they came to be referred to as the Establishment. The levels of service to which young men were admitted depended on their performance at examinations at a university—usually Oxford or Cambridge—or the civil service examinations. A "first" in university examinations was a guarantee of a high level appointment. Therefore, the Establishment very early was marked by its devotion to intellectual excellence because this identified a man as a leader—or at least one with leadership qualities. In addition to excellence, great stress was also placed on civil order, public service and personal honour. The British Establishment in its development owed a great deal to the philosophy of the Greeks who, for the first time in history, thought of their civilization as the conscious pursuit of an ideal. Any civilization thus motivated would, of course, collapse without a body, or an Establishment, devoted to excellence in the law, philosophy, the arts and sciences; and the citizens of

ancient Greece elevated their scholars and thinkers to positions of authority in the social and political hierarchy.

Time has diluted the purity of the Greek ideal but its essential elements survived Italy's Renaissance man, in France's "honnete homme" or cultivated man, and in the British concept of a gentleman. Today it has a very limited public appeal and is sometimes referred to in the vernacular as "square."

This is unfortunate and self-defeating because we in the western world—old and young alike—are still moved by ideals, whether or not we agree on what they are. The young, in fact, believe themselves to be more idealistic than the old, and it is a fact that necessary reforms have frequently been brought about by the ideal of youth. But the one irreplaceable attitude necessary to hold those ideals aloft—the pursuit of excellence—is being ignored. The negative cults of confusion and whimsy are honored in its place.

The American historian, Henry Steele Commager, has declared that it is absurd to credit mere chance for the "outbreaks of genius" which occurred in the Athens of Pericles, the Florence of Michaelangelo, the England of Shakespeare and Bacon, the Vienna of Mozart, or the Philadelphia of Franklin. Why should the little colony of Virginia have produced, in one generation, such statesmen as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Marshall and Whyte? Surely it was because they were intellectually and morally equipped to respond to the challenges which confronted them at their moment in history, just as your astronauts and space scientists are equipped to respond to the challenge our times have given them. Those distinguished Virginians are an example of an Establishment which not only accepted reform, they initiated it. If we are to offer the world new hope based on western ideals, from what soil is a modern flowering of leadership to grow? It is for this reason—a concern for a leadership vacuum—that I have chosen to use the term Establishment in a somewhat different context than the one in which it is popularly used today to refer to any group which has succeeded in building a power structure around itself. We lose the meaning—and the lesson—of the classic Establishment when we define the term so casually.

I am not quite certain where my remarks will place me in relationship with your Vice-President, Mr. Agnew, who by virtue of his office certainly is now a member of the Establishment. No matter.

The Establishment consists of those who set themselves to master their disciplines according to rigid standards of excellence. As an ideal they subscribe to a moral code based on an obedience to the unenforceable, and they have a highly developed sense of public service, though it may no longer be based on family traditions. Members of the Establishment are not necessarily outstanding public figures but they are the doers in the community. The true Establishment is the instrument of all constructive change.

The key to the Establishment's function is the rule of law because excellence cannot thrive in a state of civil disorder. I do not say this simply because the law was my profession but because our legal system is undergoing a series of challenges by those who are unmindful of the dangers in the game they play. We are the beneficiaries of great bodies of law, from Moses and Hammurabi, the Greeks, the Romans, Napoleon and the English common law. Our objective, based on that heritage, is to preserve the safety of the state while protecting the liberty of the individual. In the case of the United States, your goal, according to your own constitution, has been to "insure domestic tranquillity" while securing for yourselves the blessings of liberty. Your founders sought

to protect the new nation from a tyranny of the majority by providing for a system of checks and balances, such as two senators from each state, regardless of population. It is one of the paradoxes of our times that so much of the initiative seems now to have passed to a militant minority which threatens with a loud voice the tranquillity and the liberty of the majority which is now referred to by your President as a "silent majority." Speaking of the tongue in his general epistle St. James says, "It is a small member but it can make huge claims." Utilizing the arts of publicity, the minority seeks to subvert the very constitutional processes which are actually necessary to preserve minority rights. Furthermore, the zeal for individual rights sometimes obscures the true interests of the nation. The intent of the law—to insure domestic tranquillity—is altered to provide aid and comfort to those who break it—a trend which gives great satisfaction to the criminal element.

Lawyers today must be criminal lawyers if they are to win much public attention. But things were not always this way. In 14th century Italy, for example, even law teachers were revered and one, named Bartolus, was so highly thought of by the Emperor that he was given royal authority to grant legitimacy to any bastard who might attend his law classes. I do not mean to imply that the legal profession attracts more bastards than any other calling!

Challenges to the law today take the beguilingly innocent form of a defense of conscience. Now, conscience is an admirable thing and men who are ruled by their consciences are universally respected. This innocent word, however, has been put to a more sinister use by our new breed of revolution. We are told that the truly free man can be bound by no laws except those which his conscience tells him to obey. He need accept no obligations except those which depend on individual consent. This is a doctrine that has widespread appeal because it sounds so very moral yet it is used to give the appearance of high principle to lawlessness. One may say he refuses to pay taxes because, deep in his conscience, he disapproves of the way they are spent. One may even justify theft on the grounds that he doesn't hold with notions of private property. There is no idea more dangerous to the existence of an orderly human community than the doctrine that among the duties that are placed upon him the citizen is free to pick and choose those that he will perform.

Two distinguished residents of Los Angeles, Will and Ariel Durant, have expressed the danger very clearly in their book, "The Lessons of History."

"The first condition of freedom," the Durants say, "is its limitations; make it absolute and it dies in chaos. So the prime task of government is to establish order; organized central force is the sole alternative to incalculable and disruptive force in private hands."

It must also be understood that aspects of freedom change with changes in environment. You cannot give the same noisy midnight party in a city apartment that you can in a house in the country. The freedom of one person is always conditioned by the freedom of another. This concept is recognized at all times by law but is not recognized by demonstrators in the universities, in the streets and elsewhere who seek to impose their opinions by violence upon the rest of the community. In this sense, the citizens of the United States are in danger of losing their freedom.

We appear to have moved from one dangerous fallacy to another—from the fallacy that all men are created equal to the one which preaches the absolute importance of the individual. Thomas Griffith of Life Magazine wrote that universal equality "is a denial of the truth of an inequality of merit; but

worse, it is also a repudiation of the value of unequal effort." He speculates as to how many school children fail to demand the best of themselves "for fear of the unpopularity that goes with wanting to excel."

The second fallacy, which carries the cult of individuality of an extreme, is reflected in Thoreau's famous doctrine of civil disobedience which is being widely followed in North America today by people who probably have never heard of its author. Here the individual decides that certain laws—and the choice is his alone—are to be violated as part of the process of reform. Obviously, the whole body of the law is attacked when any part of it is systematically contravened, yet civil disobedience is widely condoned today by a public which has allowed itself to become too passive and permissive. When force becomes a necessary alternative to violence there is always a large segment of the community ready to proclaim police brutality.

"It is good," according to the Durants, "that new ideas should be heard, for the sake of the few that can be used; but it is also good that new ideas should be compelled to go through the mill of objection, opposition, and contumely; this is the trial heat which innovations must survive before being allowed to enter the human race."

What we need today is not a continuing war between the young and the old, the radical and conservative but, as your President has said, "a lowering of our voices." We need a new synthesis of conservatism and radicalism, "holding fast to that which is good," rooting out that which is not so good and replacing it with new ideas for creative excellence in society. Inevitably, the agent for that change will be the Establishment. In a world of rapid, complex and technological evolution, North America will not be competitive without a strong, intelligent and innovative Establishment.

THE 146TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF STONEWALL JACKSON

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today marks the 146th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson, one of America's most distinguished military strategists. Stonewall Jackson was born in the western region of Virginia in what is now the city of Clarksburg, W. Va. He lived as a boy and young man in what is now Lewis County in the Mountain State. History has recorded well the outstanding accomplishments of this Civil War general on the battlefield. Much has been written on Stonewall Jackson's numerous military feats, particularly on his unique conduct of the famous valley campaign. To this day, the movements and the tactics of Jackson in the valley campaign furnish teachers of military art and strategy throughout the world with the elements of success on the battlefield. The successful military maneuvers, the leadership, and the strong character of Stonewall Jackson were eloquently recognized by the great victorian military leader, Field Marshal Viscount Wolseley, who stated:

The fame of Stonewall Jackson is no longer the exclusive property of Virginia and the South; it has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American.

Mr. President, in the civic-conscious city of Clarksburg, historic and service organizations appropriately continue to commemorate the anniversary of the birth of Stonewall Jackson.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the Clarksburg Exponent of January 18 on this year's ceremony.

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

JACKSON WAS BORN HERE 146 YEARS AGO
Wednesday, Jan. 21, will mark the 146th anniversary of the birth of General Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson. He was born in Clarksburg Jan. 21, 1824.

S. J. Birshtein, chairman of the Stonewall Jackson Historical Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, announced that two local organizations are honoring the historic occasion with appropriate wreaths.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy will place a wreath on the bronze plaque erected on the birthplace site in the 300 block of West Main Street in downtown Clarksburg. Mrs. E. B. Dakan, Jr. is president of the local U.D.C.

The Stonewall Jackson Civic Club will remember the renowned general by placing a wreath on the equestrian statue on the plaza of the Harrison County Court House. Mrs. Fray G. Queen, Jr. heads the civic organization.

The Clarksburg Chapter of the U.D.C. erected the bronze plaque in August, 1911, to commemorate the General's birthplace.

On Sunday, May 10, 1953, the famous bronze equestrian statue was dedicated. This was made by the late Charles Keck, widely known sculptor of New York City. His widow attended the unveiling and impressive dedicatory ceremonies. The base of the statue was designed by William Grant, a Clarksburg architect.

The equestrian statue is a three-quarter life-size bronze original model casting for the Stonewall statue at Charlottesville, Va., dedicated Oct. 19, 1921.

Stonewall Jackson is enshrined in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. A striking statue by Moses Ezekiel of Richmond, Va., a graduate of Virginia Military Institute of Lexington, Va. and a personal friend of General and Mrs. Robert E. Lee, was dedicated at Charleston, W. Va. on Sept. 27, 1910. A similar statue was erected two years later on the grounds of V.M.I. and dedicated June 19, 1912.

Following the election of General Jackson in 1955 to the Hall of Fame, Bryant Baker, the sculptor, was commissioned to prepare the bronze bust, and this is in effect the model from which Mr. Baker made the bust later placed in the Capitol Building in Charleston, W. Va. and dedicated Sept. 13, 1959.

At V.M.I. Stonewall Jackson was professor of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, and Instructor of Artillery Tactics for 10 years, from 1851 to 1861. Then he was called upon to enter that career of distinction which in two years made the name of Stonewall Jackson immortal.

Between April 29, 1861 and May 1, 1863, Stonewall Jackson distinguished himself as one of the greatest military strategists that ever lived.

General Jackson was a master of the art of war. He used his two great elements, initiative and surprise, in unsurpassed applications.

Swift and sure of attack, dogged and determined in defense, undismayed by adverse odds, he was the ideal battlefield commander.

One of the finest tributes to Stonewall Jackson was sent in a telegram by the great general of World War II, Douglas MacArthur,

at the unveiling of the bronze bust of "Stonewall" by Sculptor Bryant Baker in the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University, May 19, 1957.

In his telegram General MacArthur stated: "Perhaps the most prized message I ever received came from the famous historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, who wrote me at the close of my campaigns in the Southeast Pacific area of World War II. 'The mantle of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson has now fallen on your shoulders.'"

Two of Jackson's favorite maxims were "You May Be Whatever You Resolve To Be" and "Never Take Counsel of Your Fears."

Stonewall Jackson's paternal grandparents, his father Jonathan and Stonewall's sister, Elizabeth, are buried in the historic cemetery in Jackson Park, located on East Pike Street, Clarksburg.

The General's mother is buried in Ansted, W. Va. His sister Laura lies at rest in Buckhannon, and his brother Warren is buried near that city.

Stonewall's wife, Mary Anna Morrison, died at Charlotte, N.C., March 24, 1915.

Jackson died May 10, 1863 at the age of 39 near Guinea Station, Va. and is buried in Lexington, Va.

EDUCATOR NOMINATED TO BE U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SWEDEN

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, after leaving the post vacant for a year, President Nixon has nominated a distinguished educator and former All-American football end at Cornell University as the U.S. Ambassador to Sweden.

He is Dr. Jerome H. Holland, now president of Hampton Institute in Virginia.

A Buffalo family is particularly proud of the President's selection. Dr. Holland's sister, Mrs. Lydia Sims, and her family are residents of my home city.

Some interesting highlights in the background of Dr. Holland are related in the story which appeared January 13 in the Buffalo, N.Y. Courier-Express, as follows:

BROTHER OF BUFFALO WOMAN NAMED ENVOY TO SWEDEN

The brother of a Buffalo woman was nominated by President Nixon Monday to be ambassador to Sweden. He is Dr. Jerome H. Holland, president of Hampton Institute in Virginia for the last 10 years.

Dr. Holland, 54, is the brother of Mrs. Lydia Sims of 29 Ada Pl.

FOOTBALL STAR

"Brud" Holland, as he is known to friends, worked his way through Cornell University stoking furnaces, and was an All-American end on the Big Red football teams of 1938 and 1939, the year he received his bachelor's degree.

After earning a master's degree in sociology at Cornell in 1941, he taught social science and coached football at Lincoln University, Tennessee Agricultural College, and Iowa State University.

He earned a doctorate in sociology from the University of Pennsylvania in 1950.

"HARD-WORKING PERSON"

"I was very delighted to hear of the nomination," Mrs. Sims told the Courier-Express Monday night. "He is a very congenial, hard-working person."

"It demonstrates what you can accomplish if you really want to," she said of her brother, one of five children of an Auburn, N.Y., gardener and handyman.

"We all helped him through Cornell," Mrs. Sims recalled. The 6-foot 2-inch 200-pound, college student later was named to the National Football Hall of Fame.

NAMED TO CORNELL BOARD

After working two years as a social research assistant in Philadelphia, Dr. Holland was named president of Delaware State College where he spent seven years before he was named president of Hampton in 1960.

In 1965 he became the first Negro member of the Cornell University Board of Trustees.

In his book, "Black Opportunity," published last year, Dr. Holland said, "Negroes are never going to solve their greatest problem by demanding equal job opportunities if they are not, in fact, equal to whites in their ability to perform the job."

STUDENTS HIT STAND

His views made him unpopular with some militant students at Hampton who demanded his resignation as president during student demonstrations last April.

There has been no American ambassador in Sweden since William H. Heath left Stockholm last January. White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler said that the President believes appointment of Holland "will end some of the tension existing between the two countries."

Sweden has been openly critical of U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

SUBJECT TO CONFIRMATION

Dr. Holland becomes the fourth Negro ambassador named by Nixon. The nomination is subject to Senate confirmation. Another Negro, Carl T. Rowan, served as ambassador to Finland under the late President John F. Kennedy.

Dr. Holland last visited Buffalo in October, 1968, to attend the wedding of his niece, Mrs. Charles Jones of Buffalo.

Dr. Holland's brother-in-law, the Rev. W. J. Sims, an African Methodist Episcopal Zion church minister, has worked for 29 years at Buffalo State Hospital where he is a staff attendant. Mrs. Sims works part-time at the hospital.

TWO OTHER CHILDREN

Mr. and Mrs. Sims have two other children, Walter of Henrietta, and James of Buffalo.

Dr. Holland has two other sisters, both of New York City, and a brother in Syracuse.

Dr. Holland is married and has a son and a daughter.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, NOVEMBER 1969

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the November 1969 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

MONTHLY REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY FOR NOVEMBER 1969

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of November totaling 2,926,139. This was a net decrease of 14,274 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of October.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government,

by months in fiscal year 1970, which began July 1, 1969 follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1969.....	3,062,319	9,276	
August.....	3,028,521		33,798
September.....	2,958,386		70,135
October.....	2,940,413		17,973
November.....	2,926,139		14,274

Total federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of November was 1,654,212, a decrease of 955 as compared with the October total of 1,655,167. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in November was 1,271,927, a decrease of 13,319 as compared with 1,285,246 in October.

Civilian agencies reporting the largest decreases were Interior Department with 1,690, Veterans' Administration with 1,139, Agriculture Department with 999 and Commerce Department with 937. The largest increase was reported by Department of Health, Education and Welfare with 3,955.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Navy with 6,272, Army with 5,320 and Air Force with 1,160.

Total employment inside the United States in November was 2,681,872, a decrease of 12,753 as compared with October. Total employment outside the United States in November was 244,267, a decrease of 1,521 as compared with October. Industrial employment by federal agencies in November was 571,068, a decrease of 2,395 as compared with October.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

The total of 2,926,139 civilian employees reported for the month of November 1969 includes 2,609,014 full-time permanent employees. This represents a decrease of 12,994 in full-time permanent employment from the preceding month of October. These figures are shown in the appendix (p. 17) of the accompanying report.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,926,139 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 110,933 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during November who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in October was 111,344.

WAVE OF ANTIMILITARISM IN AMERICA

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke to the graduating class of the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Va. In that address to 269 officers of the 46th graduating class I spoke of the current wave of antimilitarism in America, and I referred to the actions of some of my colleagues. In the speech I also comment on the most serious threat to the American Military Establishment in this century. At this time I offer the entire speech for publication at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

I must confess that it is a high honor for me this morning to speak to so distinguished a group. As you know, I am a Member of the House Armed Services Committee and over the past year I have had considerable contact with professional officers of our Armed Forces. Without exception, they have impressed me by their dedication to duty and devotion to their country.

I have recently been reading William L. Shirer's, "The Collapse of the Third Republic" . . . a remarkable work, which I recommend to you. In his book, Shirer gives an excellent and easily understood account of the Dreyfus Case, in which the commanders of the French Army succeeded in convicting an officer with forged evidence and endeavored to make the conviction stick in order that they would not be embarrassed.

Shirer goes on to describe the role that the Army played in the affairs of the Republic, a role that would seem strange to us in America.

All of you are familiar with the role of the German Army in the old empire and in the days of the Weimar Republic, when General von Seeckt held the balance of power in the life of that short-lived regime.

In more recent times, we know that the Soviet Army has played a role in Kremlin politics. In Communist China, it is the army that holds the key to balance.

This Republic has never experienced a period in its history when military power affected a decision in the national government, except when its advice was solicited to provide the Commander-in-Chief with information to reach a decision. It has always been this way with us.

When the Revolution ended, many of our officers formed a brotherhood, in honor of their Commander-in-Chief, George Washington, who emulated the name of the man for whom the organization was named . . . Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus. And why Cincinnatus? Because he was the legendary Roman hero, who was called twice to the dictatorship of Rome to lead the armies against their enemies, but who forsook personal gain and returned to work his farm. From his example was born the Society of the Cincinnati.

The pattern, once established, has persevered in our history. It is the common citizen who has usually borne arms . . . minutemen . . . militia . . . Johnny Reb or Billy Yank, doughboys and G.I.'s . . . all were essentially citizen soldiers.

In the long periods of peace that we knew before our own time, our attitude was not too different from that of the British who were indicted by Kipling in his poem, "Tommy" . . .

Do you recall the words?

"It's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an'
'Chuck him out, the brute!
But it's 'Savior of 'is country,' when
The guns begin to shoot."

Public opinion has a loud voice but a short memory. We have a new name for "Tommy" now . . . the military industrial complex. It doesn't rhyme with anything, but it means the same thing.

In the last few months, I have heard more than one officer say that he was chucking it and getting out. Some are leaving because they are fed up with the bureaucracy which exists within the defense structure . . . and I would caution you about this. Lower grade officers tell me that they are not given the authority to make decisions as used to be the case. It may be that we have so many generals and admirals, that we must permit them to make those decisions. I suspect that this is not really the case but that there is a growing unwillingness to stick one's neck out.

I think, however, that we have entered an era of discontent and frustration, in

which the military profession is being used as a convenient target . . . and how ironic . . . one that can't shoot back.

The factors behind this phenomenon are obvious to all of us . . . a war which our commanders have been restricted in conducting . . . domestic priorities, which are almost endless and which require more and more of our resources, inflation, which by itself demands a cut in Federal spending.

When I sat in the House last year, I heard some of my colleagues talk about these other needs and listened to them as they talked of slashing the defense budget to find the money for what they felt were more pressing projects.

This is tempting to any legislator, especially when that budget represents the largest piece of the pie. And these legislators are not speaking for themselves alone. They are voicing the sentiments of many Americans who do not understand why weapons of the 1970's should be so costly, who cannot appreciate the sophistication of a modern arsenal.

This Administration has not been able to ignore this sentiment. A heavy cut was made in the defense budget this past year and another one will apparently be forthcoming in fiscal 1971.

The impact has been felt in every community where there is a military base. Hopefully, we will not compromise our national security in making these cuts. I am sure that the President and Secretary of Defense share this concern and are trying to make the right choice in military spending while reducing the overall budget.

This cutting of funds of itself is not an indication of a loss of confidence in our military establishment, but the cries that there exists a military-industrial complex which would absorb a disproportionate portion of our resources, represent a segment of thought that is in the vanguard to weaken the military establishment.

I am more alarmed by the direct attacks that have been made to discredit the Reserve Officer Training programs at some of our universities. First, credit has been withdrawn from courses where it was formerly granted and in some cases, particularly in the Northeast, R.O.T.C. has been discontinued altogether.

Perhaps even more serious than this is what has happened at the Lincoln and Instrumentation Laboratories at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where defense research has been under serious attack. Dr. Charles Draper, a noted physicist, who played the key role in development of the inertial guidance system which we use in our ICBM's, has been forced out as director of the Instrumentation Laboratory.

The verbal assaults made upon him, not only by S.D.S. students but by some of his own colleagues on the faculty, are symptomatic of something far deeper than simple frustration that our national defense costs a lot of money that might be spent on more peaceful needs.

They represent the most serious threat to the military establishment in this century. They strike at our centers of learning, which have always supplied a reservoir of trained leadership to supplement the military academies. And they would deprive our military defense of the talents and research skills which our great universities have always supplied.

Some months ago, in a speech, I touched upon this point, emphasizing that if this movement succeeded, it would accelerate the creation of a true military-industrial complex, by forcing all military research and development into private industry, which would be military-oriented.

The universities have provided almost a system of checks and balances in doing military research, because they have invariably also produced peaceful benefits.

A purely military-oriented Research and Defense might not be as concerned with the vital by-products which spin off.

The tragedy of this development is that the threat to our Nation is undiminished. Perhaps we have for too long grown accustomed to our ability to meet the crises that occasionally confront us. Our people have come to expect, that our defense is invincible and that like Kipling's Tommy, the military forces will always appear like the "Savior of his country, when the guns begin to shoot."

I do not need to stress the change in military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union which has occurred since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

In less than 10 years, the Soviets have built up a formidable naval force, to challenge us in the Mediterranean . . . a submarine fleet which can operate from the seven seas . . . and an arsenal of ICBM's, which is larger than our own.

Imagine the difference in our bargaining positions if the Cuban missile crisis were to occur now.

All of you were chosen to attend this Staff College because your previous record indicated that you had the qualities of professionalism that have enabled us to enjoy effective leadership in time of war. Any visitor who enters these grounds is reminded of the splendid tradition over our foes . . . Anzio, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Eniwetok, Normandy.

There our treasure was spent and the blood of our youth spilled . . . but not in vain. Freedom's battles were won . . . the courage of our young men and the tremendous resources of this great Republic carried the day, but it was the imagination and skill in strategy and tactics of our soldiers who bore arms as a profession, that brought victory.

Your superiors saw something in each of you along the way in your career, something that marked you as a leader, someone in whom the nation could repose its trust in time of national peril. The past few months which you have spent here should have helped further refine your talents in the military arts.

It would seem superfluous for me to remind you on this occasion of all this, but I appeal to your sense of responsibility . . . to duty, that word that Lee called the noblest in the English language.

Be not dismayed by the sophisticates in our society who scorn your calling, be not impatient with the mass of good citizens who take you for granted. Recall the oath which you took when you put on your uniform and stand fast in the tradition like Cincinnatus who sought no personal gain, but found satisfaction in service to the Republic.

For if you do these things, you will have fulfilled the trust that has been given to you. The experience of learning at this institution will have new meaning and you will end your military career with those intangible qualities of honor and integrity which all men have cherished through the ages.

My congratulations and best wishes to each of you. May God be with you always.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Cameroonians attained their independence on January 1, 1960. On that day some 5 million Cameroonians became

masters of their collective destiny, even though the country was to remain divided in two parts until late 1961.

This rather large country in west-central Africa was a German colony from the late 19th century until 1919. Then for nearly four decades it was under British and French administration. Meanwhile, soon after the end of the last war the peoples in the British Cameroun and in the French Cameroun clamored for independence and worked hard for their goal.

From 1946 through 1959 the British Cameroun and the French Cameroun were under the trusteeship of the two governments, and fortunately these governments did not hinder the proposed union of the two parts of the country. This union was brought about in October 1961, thus giving birth to the Federal Republic of Cameroun.

Today the Federal Republic of Cameroun has become a full-fledged member of the international family of sovereign states, and I gladly salute the Cameroonians on the 10th anniversary of their Independence Day.

A DANGEROUS PLACE TO SCRIMP

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with my colleagues the content of a thought-provoking editorial which appeared recently in the Raleigh, N.C., News & Observer.

Since the budget slowdown on educational spending so specifically affects my own congressional district in North Carolina's research triangle area—and many similar ones across the Nation—I think the incisive logic of this editorial comment assumes an added dimension, and I respectfully suggest that the line of reasoning pursued here be thoughtfully considered. The editorial follows:

A DANGEROUS PLACE TO SCRIMP

President Nixon is still engaged in a tough and tricky duel with inflation, one in which he has not been granted an unlimited choice of weapons. Still, it seems strange that out of those available to him, he would grasp his veto power and threaten to use it on the HEW appropriations bill.

This measure, set at different spending levels by House and Senate, has settled at approximately \$20 billion after conference committee action. Nixon considers this too much for an inflationary time. He is said to be especially put out over the way the administration's request for education funds has been upped by \$1 billion.

One way to particularize this general spending tussle between President and Congress is to study how some people here at home will be affected by the final outcome—for example, Tar Heel youngsters who need U.S. financial assistance in getting a college education. Roy Parker Jr., Washington correspondent for *The News and Observer*, looked at this angle in a Sunday story.

Tar Heel institutions of higher learning, Parker reported, say they need about \$20.2 million (at least) this school year to make loans, work-study programs or outright grants available to needy students. The money sought for these programs by Presi-

dent Nixon would yield about half of what the state needs. Even the higher national appropriation by Congress would send North Carolina only about three-quarters of the minimum needed. Thus, at best, some students are going to have a hard time getting financial aid for colleges. At worst, many more of them will not get this kind of assistance, and some may see their only opportunity for college vanish with a veto.

Granted, all government spending is inflationary. It seems fair to say, however, that some expenditures are more inflationary than others. What the President proposes to scrimp on, for a cooler economy's sake, are medical programs, employ safety efforts, health services, mental health projects, campus and community libraries, better schools, expanded educational opportunities. This economizing could be exceptionally dangerous. Nixon ought not to insist upon it until he has carefully considered the consequences and exhausted all other, more appropriate areas for government cost-cutting.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LEO JENKINS

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 27, many citizens of North Carolina will gather together to hold an appreciation dinner for Dr. Leo Jenkins, president of East Carolina University in Greenville, N.C. I suppose it would be most difficult to define the qualifications of an ideal university president; but, in the opinion of all who know him, Dr. Leo Jenkins possesses qualities which certainly must be considered when we think of the ideal university president.

He came into this high office with a background of experience possessed by few men. He attended Rutgers, Columbia, and New York Universities. During the Second World War, he served in the Pacific with the U.S. Marine Corps, attaining the rank of major. He came to East Carolina College in 1947 as dean of the school; later he also served in the capacity of vice president, with a great emphasis on the business affairs of the college. He is the father of six children, which obviously gives him a deep insight into the problems of youth. He is a lay preacher in the Methodist denomination, active in scouting and politics, and is an avid sports enthusiast. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that one must agree that Dr. Jenkins does indeed possess the qualifications and experience for making an ideal university president.

Finally, and most important, is the fact that in this day of dissention and rioting on the campuses, under his leadership, East Carolina University has not experienced the disruption as has others, but rather, has steadily grown in enrollment and educational stature. Indeed, from a moderate-size college, Dr. Jenkins has successfully led the fight to create a great university.

So, it is fitting that those of us who appreciate the outstanding service of Dr. Jenkins, should honor him with an appreciation night and I am privileged and happy to have a part in this event.

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET
PROCESS: INEXPLICIT, CLOSED,
AND UNINFORMED

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I highly recommend a perceptive and thought-provoking speech, "The Congressional Budget Process: Inexplicit, Closed, and Uninformed," given recently by my colleague, Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, to any of my colleagues who are seriously interested in realigning our national priorities.

Congressman MOORHEAD points out that the Congress will not be able to substantially shift our priorities unless the spotlight of economic analysis is placed on full range of programs which we have inherited from the past and unless decisions are based on the results of this analysis.

I would like to highlight just one shocking example of inequity which the Congressman illustrates. He points out that the budgetary costs plus the costs to the consumer of higher prices involved in the farm program, interestingly enough, comes to about the same dollar amount as the annual cost of our strategic nuclear weapons programs. This is something like \$8 to \$6 billion per year.

It turns out that 60 percent of the farm subsidies, roughly, go to the upper 16 percent of the farmers in terms of income. I find it most difficult to justify this program on equity grounds.

It is analysis like this which must be encouraged. The facts of efficiency and equity in public programs must be laid out with clarity for all to see. These facts must be brought home in open and explicit fashion to the American people.

The speech follows:

THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS: INEXPLICIT, CLOSED, AND UNINFORMED

(Remarks of Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD to the Association of Public Program Analysis, Oct. 14, 1969, Washington, D.C.)

I would like to begin my remarks by expressing appreciation to you for your efforts in implementing policy and issue analysis in the context of the Program Planning and Budgeting System.

As you are well aware, the Government sorely requires the yardstick of social costs and benefits to be applied to those programs supported by taxpayers' money. Only by determining those programs which have outlived or attained their original objectives; those programs whose objectives have become outdated; and those programs whose costs are far in excess of social benefits can we lay a basis for reordering our national priorities. I would argue that the application of sound economic analysis to all public programs is the first and basic step in reordering national priorities. Your leadership in both doing policy analysis and publicizing the role which it must play in an effective government has been most valuable.

As you, I believe that responsible government must adopt a more rational approach to public policy decisions. We can no longer continue with a system which fails to undertake the quantitative evaluation of the economic benefits and economic costs of program alternatives, both now and in the future, in relation to analyses of similar pro-

grams. To continue to ignore the careful consideration of gains and losses is equivalent to saying that we have no objective; no goals which we are attempting to achieve. While it is true that the objectives of the Federal Government are less tangible and more complex than those of a business firm, they do exist, and analysis should be carried out to determine which of our alternatives will allow us to satisfy these objectives at least cost to the taxpayers. I would add that the very effort of attempting to evaluate alternatives is of substantial assistance in determining what our objectives really are. To neglect a conscious and quantitative appraisal of policy alternatives is the recipe for continued unresponsiveness and ineffectiveness of government.

While your efforts have been most important, I would emphasize that efforts to institute effective economic analysis of policy issues is not completed. In fact, only the very barest start has been made. The concrete of tradition, which protects many outworn institutions and outlooks, must be broken down if policy analysis is ever going to be made an effective decision tool within the public sector of our economy.

I know and I am sure that you appreciate the resistance to your efforts that you have met and will continue to meet. No doubt one of the most serious of these is opposition to those in the bureaucracy who fear that sound and quantitative policy analysis will upset their comfort and, more significantly, their power and influence if it becomes effective in the decision-making process. Such forces exist in both the Executive Branch and the Legislature. You must not be discouraged by them. As time erodes vested positions and as the value of program analysis becomes more widely understood, their ability to deny analysis and information its due will be reduced.

In urging you to remain optimistic, I am arguing that one of your next steps must be to increase your efforts in publicizing the importance of the PPB System. The worst thing that could happen would be for you to withdraw into the comfortable warmth of the society of analysts—where you could discuss with fellow believers the fine points of analysis. You must make the education of nonanalysts both inside and outside of Government one of your primary missions. To fail to do so would play into the hand of those in the bureaucracy who retain their power only by keeping the spotlight of analysis away from their decisions.

THE CONGRESSIONAL NEED FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

As you may surmise, in advocating an increased role for "Missionary activity" on your part, I have a particular group in mind. While many in the Executive tend to forget the fact, the Congress plays an important role in the budget and decision process. Decision-makers in the Legislative Branch require sound policy analysis and a broad consideration of alternatives fully as much as do Executive decision-makers. I would like to give you my assessment of the present role of policy analysis in the Congress and describe what you can do to improve this situation.

In my judgment, the congressional budgetary process is one of the world's great anachronisms. In a very real sense, the congressional appropriation process is a classic example of an *inexplicit, closed, and uninformed* decision process.

This does not mean that the executive budgetary process is perfect, or that it is, in fact, very good on any absolute scale of balance. But it is both informed and open compared with the budgetary process which exists in the Legislative Branch.

In the Congress, with its committee and subcommittee system, there is very little explicit consideration of program objectives, of tradeoffs, or alternative means of achieving objectives, or of the benefits and costs

of budget proposals this year and in the future. In short, Congress does not really give the budget a meaningful review because it fails to ask the right questions. Indeed, in program area after program area, the Congress does not even know what the right questions are.

I would argue that a primary reason for this is the traditional policy of the Executive Branch dealings with the Congress. In my view, the Executive has been irresponsible in its budgetary dealings with the Congress. The basic presumption of the Executive is that it can govern itself without interference of the Legislature. Consequently, it divulges to the Congress as little information as it can get away with. The Executive Branch comes to the Congress with only one budget, with only one set of program proposals, and typically with no quantitative information on the benefits and the costs of even their own proposals. There are no budget projections; there is no description of the characteristics of the beneficiaries of programs; there is typically no indication of alternative ways to satisfy an objective.

I should emphasize, however, that much of the responsibility for this void rests on the Congress. We should demand alternatives and more sophisticated program analysis. We have not done this. For the first time in my memory, both the House and the Senate has been demanding this kind of analysis in the military area, and for reasons I will discuss later, the analyses were not made available. This effort, I believe, signals a new era in the demands of the Congress for analysis and policy studies.

One of the reasons why the Congress has performed so badly in the budgetary and appropriation areas has to do with the interest of Congressmen and Senators. Many in the Legislative Branch have little interest in or patience for careful deliberations on budgetary matters. A careful consideration of alternatives requires much effort and concentrated study of the relative merits and demerits, the costs and benefits, of alternative policy proposals. This is hard and grubby work. Many legislators not used to thinking in such terms have found it easier simply to rely on the Executive agency. Unfortunately these agencies are often more interested in selling their programs regardless of the merits than in having Congress analyze them. Other legislators, some in powerful positions, fear that the spotlight of analytical information will diminish their power to set policy in a particular area. Irrespective of the basis for the lack of interest by particular members of Congress, those of us concerned with improving the effectiveness of government must demand more and better analysis.

I would mention a further reason for Congress' poor performance in this area—the severe staffing constraints under which the Legislative Branch operates. Currently we do not have the staff either to interpret or to evaluate the analyses done by the Executive Branch if it were presented to us. More significantly, we have no staff to do program analysis on its own. An official of the Bureau of the Budget, in viewing congressional capability, stated:

"You (the Congress) have some outstanding people who can provide program evaluation, but very few. I frankly think that Congress is not very well equipped to provide that evaluation."

In addition to this lack of interest and staff, there is a further serious problem. The very organization of the Congress is such as to discourage the establishment of an effective public expenditure decision process. A primary difficulty is the organizational structure of the legislative and appropriations committees. A Congressman has strong incentive to get on a committee which would serve his own best interests and those of his constituency. The net result of this, of course,

is that the committee structure develops a built-in bias toward higher budgets. Because the people who serve on each committee have an interest in seeing the budget for which they are responsible increase, they often fail to encourage a careful evaluation and analysis of expenditures. When this is combined with the well-known problems of the seniority system in combination with virtual fiefdoms in some areas, the stage is set for "power without information."

Largely as an outgrowth of this built-in committee bias, the relationship between the staffs of the committees and their counterparts in the executive agencies is hardly one of arm's length dealing. The degree of mutuality of interest between the executive staff and those on the Legislative Branch committees is substantial. I would add that this problem is not peculiar to Legislative-Executive relationships. The serious lack of an adversary climate between Budget Bureau examiners who work on the military budget and their counterparts in the Pentagon has recently been of much concern to me.

The response of the Executive to the congressional situation has not been encouraging. Indeed, realizing the organizational, staff, and incentive problems in Congress, the Executive has used its monopoly on information and analysis to retain real decision-making power inside of the bureaucracy. The failure of the Bureau of the Budget to attempt to educate the Congress to the purposes, methods, and benefits of the PPB System is only one manifestation of the Executive tendency. In preparing for my discussions with you tonight, I had my staff query a random sample of House legislative and administrative assistants as to their level of understanding of the PPB System. It is noteworthy that only about 10 percent could identify what the letters "PPB" stand for. This is appalling. If either the Executive or the Congressional leadership had been concerned with a better decision process, this result would not have occurred.

THE CONGRESS, THE MILITARY, AND ROLE OF ANALYSIS

The question of domestic priorities versus military priorities has not been a subject for discussion in the highest councils of the National Government. This is one of the primary reasons the American people today face what some call "the military juggernaut." It is one of the primary reasons for the extended talk on the "failure of government" which has manifested itself in the taxpayers' revolt.

The Legislative Branch has not developed even the beginnings of a rational decision-making process as regards the military budget. The Executive Branch, and particularly the Department of Defense, has at least formally adopted a system of analysis and evaluation for their spending programs. The Secretary of Defense never comes to the Hill without a satchel full of analytic studies evaluating the cost-effectiveness of proposed decisions. These studies which estimate costs and effectiveness enable the Secretary to understand the effects of a variety of alternative ways of reaching similar goals and enable him to well defend his proposals.

Congress has lagged far behind the Executive in developing this capability. Indeed, Congress does not even go through the motions of systematic analysis and evaluation. This is especially serious in face of a military policy which is distorted by bloated views of contingencies, a tendency to over plan for even the most improbable contingency, and unhealthy relationships between military planners, procurement personnel, and contractors.

The problems of Congressional decision-making, it should be noted, are not often discussed in Congress. It is a taboo here, and the committee structure with all of its inadequacies and shortcomings is regarded by many as some sort of a holy cow.

Yet the vast majority of us know that the authorization and the appropriation process often does not produce rational or good decisions, and this is especially true in the area of military spending.

My point that the Congressional appropriation process is a classic example of an implicit, closed, and unformed decision process is doubled in spades as regards the military budget.

In the case of the military budget, as with others, the Executive comes before Congress with a single budget and a single set of programs. The committees might change the budget somewhat, and sometimes programs are modified. But changes and modifications are relatively slight. The Pentagon knows it will get from Congress more or less what it requests. Moreover, it knows that it will be able to guide whatever marginal changes do get made. Especially in the area of military spending, the Congressional committees have played a passive, noncritical, and overly permissive role. As John Kenneth Galbraith pointed out in the Economy in Government Subcommittee hearings on "The Military Budget and National Economic Priorities," Congress has sorely neglected the economics of defense.

In sum, the Pentagon and defense contractors have used fear, secrecy, propaganda, and monopolization to obtain fat budgets and fat contracts. Congress, up to this year, has acquiesced.

Many who defend the status quo argue that military affairs are so technical and complicated that decisions about weapons systems and military policy are best left to the experts. They point out that the experts reside only in the Executive Branch and in the Pentagon, and that Congress is misinterpreting its role if it tries to second-guess these experts. For many years, Congress has succumbed to the temptation to delegate its authority to the Executive Branch using this "technical expertise" argument to rationalize its inaction. In fact, this argument has been carried so successfully that many in Congress now feel their responsibility fulfilled when Congress, relying upon the knowledge of the experts in the Executive Branch, exercises only common sense judgments about the broader policy questions with the aid of its own wisdom and the political pressures it perceives.

I emphatically reject this argument. In my view, it represents the abdication by Congress of its constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

In my view, the function of the Legislative Branch is to make decisions on matters of public policy within its jurisdiction. Under the Constitution, national defense policy is clearly under the jurisdiction of Congress. However, and this is my main point, in order to make intelligent decisions about these matters, Congress must be informed. Currently the main obstacle to intelligent Congressional decisionmaking on the military budget is the lack of information, analysis, and qualified staff necessary to evaluate Pentagon assertions.

In point of fact, the Congress has often been misinformed by the Pentagon. Indeed, Pentagon misinformation is only exceeded by Pentagon noninformation. The numerous and shocking cases of large cost overruns, poor performance, and late delivery of weapons systems reflects very poorly the Pentagon's ability to manage the affairs entrusted to it. They also reflect on the ability of Congress to keep itself informed and to oversee Executive performance. It is such inept management and misuse of the public interest which has fostered the current lack of confidence in the ability of the public sector to serve the people.

This serious shortfall in both Executive and Legislative performance is best illustrated by the C-5A affair. Among other things, this affair triggered what could be

called "The year that the Congress discovered the usefulness of systems analysis, but lacked the capability of doing anything about it." Because of the groundswell of public outrage generated by the initial investigations of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government, there has arisen a genuine feeling among many Congressmen and Senators that the Congress sorely needs an analytic capability for program evaluation across the board.

Based on the findings of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government, I began questioning the requirement for the fourth squadron of 23 C-5A's. This was as early as March. It seemed to be a perfect system to question because:

The C-5A was an integral part of a new system for airlift—sealift capability with the FDL's. If the FDL's are cut out, do we still need the C-5A's?

The fantastically increased cost of the C-5A from \$21 million to \$45 million per plane. How does this escalation affect the cost effectiveness of the system vis-a-vis existing capabilities of C-141's, C-130's, and the new Boeing 747?

In the Senate debate over the fourth squadron of C-5A's, a great deal of debate focused on the conclusions, methods, and implications of two policy studies done in the Office of Systems Analysis in OSD. One study was made in November 1968; the other in June 1969. In general, both of these studies found little if any military or economic justification for purchase of these aircraft beyond the third squadron. As is now well-known, Mr. Laird decided to override the findings of these studies. In other words, he overruled the only studies that were made in determining the justification for an additional 23 aircraft which in total will probably cost American taxpayers over \$1 billion. While some might label such a decision "tough-minded," it seems to be more appropriately called "knot-headed."

Having made his decision, Secretary Laird came to the Congress fully expecting *carte Blanche* ratification. And his expectation was justified. We, in the Congress, confronted his decision with no independent analysis of our own and with no capability to generate it. In truth, all we possessed was some dribbles of information from the leaked reports. Moreover, because the Pentagon had classified these reports, their usefulness in Congressional debate was minimized.

As ultimately became known, Secretary Laird had rejected the assumption of the first study concerning the utilization rates of the aircraft under emergency conditions. He also rejected the assumptions of the second study regarding the availability of other transports and the availability of prepositioned material. I was and still am baffled concerning why the Pentagon undertakes such studies using analytical assumptions which are later going to be rejected as unrealistic.

The lesson of this sordid experience is clear. Congress finally saw itself as awkward and helpless and wholly unprepared to manage and control that for which it has constitutional responsibility. Because of the frustrating debate over the military procurement authorization bill, there is a growing consensus among those who are concerned about efficient and responsive government that the Congress should insist that the Administration undertake careful and quantitative studies of the programs which they are proposing and submit these to the Congress for its scrutiny. As an aside, it is interesting to note that I talked with a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee staff about whether or not they had seen the Systems Analysis studies of the C-5A. He said neither the Subcommittee nor its staff had seen them but that, if they requested, they could be briefed on them. I asked if they had demanded any study justifying this additional buy so that they could see the assumptions

on which it was based, as well as the effectiveness of the alternatives. They had not. This example, it seems to me, gives stark evidence of the ability of the Pentagon to do what it wants without interference from the Congress. The up-shot of this affair is that there is now a strong feeling in the Congress that we need a substantial increase in staff capability in the systems analysis or program analysis area so that we may develop the capability to ask the right questions concerning both military and civilian programs.

THE FORM OF INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

If it is ultimately decided that the Congress should develop an increased analytical capability, the basic questions will have to be confronted. Where should it be housed? How large should it be? What should its responsibilities be? To whom should it report? These are tough questions.

Some argue for a straight increase in committee staffs. Although I agree that the committee staffs, and especially the appropriation committees, should have increased capability available in this area, this will not answer the basic need. There needs to be some capability available to all members of Congress desiring independent analysis and study of programs which are not prepared by existing substantive committees.

My initial feeling was that the GAO could perform this role. I have had a number of both private and public discussions with Mr. Staats about this matter. However, I grow increasingly less optimistic about this alternative. There is a basic problem of the capability becoming institutionalized and controlled by certain segments of the Congressional establishment. The danger that the staff of an independent analytic office in GAO would be severely restricted is a very real one.

A second alternative is the establishment of a semi-autonomous staff unit of say, 10 professional analysts to the Joint Economic Committee. This is a realistic solution and, in fact, Senator Proxmire has stated his intention to introduce a resolution to this effect within the next few weeks. In Senator Proxmire's view, the services of this staff unit would be available to all members of Congress. It would have responsibility for:

- (a) Stimulating and drawing from policy analysis work done in the entire analytical community;
- (b) Staying abreast of analysis information and results as these develop in the Executive Branch;
- (c) Establishing Congressional liaison with university analysts and those in research institutions;
- (d) Monitoring in the sense of testing assumptions and checking data of studies forthcoming from any source;
- (e) Translating into a form appropriate for open Congressional debate the results of complex and technical analytical studies; and
- (f) Providing evaluation information and analysis to Members of Congress, Congressional committees, and their staffs.

However, even if this staff capability were achieved, the Congress would find itself at a serious disadvantage. We would be assisted in asking the right questions, but we still would not have access on an on-going basis to the wealth of studies and staff capability available to the Executive. In my view, the Congress needs to be provided by the Executive with certain basic kinds of PPB-type information on an on-going basis. The Executive Branch must be asked to develop this information and submit it regularly to the Congress in a form appropriate for use in Congressional debate. As a Report forthcoming from the Subcommittee on Economy in Government will document, we need a substantially improved budget document which will enable any member of Congress, indeed any citizen, to determine in short order the nature of any Federal program and the administering agency, the past budgetary

costs of the program and the future budgetary implications of decision already made, the economic costs of the program, and the economic and social characteristics of the recipients of the program benefits. This means that the budget document must include:

- (a) A Breakdown of the Federal budget by detailed, government-wide program categories;
- (b) Five-year budget projections for each major Federal expenditure program, describing the future implications of commitments or decisions made and proposed, of the sort required by Public Law 85-801 for new programs;
- (c) An experimental regional budget covering those Federal programs of a grant, construction, investment, or project-type nature;
- (d) A detailed analysis of "tax expenditures" including a functional and agency breakdown of these "expenditures;"
- (e) A detailed analysis of the full economic and distributive impact of subsidy and subsidy-like programs, including those involving loans and guarantees.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

As I mentioned earlier, it is my belief that the public sector will not be able to accommodate flexibility to new national priorities unless the spotlight of economic analysis is placed on the full range of programs which we have inherited from the past and unless decisions are based on the results of this analysis. We need to engage in true zero-based budgeting so as to eliminate or severely reduce programs with outdated and obsolete missions and those with negative net benefits.

Although the tools of economic analysis have been with us for some time, we, for one reason or another, have failed to apply them rigorously to public expenditure policy decisions. This fact was made crystal clear in the recent Economy in Government Subcommittee hearings on "Economic Analysis and the Efficiency of Government."

In these hearings, the Subcommittee turned the spotlight of economic analysis on several government programs, and what we found was highly disturbing. Among the programs discussed in these hearings were Federal maritime policy, aviation policy, navigation policy, highway construction policy, urban renewal policy, water policy, water pollution control policy, and programs for institutional aid to higher education. In case after case, distinguished analysts confronted the Subcommittee with disturbing evidence of the waste, inefficiency, resource misallocation, and inequity of public expenditures and rulemaking decisions. Some examples will make this clear.

"Many of the nation's largest and renowned corporations and their stockholders received, free of charge, publicly-supported and publicly-produced goods and services—subsidies which are neither economically efficient nor available to middle-income citizens and the poor."

"Federal rulemaking and regulatory policy, we were told, undertakes no analysis of the economic impact of the decisions which they make. Moreover, they are supposed to be the object of regulation in the public interest."

"Enormous spending programs with little economic justification are established and supported for decades with no challenge to their existence or increased funding. This is true of Federal highway and water policy."

"Some public programs incorporate reverse incentives for program efficiency and thereby foster inefficiency and inflation. The structure of incentives in Medicare reimbursements and the Maritime programs are examples."

"Some public programs designed to achieve social objectives in fact impose higher costs on low-income citizens, costs of which

are neither compensated nor considered in program decisions."

"Many Federal programs generate serious overproduction and resource misallocation because they distribute public outputs free of charge or at a price substantially below cost."

"Public policy subsidizes those who generate pollution and congestion rather than making them bear the costs which they impose on society. Through this strategy, the Government fails to induce altered private behavior which would eliminate enormous pollution and congestion costs."

The conclusion of this miserable record is that open and explicit economic analysis has not been rigorously applied to public decisions. Consequently, although the Nation's needs and priorities have changed, the Federal budget has not responded. While the social demands which justify the creation of many public programs have been met or have evaporated, the tax dollars poured into these outmoded, outdated, inefficient, and inequitable programs expand as though driven by an "invisible hand." New concerns, new responsibilities, and new commitments requiring new programs or lower taxes are no match for old subsidies for supporting entrenched interests. It is clear that this new "invisible hand" does not have the properties which were attributable to its predecessor. It neither serves the public interest nor guides the economic system to respond to new demands and new needs.

Although discouraged, I am not pessimistic with regard to the future of the public sector to improve its performance. I am convinced that we can increase the efficiency, equity, and responsiveness of Government if we begin using analysis as a guide to decisions. Currently the Congress itself actually prohibits much economic analysis, and the Executive Branch expects the Congress to ratify the pre-cooked decisions with little economic justifications or open consideration of alternatives. In many cases, the instrument of Executive privilege is wheeled out to justify Executive unresponsiveness. This syndrome of bureaucratic unresponsiveness cloaked in secrecy must give way to the open and explicit consideration of alternatives based on analysis and study.

In my view, one of the first things we must do is to communicate efficiency and equity distortions to the people in clear, unmistakable terms. So far we have not done so. I have a feeling that the time is right. There is now widespread acceptance of the proposition that our national priorities are seriously out of line. To capitalize on these sentiments, we have to put the economic case against inefficient and inequitable government programs in terms people can understand and then encourage widespread debate on the issue, as was done in the case of the ABM.

Some of these cases are astonishing and could be made very popular. I would like to very quickly run through the farm subsidy case as presented to the Subcommittee by Charles L. Schultze, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He prefaced his comments by pointing out two interesting things. First, that very often, we undertake programs which admittedly reduce the efficiency of the economy presumably for purposes of welfare or income distribution. And that is a perfectly legitimate objective at times. But some programs, as a matter of fact many of them, tend to reduce efficiency, but don't even redistribute income in a way in which most of us would think properly—mainly, toward the poor. They tend to redistribute income upward.

If we measure the budgetary costs plus the costs to the consumer of higher prices involved in the farm program, interestingly enough it comes to about the same number as the annual cost of our strategic nuclear weapons programs. This is something like 8 to 9 billion dollars per year. This volume of

subsidy tends to be distributed among farmers on the basis of production; the more that is produced, in general, the higher the subsidy. It turns out that the largest 16 percent of American farmers produce about two-thirds of all farm output and get about 60 percent of the subsidies. So 60 percent of the subsidies, roughly, go to the upper 16 percent. In turn, the upper 16 percent is a group of farmers whose average net income is about \$19 to \$20 thousand per year. Two-thirds, therefore, of this \$8 to \$9 billion subsidy, direct or indirect, goes to 16 percent of the largest farmers making something in the neighborhood of \$19 to \$20 per year. Calculated out, this comes to about \$7 to \$8 thousand per farmer. I find it most difficult to justify this program on equity grounds.

It is analysis like this which must be encouraged. The facts of efficiency and equity in public programs must be laid out with clarity for all to see. These facts must be brought home in open and explicit fashion to the American people.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY OF POLICY ANALYSTS

As I have tried to make clear, the decision-making process in the Congress operates with little information and under severe institutional constraints. For all intents and purposes, policy and program analysis plays little if any role in legislative deliberations. In essence, the problems is one of contagious and spreading ignorance as a basis for decisions. I believe that this condition can over time be changed. The basic ingredient for change must be a strong and effective educational program directed at Congress and Congressional staff.

This is where I see the community of public policy analysts playing a vital role. As a first step, I would suggest that the Association of Public Program Analysts set up a seminar series of Congressional staff along the lines of the seminar program on military procurement undertaken last spring. This series should focus on the role of analysis in spotlighting waste, inefficient policy strategies and inequity in government programs. I would propose that the recent hearings of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government on "Economic Analysis and the Efficiency of Government" be used as a text book.

This seminar series can be run with little or no money, and the response on the Hill is usually pretty good. Some political appeal, of course, has to be provided in terms of egregious examples of unproductive programs and interesting and well-known speakers, such as Charles Schultze, and others, who have highly significant insights on the failure of Government to perform in the public interest.

I would hope that the explanation of the systems or programs would be in laymen's terms—stressing simplicity and common sense rather than complexity and sophistication. Moreover, the sessions would have to be geared toward recommendations for changes in public policy so that the staff can elicit action from their Congressmen or Senators on specific issues that have some immediacy.

I hope that you will seriously consider these suggestions. I will do what I can to assist you in making policy analysis relevant to the Congressional decision process.

PRAISE FOR JAYCEES

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, the United States Jaycees celebrates its 50th

anniversary in 1970. There are 6,000 chapters in America with 300,000 members. In my own State of Virginia there are 139 chapters with 9,000 members. I am proud to have been selected an honorary member of the Norton-Wise, Va., Jaycees at its charter night banquet, January 9, 1970.

I would like to commend the Jaycee organization for its outstanding service. Jaycees are men of action. They not only voice their concern about solving the problems we face, but they also take constructive action toward this end. Their leadership is felt in individual communities, in entire States, in our whole Nation, and throughout the world.

As Virginia Jaycee President Lewis Walker recently said:

Jaycees offer a handup, not a handout.

They build better men and a better world. Surely these dedicated people deserve all the praise we can give them.

ADMINISTRATION FLAGRANTLY VIOLATES CIVIL RIGHTS ACT AGAIN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that it is necessary to arise again and again and call to the attention of the House the continuing and flagrant violation of the law of the land by agents of the Federal Government.

It is more than unfortunate; it could prove to be disastrous to the Nation. The philosophy that we need obey only the laws with which we agree, sold to an innocent public by rabble-rousers and subversives in the decade of the sixties, seems to have reached the point of no return, when Government officers feel free to defy the law and utilize the terrifying power of Government to accomplish their own devious purposes. Tyranny and anarchy are indefensible.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 clearly prohibited racial quotas in either labor union membership or in hiring. The same law clearly prohibited racial quotas in school desegregation. In each case the law is being openly violated by the very people sworn to uphold it. I include as part of my remarks a pertinent news-clipping:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 11, 1970] EXPECT UNIONS TO QUICKLY O.K. NEW JOBS PACT—PROVIDES FOR HIRING MORE NEGROES

(By Joseph Boyce)

Ratification by building trade unions of an agreement to put 4,000 Negroes to work in Chicago construction jobs is expected to come within the next two weeks, Thomas J. Murray, president of the Chicago Building Trades council, said yesterday.

The agreement was signed Friday by 11 representatives of various black organizations. It originally was offered Nov. 6 but was rejected then by the black groups after weeks of negotiations with the Building Trades council and the Building Construction Employers association, representing 19 construction unions.

CALLS IT A GOOD PACT

"I don't see any difficulty in getting ratification," said Murray, who stressed that Friday's agreement was "practically identical" to the one submitted by the unions Nov. 6.

"I think the organizations [member unions] understand the situation and recognize this as a good agreement," Murray said.

Once ratified, implementation of the agreement would begin immediately, he said.

Under the pact, the Building Construction Employers association and the council will find 1,000 jobs immediately for qualified Negro journeymen. Another 3,000 will be placed in on-the-job or apprentice training.

A formal announcement of the accord will be made tomorrow in the office of Mayor Daley.

REMOVE FEDERAL CURBS

Meanwhile, the pact removed the federal ban on five Chicago contracting firms ordered by the federal government in October to hire more minority workmen. The companies agreed to hire Negroes for 20 per cent of their work forces in 1970.

The five firms were among 17 Chicago contractors whom the labor department said were suspected of being in violation of government requirements for equal employment opportunity.

PLAN CLOSE SCRUTINY

John L. Wilkes, director of the office of Federal contract compliance, said the government would review the hiring practices of the five firms within 60 days to "assure good faith" on their part.

The companies are the Advance Heating and Air Conditioning corporation, 117 N. Desplaines st.; Thomas H. Litvin Plumbing company, 1355 Washington Blvd.; Shannon Plumbing Company, Inc., 8550 Genoa av.; S. N. Nielson Construction company, 3059 Augusta Blvd.; and Waner Heating and Air Conditioning corporation, 5414 Archer av.

JAYCEE WEEK

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the week of January 18 has been designated as "Jaycee Week" across the Nation in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The junior chamber has been an outstanding service organization since its inception, providing excellent leadership opportunities for its members, and offering to the many American localities served by its chapters groups of sincere young men actively dedicated to the concept of community betterment.

Earlier this month, I was honored to be the guest of the Maine Jaycees at a statewide membership meeting held in Westbrook, Maine. And as on other such occasions, I was impressed by the members' interest in public affairs and their obvious resolve to effect progressive change in their social and economic environment.

Surely, we have benefited greatly from the selfless and dedicated work of the thousands of loyal Jaycee organizations across the country.

On behalf of the people of the Sec-

ond Congressional District of Maine, therefore, I want to commend the efforts of the United States Jaycees and to express both congratulations and gratitude for their tremendous achievements in the first 50 years of service to their fellow man.

A TRIBUTE TO THOMAS J.
"STONEWALL" JACKSON

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is enough glory in the dramatic history of the War Between the States to last our country for the next thousand years. It was the last of the old wars and the first of the new; the last involving muskets and large-scale cavalry operations; the first involving airborne reconnaissance and the full employment of rifles and trenches. It was not the last, perhaps, in which brave men could write their names in history, but it did produce a remarkable number of heroes, and the State of West Virginia has the honor of association with one of the greatest and bravest of them all: Gen. Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson.

In the eastern theater of operations, the war involved a long series of assaults against the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia, protecting the Confederate capital at Richmond. Time after time, Confederate forces under Gen. Robert E. Lee repulsed the northern armies, in front of Richmond, to the astonishment of the world. Outnumbered on every occasion, Lee fought back brilliantly, to hold his own against extraordinary odds. But he was not conducting a one-man show. He had help, in great quantity, from West Virginia's outstanding contribution to the Confederate cause, the redoubtable "Stonewall" Jackson, a native of Clarksburg.

In the battle of First Bull Run, Jackson earned his nickname by standing, it was said, "like a stone wall," against the Federal attack. In the peninsula campaign of 1862, he entered the Shenandoah Valley, in a move threatening Washington, D.C., compelling the withdrawal of many Union troops from the assault on Richmond. Pursued by several Union armies in the Shenandoah, Jackson met them separately, defeating them one at a time in what has been called the most remarkable display of strategic science, based on accurate reasoning, correct anticipation of the enemy's plans, rapid marches, and judicious disposition of an inferior force, in all American military history. It also was largely responsible for the Union defeat on the peninsula.

At Second Bull Run, in 1862, Jackson's forces overwhelmed one wing of the Union army, disrupting its advance and forcing the retreat of the entire force. To Jackson, more than to any of his other lieutenants, General Lee owed the success of the turning movement which

enabled him to continue the offensive and carry the war into the North.

Stern in discipline and fierce in combat, Jackson drew from his associates that special burning respect reserved for military genius. One of Jackson's junior officers once observed that he never saw one of the general's couriers approaching without expecting an order to assault the North Pole.

Jackson was once again effective in the Antietam campaign and the battle of Fredericksburg, before engaging the Union forces in the final battle of his life, at Chancellorsville. Before daylight on May 2, 1863, he began the last of his great marches, one of the most effective of its kind in the history of warfare. Flanking the Union army, Jackson struck, routing one corps and driving it back upon another, compelling the precipitous retreat of the entire Union army, across the Rappahannock River.

Once again victorious, General Jackson had hopes again of ultimate Confederate success, but fate would not allow it. In the twilight, returning from the front, he was mistaken for the enemy and fired upon by his own men. Overcome by shock and cold, he died of pneumonia, May 10, 1863. And from the moment of his departure, the Confederate Army of General Lee was never capable of the same miraculous performance. As Lee himself observed, Jackson's death had virtually deprived him of his strong right arm.

In all American history, no hero outshines Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson, the pride of West Virginia. He was a man among men, overshadowing the ablest of his contemporaries, and ranking with the greatest of American military leaders.

THEY DESERVE PRAISE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding local publications serving my congressional district is the Riverdale-Dolton Pointer which is known for its support of outstanding community efforts. Therefore, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD a Pointer editorial of January 8 in which the local volunteer fire department is eulogized.

May I take this opportunity to point out that the volunteer firemen across the country display the type of spirit and responsibility that has helped build the wonderful communities that in turn comprise our great Nation.

The editorial follows:

THEY DESERVE PRAISE

The local volunteer fire department is a corps of local men banded into an effective organization to control and extinguish any fire in the district it serves. We have commented many times on the vital work done by local volunteers, the aspect of training, and equipment needed for fire fighting.

But we have never thought before to mention the personal sacrifice made by the em-

ployers who make it possible for each volunteer to answer a call for help.

In our small communities, a number of business people and their employees are members of the volunteer fire department. When these people are called away from their work, their income stops for that period, for they cannot be selling merchandise or giving their customers service when they are fighting a fire.

When the alarm sounds, there is no telling how long these people might be gone. Sometimes it is just a matter of minutes until a fire is out and the firemen can return to their homes or jobs. Sometimes it is a matter of hours, and we can recall some which lasted the better part of a full day.

Firemen receive a tiny compensation for their great work, about enough to take care of cleaning the smoke from their clothes. There is no reimbursement for the time they lose from their occupations, sales they missed by not being in their stores, or help in catching up on the backlog of work which accumulates during the time they devote to fighting fire.

We commend the volunteer firemen and their employers for their unselfish efforts in serving on the fire department.

NORTH APOLOGIZES TO SOUTH:
CORRECTING THE RECORD

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest a statement appearing in the December 12, 1969, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 29, page 38880.

Inserted in the RECORD at that point was an editorial comment apologizing for supposedly having "distorted and slanted" news about the South. The apology was attributed to the Chicago Tribune.

The apology was inserted in the RECORD for the benefit of, among others, historians. If historians are not to be misled, a correction is in order. The Tribune has asserted, according to a news article appearing January 14, 1970, in the Washington Post, that they never printed the editorial in question.

The Post news article reports that since 1966 the Chicago newspaper has been denying authorship. The spurious Tribune editorial has been widely circulated through the South and Southwest.

I include in the RECORD the news article denying Tribune authorship as it appeared in the Washington Post:

PAPER ASKS BAN ON USE OF EDITORIAL

CHICAGO.—The Chicago Tribune said today it had asked a federal District Court in Memphis, Tenn., to bar use of its name with an editorial which it said has been falsely attributed to the newspaper.

The suit asked an injunction against Betty Furness and the Memphis Citizens' Council. The suit said the council paid for publication of the editorial in the Dec. 16 issue of the Memphis Press-Scimitar.

The Tribune said the editorial apologizes for coverage of racial incidents in the South by Northern newspapers.

It quoted the editorial as concluding, "Dear Dixie, perhaps we have not learned to appreciate what you have been trying to do to defeat revolution—but for whatever belated comfort it may be, from our glass

house we will not be throwing any more stones."

The Tribune said that since 1966, the editorial has been attributed to the Tribune and circulated widely through the South and Southwest. The Tribune never printed the editorial and has sent letters to editors of newspapers and other publications calling it a hoax, the newspaper said.

The suit quoted a 1966 Tribune editorial which said, "It is our understanding that it (the 'apology' editorial) was a radio editorial read over the air by Paul Harvey, a news commentator. We trust that from now on it will be credited to the proper source."

LEAD US NOT INTO INFLATION

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed as I read the papers each day how widespread is the belief that the Congress has substantially increased the fiscal year 1970 Health, Education, and Welfare Department budget requested by the President. This belief emanated from the White House where it has become popular to cite this appropriation bill as the Armageddon for the administration's belated counteroffensive on inflation. If we lose this one, the President tells the press, we will forever be the prisoners of a free-spending Congress, welfare mothers, and little children with books.

The fact is the total sum appropriated by Congress for HEW is slightly less than that requested by the President. According to the Legislative Reference Service, Mr. Nixon asked Congress for \$19.834 billion for the Department's fiscal 1970 programs, and has received by virtue of the bill now on his desk \$19.747 billion—a cut of \$87 million. He now threatens to veto a sum which is less than he originally requested.

The administration complains bitterly about a \$1 billion increase approved by Congress for education and charges it is inflationary. On that basis, the President vows to veto the entire HEW appropriation.

This is simply a numbers game. While the President may choose to disagree with the high priority the Congress has assigned our education programs, he will have a hard time arguing that the total HEW budget Congress sent him is more inflationary than the even higher figure he asked for. The fact is that Congress made substantial cuts in other areas of the HEW budget which offset the billion dollar increase for education.

Moreover, even with the increase in education funds proposed by Congress, my State and others will receive less money than last year. When I voted for the now famous billion-dollar increase, what I was saying in effect is that my State was prepared to accept a 4-percent cutback in education money, but not the 30-percent slash envisioned by the Nixon administration—a slash that would necessitate higher property taxes, double sessions in some districts, and tremendous reductions in badly needed vocational training programs.

The following is a breakdown of the moneys contemplated for Arizona edu-

cation programs by Congress and the Nixon administration:

	1969 actual (millions)	Congress	Nixon	Difference
Elementary and secondary education.....	\$12.78	\$12.35	\$11.19	\$1.16
Impacted area.....	10.28	11	6.7	4.3
Higher educational programs and construction.....	2.435	.993	.669	.32
College student loans and direct aid.....	5.517	4.556	3.965	.60
Total higher education.....	7.95	5.55	4.63	.92
Vocational education.....	2.133	4.804	2.827	1.977
Libraries and community services.....	1.517	1.048	.807	.240
Education for handicapped.....	.819	.224	.224	0
Total.....	37.6	36.07	26.63	9.438

Mr. Speaker, I am appending to this statement a study of how the Federal education programs affect our economy. The study, prepared by Gerald O. Bryan of Arizona State University, disputes President Nixon's thesis that the education budget is inflationary. It is an especially thoughtful piece, and I recommend it to the Members:

FEDERAL AID—EXPENDITURE OR INVESTMENT?

(By Gerald O. Bryan)

(NOTE.—The author is associate in executive programs, Center for Executive Development, Arizona State University. Before assuming his present position he spent six years as teacher-coordinator of distributive education in Des Moines and in Tucson. He is immediate past president of the Arizona Vocational Association.)

Government, through its taxing, spending, and policy making activities, plays a vital role in the economy of this country. Increased taxes reduce the income available for private consumption. Increased spending tends to stimulate business activity. Combined, these two expedients can provide for a complete redistribution of income.

Government policies, such as those initiated by the Federal Reserve System, can stimulate or retard saving and investment. Because of its strategic role, it is no surprise that government is asked to correct, and blamed for causing, the many economic problems that exist in our system. One of these is unemployment.

The Keynesian economists would say that unemployment conditions can be corrected by creating more jobs through increased investment or government spending. They would advocate government policies encouraging private investment as well as deficit spending by government agencies. Whether this spending was used for highways, schools, war, or water-wings would be irrelevant as long as it stimulated productive activity. The increased activity alone would produce the jobs necessary to eliminate unemployment.

CURE LOSES EFFECT

As income rises, however, this system becomes more difficult to maintain. Larger and larger amounts of investment are needed to offset the increased savings in the system. In addition, this larger investment tends to raise the level of technology. The effect of this may be that many people are left behind because they lack the skills and education to compete at such a high level of technology. This can result in the paradox of a labor shortage and unemployment occurring at the same time.

Many feel that this is the situation currently faced by our economy. They feel that for all practical purposes, we are at full employment. The unemployed are simply those who have been left behind. Any Keynesian attempt to provide further employment produces more inflation than jobs.

The solution to this dilemma seems to lie in "directed" rather than general government spending. The direction of expenditures

toward the problems of the unemployed can obtain two results. The unemployed are given a chance to catch up. At the same time the rest of the economy enjoys the indirect effects of government spending.

VACCINE VERSUS ASPIRIN

Government spending directed toward unemployment seems to have taken two forms; expenditures for "aspirins" and expenditures for "vaccine." The first is for the temporary relief of the symptoms of unemployment. The second is an attempt to cure the disease of unemployability.

This article will discuss the effects produced by one of the government's vaccine expenditures—specifically, a study of the results produced by the government-supported distributive education program in the State of Arizona.

The use of federal money for such programs has been the subject of much controversy in recent years. Some consider such aid to be just another expenditure of limited tax revenues. Others feel it is a sound investment in the future.

There is only one sure way to distinguish an investment from an expenditure—measuring the returns that are produced. If the dollar returns are greater than the original dollar input, then that input must be considered an investment. If not, it must be classified as an expenditure.

THREE ASSUMPTIONS

The following paragraphs are devoted to identifying, in the form of increased tax revenues, the dollar returns produced by the distributive education program in Arizona. In plotting such returns, it was necessary to make several assumptions. The three used in this analysis are as follows:

1. According to the Chambers of Commerce, every dollar that is injected into the business system creates approximately two and one-half times its value in additional income before it runs its course. This is how the Chambers determine the effects of a new industry in a community.

2. Even though the lowest rate levied by the Internal Revenue Service is 20 percent, a ten-percent average rate was used in this analysis. This reduction was made to allow for any deductions and exemptions that might be claimed by the taxpayers involved. The only exception was in the case of student earnings where the tax was plotted more directly. The Arizona state income tax averages approximately five percent of the federal figure. Therefore a five-percent rate was applied in this analysis.

3. Finally, in order to apply the state's four-percent sales tax, an estimate had to be made concerning the amount of income expended for goods and services. National income statistics show that consumption is equal to approximately two-thirds of the national income totals.¹ Therefore the sales tax was applied to only two-thirds of the income totals listed. An exception was again made in the case of student earnings. The

Footnotes at end of article.

writer's experience with the students involved prompted the adoption of 80 percent as a consumption rate for them while they were in school.

Of course this analysis is only an informal look at the situation. More accurate figures could have been achieved if the amounts had been plotted rather than estimated. For this reason, conservative estimates were used.

"DE" EXPENDITURES

In the 1966-67 school year, the federal expenditure for distributive education in the State of Arizona was \$247,940.² To this amount was added some \$731,525 of state and local funds.³ Thus a total of \$979,465 was used to support distributive education in the state that year.

All of this money was used for the purchase of goods and services. Hence if we assume a turnover of two and one-half times as indicated by the Chambers of Commerce, a total income of \$2,348,664 was generated. The taxes on this income represent the first return on the original investment.

If we assume that two-thirds of this amount was used for consumption, we can estimate that \$62,631 was collected by the state in sales tax. If we further assume that an average of 10 percent of the total income was collected for income tax, the federal government received a return of some \$234,866. With state income tax equal to approximately five percent of the federal tax figure, Arizona collected an additional \$11,743 in state income taxes. These returns are the result of simply spending the money.

STUDENT EARNINGS

However, this money was invested for a purpose. What were the returns produced by the program itself? A total of 763 high school seniors were given part-time employment through the distributive education program during the 1966-67 school year. During the course of that year, those students earned a total of \$630,000.⁴

Assuming that the students consumed 80 percent of their income, we can figure that a total of \$20,160 was collected from them in the form of sales tax. The average earnings per student were \$826; of that, \$226 represented taxable income. A 20-percent tax rate applied to this figure shows that the students paid a total sum of \$34,487 in federal income taxes. When the two-and-one-half turnover rate is applied to the students' earnings after taxes, and the 10-percent average tax is applied to the resulting sum, it can be shown that the federal government received an additional income tax return of \$94,500. The five-percent state average applied to this figure amounts to approximately \$4,725 paid to the state in income taxes. Finally, an additional \$25,200 in state sales tax was collected as a result of the turnover of the students' original earnings.

AFFECTS UNEMPLOYMENT

Another return produced by the DE program was its impact on unemployment. The national unemployment rate for 16- and 17-year-olds was 14 percent in 1966 and 1967.⁵ The unemployment rate for the 763 students graduated from the Arizona DE program during that same period was 6.9 percent.⁶ When these two rates are applied to the 763 individuals in question, the program is shown to have reduced the number of potentially unemployed from 107 to 50. Therefore, the earnings of 57 people saved from unemployment represent another investment return. (This conclusion is based on the supported assumption that employment of the DE graduates resulted from their distributive education experience.)

Observations have shown that most employed DE students receive a raise during their senior year. Another raise is usually forthcoming when they become full-time employees after graduation. If we assume the

minimum wage of \$1.40 as a starting base and an average raise of ten cents per hour, we can plot the increased earnings of these workers.

At 40 hours per week for a 50-week year, the 57 additional employees produced by this program earned a total of \$171,000. With the turnover, this sum creates some \$427,500 in additional incomes. From this, the federal government received \$42,750, and Arizona received \$2,137 in income taxes and \$11,400 in sales tax.

INCREASED EARNING POWER

Each of the remaining 706 employees earned an average of \$400 over the amount earned by their peers who waited until after graduation to begin their employment. This figure is arrived at by assuming a \$1.40 hourly rate for the beginning workers as compared with a \$1.60 hourly rate for the 706 experienced workers who had already received two raises of ten cents per hour. Working 40 hours per week in a 50-week year, these experienced workers achieved a total of \$282,400 in increased wages. The turnover raises this amount to \$706,000 of generated income. From this, the federal government collects \$70,000, while the state receives \$3,530 and \$18,826 in income taxes and sales tax respectively.

Moving on to the second year of full-time employment for DE graduates, we find that more returns are produced. National statistics show the unemployment rate for 18- and 19-year-olds to be 22 percent lower than the rate for 16- and 17-year-olds.⁷ The adjusted national rate is 10.9 percent, while the adjusted rate for DE graduates in Arizona is 5.5 percent. (Both of these rates are for the 1966-67 school year.)

Application of these rates to the 763 graduates shows that the program produced 41 additional workers in the second year. Continuing on the assumptions used above, we can estimate that these 41 individuals earned \$131,200 during the year, creating a total of \$328,000 in additional income. The federal government's share was \$32,800 while the state collected a total of \$10,387.

The increased earnings of the remaining 722 individuals come to a total of \$228,800. This figure is arrived at by assuming the same \$400 differential used to plot the increased earnings during the first year of full-time employment. With turnover, these earnings produced incomes of \$722,000. Federal income tax amounted to \$72,200, and the state collected \$3,610 in income taxes and \$19,253 in sales tax.

INVESTMENT RETURNS

It is evident that these tax returns will continue into the third, fourth, and fifth years of full-time employment. However, it is interesting to note that in just three years from the date of investment, a total of \$6,107,164 income was generated. From this, the federal government received a return of some \$582,203 and the State of Arizona received \$193,602. In other words, the federal government received over two dollars for every dollar invested, while the state reduced its expenditure by 26.5 percent.

It should be noted that the 763 individuals studied here represent only 11.3 percent of the total number of people served by this government expenditure. Also served were 1,184 high school juniors, 391 junior college students, and 4,364 adults.⁸ Many of these people also received employment as a result of the distributive education program. However, the unavailability of data prevents an analysis of the returns produced by these individuals.

There are many returns from this program that cannot be equated with a dollar sign. But the fact that no dollar value is placed upon them does not make them less important.

The first of these benefits is derived from

the fact that during 1966, some 13,659 hours of instruction were offered to the people in the program. If 25 students per class is assumed, this represents about 64 hours of instruction for each student. If this instruction were left for employers to perform after these people had been placed on their payrolls, and if these employers were able to provide this instruction at a cost of one dollar per person per hour, which is doubtful, it would have cost them a total of \$341,475.

In addition to the above, distributive education graduates tend to be promoted faster than their peers. Numerous success stories can be cited to verify this fact. It is not uncommon to find these graduates in positions of responsibility and authority early in their careers.

A MATTER OF DIRECTION

With our economy near full-employment and with a rising level of technology, government spending must be carefully directed to be effective. Spending, such as that for properly directed distributive education programs, becomes an investment rather than an expenditure.

The problems of the unemployed is an area where directed government spending can be used to an advantage. The unemployed are those who have been ill-prepared or those who have been left behind by the technological advances of our times. Thus, programs to help them keep in step can prevent the problem from becoming more acute in the future.

The aspirin tablet programs are temporary relief, although they may be necessary as an immediate measure, should not become permanent. Vaccine programs, such as distributive education, should be encouraged as a more permanent cure for the disease of unemployment.

These educational programs clearly pay returns that are greater than the investment made in them. In fact, such investments can be compared with those made by business firms on capital goods. Both pay for themselves in increased productivity. In addition, a broader economic base is created by converting potential economic liabilities into economic assets.

FOOTNOTES

¹ U.S. Department of Commerce, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, July 1966, pp. 321-22.

² Controller, State Department of Vocational Education, Phoenix, Arizona. Personal interview.

³ "Annual Descriptive Report," Arizona State Department of Vocational Education, 1966-67.

⁴ Statement by Charles E. Hulse, Assistant State Supervisor, Office of Distributive Education, Arizona State Department of Vocational Education, in a personal interview.

⁵ U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Monthly Labor Review*, August 1967, p. 83.

⁶ "Annual Descriptive Report," Arizona State Department of Vocational Education, 1965-66.

⁷ U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Monthly Labor Review*, August 1967, p. 83.

⁸ Annual Descriptive Report, Arizona State Department of Vocational Education, 1966-67.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

United States Department of Commerce, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 90, No. 8, Washington: Government Printing Office, August 1967.

State Department of Vocational Education, "Annual Descriptive Report," 1966-1967 (unpublished). Phoenix, Arizona.

State Department of Vocational Education, "Annual Descriptive Report" 1965-1966 (unpublished). Phoenix, Arizona.

State Department of Vocational Education, "Follow-Up Survey of 1966-67 Graduates" (unpublished). Phoenix, Arizona.

TABLE I.—RETURNS ON DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION INVESTMENT

Explanation	Actual income	Created income	Federal income tax (10 percent average)	State income tax (5 percent of Federal)	State sales tax (¼ total income)
Federal investment.....	\$247,940				
State and Local.....	731,525				
Total investment.....	979,465				
Turnover Total.....		\$2,348,664	\$234,866	\$11,743	\$62,631
Student earnings (senior year).....	630,000				
Turnover Total.....		1,575,000	128,987	4,725	45,360
Added employees (First year).....	171,000				
Turnover total.....		427,500	42,750	2,137	11,400
Increased wages (First year).....	282,400				
Turnover total.....		706,000	70,600	3,530	18,826
Added Employees (2nd year).....	131,200				
Turnover Total.....		328,000	32,800	1,640	8,747
Increased wages (2nd year).....	288,880				
Turnover total.....		722,000	72,200	3,610	19,253
3-year grand total.....		6,107,164	582,203	27,385	166,217

¹ Students' original earnings plotted on a 20-percent tax rate.
² Students' original earnings plotted on the basis of an 80-percent consumption rate.

THE MORE THINGS CHANGE, THE MORE THEY ARE THE SAME

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the sounds of the demonstrators we hear so much about today are very similar to those which we heard a generation ago. I include for the benefit of my colleagues an article which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner entitled, "The More Things Change, the More They're the Same."

THE MORE THINGS CHANGE, THE MORE THEY'RE THE SAME

(By Charles L. Gould)

Do these news items sound familiar? Do they sound current?

"Ripe tomatoes, rotten eggs, gas bombs and fist fights distinguished peace demonstrations held by students throughout the nation."

"Anti-war strikes with more than 300,000 students participating on more than 100 campuses are set for next Wednesday."

"Eggs, vegetables and water filled paperbags were hurled at San Jose State College during a student anti-war demonstration."

"Sponsored by the American Students Union, thousands of college undergraduates and high school students left their classrooms to participate in the third annual demonstration against the war."

"Aiming for an initial operating budget of more than a million dollars, Ray Newton, executive director of a new combination of anti-war groups, asserts it is 'the most ambitious program ever attempted by the peace movement in the United States.'"

"A shouting, chanting mob of UC students estimated at more than 3000 blocked traffic and broke windows as they conducted a massive anti-war demonstration outside Sather Gate at the Berkeley campus."

"Anti-war demonstrators in New York claim moral support from dozens of congressmen, thousands of teachers and tens of thousands of clergymen."

"For the hundredth straight day, pickets marched in front of the White House chanting 'Peace' and protesting the draft and war."

Actually they were taken from newspapers of nearly 30 years ago. They are typical of thousands of reports that were published in papers from coast to coast in the late 30's and early 40's.

Long before the current crop of young protesters came on the scene, an earlier generation of activists was chanting anti-government slogans in peace demonstrations on campuses across the Nation.

Then, as now, authorities who attempted to disperse the "peace" demonstrators were charged with "police brutality."

The protesters of a generation ago were anti-government, anti-establishment and anti-law-and-order.

They fought the draft. Although England and France were locked in a life and death struggle with Hitler, the peace agitators in the U.S. screeched and screamed and demonstrated against our aid to our historic allies.

The loudest protests came when the U.S. gave 40 over-age destroyers to England. Then came June 22, 1941.

For two years prior to this landmark date, Hitler and Stalin had been joined together as allies.

While the pact was on, the Communists in this country—and throughout the world—recognized Hitler as a blood brother.

It was the Communists in this country who masterminded most of the peace demonstrations of a generation ago.

The same red leaders travelled from campus to campus, from coast to coast. They were past masters at wooing and winning the support of starry-eyed idealists.

Then came June 22, 1941.

It was on this date that Hitler marched into Russia. The German dictator, flushed with a series of victories against Poland, Austria, France and England, turned on Stalin.

Even as Hitler launched his war against the Communists, the peace demonstrators in this country were marching in front of the White House and conducting protest meetings on a hundred campuses throughout the 48 States.

They were caught flat-footed. They were caught with their signs up and their signals down. Quickly they retreated and regrouped. Then they got the message on the party line.

The next day the home-grown demonstrators were back on the job. They renewed their picketing and demonstrating.

Now, though, their signs urged "More Aid to Great Britain."

Some of the true idealists were shocked and saddened. They were sincere in their peace protests. Tens of thousands were disillusioned. They realized they had been manipulated and used.

Today, the average age in our Nation is 27. Nearly 60 percent of our people were not alive during the hectic years that preceded World War II. Today's young people can have no direct knowledge of the peculiar divisiveness that was promoted among our people.

It was a divisiveness that endured only so long as it served the best interests of the Communists.

Who is served by today's divisiveness?

IN RECOGNITION OF MILLS COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the feelings of anxiety that exist on the part of the youth of America. Therefore, I wish to remind you that the elementary school students of today are the Nation's future leaders and the nursery school toddlers are the voting citizenry in the year 2000. With this in mind, it is of particular importance that we examine those people who hold most of the responsibility for molding the minds of these youngsters and thereby shaping their future and the destiny of our Nation. Those people to whom I refer are our educators and those who will become teachers.

Recently, I learned of a very unique college in New York City that specializes in educating these future teachers by combining their major subjects with an overall program designed to prepare the students for a meaningful life as a person, citizen, and educator. Therefore, I would like to bring to your attention Mills College of Education, an independent, nonsectarian, accredited 4-year women's college whose graduates go on to teach in nursery school, kindergarten, and the elementary classes through grade six.

Founded in 1909, Mills has pioneered in the field of early childhood education for almost six decades and through its halls have passed young ladies who have gone on to teach in schools throughout the world. Graduates have come from Central and South America, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, England, and as far away as the Philippines, Australia, India, and the Orient. In most cases, foreign students have returned to teach in their native lands, taking with them a greater understanding and appreciation of our American way of life.

In addition to its regular curriculum, the college also operates two day-care centers in Harlem for more than 200 youngsters ages 3 through 8. Both centers are located in large city housing projects and cater to children of working parents and to those unable to provide weekday care. The students of Mills College operate the centers on a year-round basis and are, therefore, able to sharpen their teaching skills while providing a

much needed community service. The Mills Theater Workshop also makes an admirable contribution to the community by performing productions, semiannually, before audiences comprised of disadvantaged children; thereby giving them their first, and possibly only, opportunity to be exposed to the realm of live theater.

The philosophy of Mills, reflected by its graduates, will most certainly be a beneficial influence on tomorrow's students. This college strives to endow each student with essential nonacademic tools; to cultivate a deep understanding and respect for the children they will teach, to become widely aware of the world's social structure, to become instilled with a working knowledge of human behavior. Each student is encouraged to be an informed citizen with a genuine desire to participate in civic and community life. As a result of this democratic approach to life, serious unrest has not hit the Mills campus; the students already possess many of the freedoms for which militant students are fighting; it has a participating student body and cooperating student-faculty government.

I feel that the continuous contribution being made by Mills College is without bounds and is to be commended and appreciated by all of us. The policy set by its president, Dr. Margaret Devine, the example set by the faculty, the dedication of Mills' students, and the responsibilities assumed by its graduates all have a vast effect on what our world of tomorrow will be; and set an example that could well be followed by other institutions of learning and their educators and students.

MARYLAND MARINE KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lance Cpl. Michael Soltys, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:
ENEMY HAND GRENADE KILLS LANCE CPL.
MICHAEL SOLTYS

The Defense Department announced yesterday that Marine Lance Cpl. Michael Soltys, 19, was killed December 17 by an enemy hand grenade while on a search and clear mission with his platoon in Quang Nam province, 375 miles north of Saigon. Corporal Soltys had lived at 1200 Gleneagle road.

Corporal Soltys joined the Marine Corps November 7, 1968. He was sent to Vietnam on July 13, and was promoted to lance corporal October 25.

The recipient of an award as the best marksman in his platoon, he told his mother, Mrs. Thaddeus Soltys: "This is nothing mom, wait until you see all the medals I bring home."

In his last letter home from Vietnam he wrote, "For all the lousy weather, and the lousy food and everything, I don't mind it.

Freedom 'tis sweeter to those who sacrifice a slight bit for it."

He attended Calvert Hall college, where he played lacrosse and junior varsity football. On his 18th birthday, he enlisted in the Marine Corps. While waiting to be called to duty, he worked for three months as a cashier in a grocery store.

An avid Colts fan, he had hoped to try out for the team after he left service.

Born in Salisbury, he was brought to Baltimore as a small child by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thaddeus Soltys, of Baltimore, who survive him.

PRESIDENT NOMINATES NEW ASSOCIATE JUSTICE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to heartily commend President Nixon on his nomination of Judge G. Harrold Carswell, of Tallahassee, Fla., to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

By judicial standards, G. Harrold Carswell is a conservative. He sees his judicial responsibilities in clear and simple terms. He considers himself to be charged with upholding the terms of the Constitution of the United States and strictly enforcing the laws of the land. I agree with this philosophy, as does President Nixon.

Judge Carswell, presently a distinguished member of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, stands squarely in the hallowed legal tradition of adherence to prior legal precedents. As an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, he would not be tempted to engage in judicial legislation. Neither would he be tempted to pervert the Constitution of the United States to satisfy his own political leanings.

In my judgment, Harrold Carswell represents the type of judicial philosophy that is desperately needed on the High Court; moreover, I believe Harrold Carswell to be the right man to help implement that philosophy.

By nominating Judge Carswell, President Nixon also served clear notice that he does not intend to be intimidated or controlled in his choice of key Federal appointees by labor bosses, civil rights agitators, or the eastern liberal establishment. The President's duty, in this regard, lies to the American people and not to special interest groups that would further imbalance the Supreme Court by placing on the High Bench political disciples of liberalism who could impose their warped philosophy on the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, President Nixon has clearly fulfilled one of his responsibilities to the American people by his nomination of Judge Carswell. I call upon the Senate to fulfill theirs by promptly passing on this nomination so that the membership of the Supreme Court can once again be raised to its full strength and effectiveness.

JAYCEE'S GOLDEN YEAR

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in this Jaycee golden anniversary year, this outstanding service organization should be placed in national focus. As a former member of the Jaycees, I have a personal knowledge of the work performed by this dedicated group of young Americans.

It is entirely appropriate that their achievements be given due recognition in the highest legislative body of our land. The creed of the Jaycees embodies the ideals of true Americanism. Yet, the members of this organization are bound to American goals by more than the lofty language of a fraternal pledge. Each individual member possesses inherently the personal characteristics which motivate him in the service of others.

Throughout the United States, Jaycees possess a common bond. Northerners, westerners, southerners—all are "young men of action." Since the founding of the organization, these men have worked either individually or collectively for the betterment of their community and its citizens. In a time when the need for responsible leadership is frighteningly evident, these young citizens represent the hope of tomorrow. These are men who face the crises of our modern times, unpleasant as they may be, with an aim to solving or alleviating the problems. These are the kind of men our Nation's youth deserve to witness in everyday life and whom, hopefully, they will seek to emulate. These are men who have banded together in the hope that a unified effort will preserve the free American system that was the dream of their forebears.

Countless public service programs have been undertaken by Jaycees in every State. Whether local, statewide, or nationwide, the projects of this vigorous organization are predestined for success. Recently, a highly commendable national Jaycee movement was designated as "Project Prayer." Representative members from Virginia, Minnesota, Ohio, and Tennessee visited my office seeking support of a constitutional amendment designed to return voluntary prayer to public schools and public life. The responsible manner of conveying their opinions on vital issues, as well as the timeliness of this project, is indicative of the caliber and perceptiveness of their leadership. Their efforts illustrate an awareness of the tremendous impact that prayer had in the birth of freedom on this continent and of the necessity for withstanding bitter attacks on religion by improperly motivated groups.

The United States Jaycees, a service organization in the truest sense of the word, has upheld successfully through 50 years the noble principles upon which it

was founded. Made up of tireless workers dedicated to common goals, this national association of devoted young men has become a moving force in community life today. On its 50th anniversary, this worthy civic association should be hailed as a true friend of freedom, for it is actively seeking to "keep America America."

THEY GOT THE FEELING THAT
EVERYBODY'S SOMEBODY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, education is one of the soundest investments we can make. A presidential veto of the Labor-HEW appropriation bill may rob many children of high-quality education and create a severe burden for our schools. I should like to share with my colleagues a description of one of the federally financed programs which has proven a great success in Baltimore County. The program was highlighted in the December issue of the HEW magazine, *American Education*. It is vital to encourage such educational opportunities by providing the funds to sustain them. The article follows:

THEY GOT THE FEELING THAT EVERYBODY'S
SOMEBODY

(By Mary Pat Pfeil)

Seven-year-old David has been separated from his parents for almost six months. They could no longer provide for him or his brother and younger sister, and so the children now live in an institution—Villa Maria in Baltimore County, Md.

But David is luckier than many of the more than 75,500 neglected and dependent children in State and local institutions throughout the country. He not only gets the love and attention of the institutional staff, but he also has one very special person to love him.

David's special friend is Will, who is 14, has long blond hair, wears Levi's, and goes barefooted. Will was David's private tutor last summer and in many ways had as many problems as his young charge. He too lives in an institution, committed there because he could not get along in his upper-middle-class home. Last year he was suspended from school eight times. As he helped David, Will was trying to find himself.

Will was one of 36 tutors, most of them from the Methodist Home in Baltimore County, who worked with younger institutionalized children in a summer project at Pinewood Elementary School in Timonium, a suburb of Baltimore. The project, financed under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, involved some 220 children from four institutions in the county—Villa Maria, a Catholic home for children aged six to 13; the Methodist Home, administered by the Methodist Board of Child Care; the General German Orphan Home; and the Augsburg Lutheran Home.

The six-week tutorial program that got under way last spring was an outgrowth of disciplinary problems that had occurred during the previous summer. At that time the Baltimore County Board of Education operated two separate summer programs for institutionalized children: one for teenagers at Johnnycake Junior High School, the other for younger children at Pinewood. Three youths were dismissed from the Johnnycake

program for disruptive behavior and became teacher aides at Pinewood. Five other teenagers volunteered as aides too. All of them worked out well.

From this experience, Donald E. Snoderly, then director of Baltimore County's title I ESEA program, decided to expand the tutorial concept, but not without some apprehension. He admitted the idea that the tutors, many of them with records of delinquency, might be a bad influence on the younger children "entered our minds a little bit." A few of the volunteers used foul language and tended toward disrespect for adults, but Snoderly decided to "give them all a chance and if they didn't work out, we'd have to tell them they couldn't come back."

Twenty youths signed up to tutor in the 1969 project at Pinewood, and during the first few days of school, there were some raised eyebrows over the tutors' bare feet, long hair, and cigarette smoking. The teenagers themselves took care of some of the apprehension. They decided not to smoke in front of the younger children and, though smoke often clouded their faculty room, few lit cigarettes around their charges. Soon teachers and officials visiting the school dismissed the tutors' mod appearance and began to see them in terms of how they had drawn some of the youngsters out, how they were giving each child some individual attention, how, in brief, they were making the program work. Only one tutor was asked not to return—and that happened in the final week of school.

The fears were not all on the side of the project administrators and teachers, however. The teenagers too had some suspicions about the project for which they had volunteered. "When we first came, we sort of figured it would be like a regular school—rules, checks, with everything set out for us," said one of the girl tutors. "But then we found out we could be free. We had our own faculty room to work and talk in and freedom to think, to find out what we were, and to express ourselves."

The tutors' feeling of freedom was largely a result of the treatment they received from the regular teaching staff. Eugene Thomas, a title I staff member in Baltimore County and a teacher at the Pinewood summer project, told the teenagers on their first day that they were starting with a clean slate. "I didn't want to know their backgrounds," he said. "What mattered was what they were going to do here. At first they didn't believe me. It took a while to prove my point."

The Pinewood teachers were hand-selected by Snoderly. Since only a few of them had worked with institutionalized children before, they received extensive preservice and inservice training on the background and problems of these children. Although the teachers varied widely in age and experience—some were just two years out of college, some had 20 years of teaching experience—they had one quality in common for which Snoderly had chosen them: All could react toward children and make them feel loved.

"These children are starved for affection," said Rhys Carter, a summer teacher at Pinewood and a remedial teacher in the Baltimore County school system during the year. He praised the tutorial program for providing more attention for the youngsters. The tutors were often seen hugging their children, holding hands while they walked, or giving them piggyback rides to the bus. The teachers too established physical contact with the children, from a reassuring tap on the head to a squeeze just before they left for the day.

When the children arrived on buses each morning, their tutors were often there waiting to escort them to their classrooms. Holding hands, they skipped down the hall and entered a room decorated with numbered fish used in arithmetic games, pictures from the last field trip, and puzzles to be filled in for a vocabulary drill.

In most cases the children chose their own

tutors. David adopted Will, who had lifted him onto the bus the first day. At first many of the tutors had several charges, but as more tutors came into the program, the children were reassigned. Some of the original tutors fought hard to keep all their children: "She needs me," said a tutor, objecting to the transfer of one of her charges.

A surprising and unexplainable feature of the program was that many youngsters chose tutors of another race. The mixing was neither deliberate nor anticipated.

The rapport between the tutor and his student grew quickly. Will missed a day during the second week of the project. The next day no faculty member reprimanded him or questioned his absence, but David did. "He really gave me the going over," said Will. "At first I thought I could put him off by saying I missed the bus. But then the kid wanted to know why I missed the bus. So I explained that I had been horsing around at the home. I guess that took care of him. But, gee, telling that to a little kid."

Later that same day David's teacher told Will how lost David had seemed without him. "Things like that kind of get to you," Will said. "He thinks I'm his big brother."

Other tutors got the same reaction from their children. "My little girl won't listen to the teacher until I get there," said one. Another teenager, while talking to visitors at the project, was delayed in meeting her charge. Soon there was a knock at the door and in walked the youngster, promptly plunking herself in her tutor's lap where she was welcomed with a big hug.

The teenagers were paid \$1.50 a day for one hour of work, although many, like Will, worked the full three hours they were at Pinewood. In addition to the hour they spent with their private charges, the tutors usually spent an hour in one of the classrooms helping one group of youngsters to work the slide projector, reading a story to a few children, or rhyming words with a child who was poor in phonics. Usually the tutors themselves spent an hour getting instruction in reading skills and teaching methods from project staff members.

But it was the hour the tutor spent alone with his charge that was most rewarding—and most flexible. "The teachers usually tell you to work on something—like reading maybe. But when you've done what they wanted, then you're pretty much on your own," said Will. "You can take your kid outside to catch crayfish in the stream or work in the garden or just walk. You can sit inside and play a game or just talk."

For some of the tutors, trying to teach their charges meant learning themselves. "I told Mr. Thomas I couldn't read," said one 15-year-old tutor who returned home this fall. "He said there wasn't anything I couldn't do. And when I saw my little kid reading, I knew he was right. My little kid couldn't show me up. Now I'm reading a book on Germany."

But there was much more to the program than improving academic skills. Snoderly said the purpose of the project was to improve reading and the children's attitudes toward school and themselves. Will put it another way. "I'm trying to teach David that he's somebody. Everybody's somebody. You just got to let him know it," he said.

In some cases it was the child who taught the tutor that he was somebody. Dorothy Reiser, a project teacher, said the biggest improvement she saw during the summer was social improvement because of the close relationship between the tutors and their charges. She pointed to one teenager whom she said had been very withdrawn at the beginning of the summer. "But the child he tutored was so outgoing that some of it rubbed off on him too."

The tutors themselves realized they got a lot out of the program. According to Will, "Each person gets something out of this. I

probably won't mess up like I did last year in school. I've learned these teachers have a lot to put up with. Little kids hit you. They yell too. I wouldn't ever been a teacher."

He was more specific on an evaluation form filled out at the end of the project. When asked whether he felt the summer project had been worth his effort, Will answered: "Yes, I have experienced a little of what a teacher goes through in school. I'll try not to sass the teacher and fight in front of the younger kids in school. It also made me feel that I was needed by the faculty and worthwhile to the program."

Some of the tutors finished the project determined to be teachers themselves some day. "It really helped me," said one girl. "I was so nervous at first. But those little kids don't let you be nervous for long. They're all over you. It made me feel good—and needed."

The teachers also saw the program as a success. Carter, who had David in his classroom, described the relationship between the youngster and Will as "great." "David waited patiently for him every morning. He was withdrawn at first, but he has really blossomed out. Will can be given the credit," he said.

"I don't know who's done more," said Mrs. Reiser, "the tutors for the little children or vice versa." As a teacher, she appreciates having the tutors. "Otherwise we could never give that much attention to the children," she said.

Snodderly viewed the success of the program from the tutor's standpoint. "It would be hard for counselors in counseling sessions to give these kids the insights they've reached by just being here," he said. In addition to their function as tutors, the teenagers spent some time each day just talking among themselves, and the conversations—some of them taped for study—ranged from problems of married life to the failures of today's schools. "They're getting a lot out of their systems," Snodderly said.

Efforts were made to validate the success of the Pinewood project statistically. Gary L. Brager, research assistant for Baltimore County's title I projects, said pretesting and post-testing within a six-week period would not produce reliable results. Therefore, the children's latest test results prior to the summer were taken, and the students were again tested after returning to the institutions at the end of summer. The tutors were pretested the first week of the summer program and were tested again in early October. The results are being analyzed.

"We expect the tutors will gain in reading by the very act of tutoring," Brager said. But even if the statistical results aren't overly impressive, few staff members involved with the project would be willing to question its success. "I'm extremely proud of what the tutors accomplished," said Thomas. "The change can't be measured by a few grade points. They realized now that each one is a person who can do what he wants in life, even though it will be hard."

The tutors' attitude changes were reflected in their answers to the written questionnaire at the end of the project. Will stated, "I found out that I can get along with people and make friends both with children and adults." He voiced a stronger opinion in a conversation with project visitors in which he mentioned that his father used to call him a hood. "I hope," he said, "that we've proved we're not a bunch of bad kids, that we can be nice."

Snodderly and Thomas were convinced. Both said they would try to see that the program was continued in some way during the school year. "It would be hard just to cut it off now that we know what teenagers can do," said Thomas, who will continue his work with the institutions during the regular school year under the county's title I program.

William S. Sartorius, superintendent of schools in Baltimore County, was so impressed with the project that he encouraged principals and teachers at the beginning of the school year to implement some of the Pinewood project's concepts. He urged them to find ways for teenagers to be useful, even those who had been troublemakers in the past.

John Gist, who succeeded Snodderly as project director, has introduced the tutorial practice in regular title I projects in the county. Teenagers at Sparrows Point High School in the southeast portion of the county go to school on a flexible schedule that allows them to tutor at Edgemere Elementary School part of the day. They are paid for their services by the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Will returned to the public school near the Methodist Home this fall determined to make it. He hopes to see David on a continuing basis during the school year and to keep in contact with Mr. Thomas. He knows now how the person on the other side of the desk feels.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER McCORMACK IN CONNECTION WITH THE 1970 HEW-LABOR OEO APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recently, while this Congress was out of session the counselors to the President indicated to certain Members of Congress that the President intended to veto the critical and important 1970 HEW-Labor OEO appropriations bill.

This bill is extremely important because it contains within it sums of Federal funding which are essential to vital programs like NDEA, the Elementary-Secondary Education Act, cancer research, and other measures of similar critical nature to the country.

The Presidential counselors have indicated that the President plans to veto this measure because he claims it is inflationary.

This level of funding, which is \$1 billion more than the President requested, happens to be at the very level that the Congress funded these programs at in 1968. This is not an increase above and beyond the 1968 level.

If this funding cutback, which the President seeks, is to go forward it will mean that the greater Cleveland area will suffer cuts of millions of dollars for these programs. In some instances these programs will have to be closed down completely and thousands of children will suffer.

It is inconceivable that one can define this kind of spending as inflationary while at the same time the President goes forward with these requests for massive subsidies for the supersonic transport and merchant marine which are indeed inflationary and have little bearing on the general welfare of the country.

I wish to include at this point in the RECORD a full statement by Speaker McCORMACK which he made on January 6,

1970, which eloquently states his views on the HEW-Labor OEO appropriations bill. Speaker McCORMACK's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF SPEAKER McCORMACK

It has been called to my attention that Bryce Harlow, Counsellor to the President, has written to a Republican member of the House, and probably all Republican members of Congress, that "it happens that a very early event of the new Congressional year is likely to be Senate action on the still pending 1970 HEW-Labor-OEO appropriations bill—followed by a Presidential veto of that bill, should it pass in its present form—this followed by Senate and House consideration of the veto."

This is a most unusual letter, that of a President announcing before a bill is presented to him that he intends to veto it, and, secondly, that the announcement is not made by the President but by the Counsellor to the President.

The HEW-Labor-OEO appropriation bill contains many important appropriations of deep interest to the people of the United States. This is a most unusual procedure in announcing in advance that any bill would be vetoed by the President. It is one thing during debate that a President is likely to veto a bill, but it is another thing to definitely state that a bill will be vetoed, and the announcement made by someone other than the President. It must be borne in mind that Congress got the same threat of a veto on the Tax Bill but the President signed it. And Congress also received a threat of a veto on the Mine Safety Bill, as well as one or two other bills, and the President signed them. However, in none of these bills was there a definite threat as written by Mr. Harlow. I am sure that members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, will be interested in having knowledge of this particular letter.

If this bill is vetoed, every effort will be made to over-ride the President's veto.

The appropriations contained in this particular bill affect the lives of millions of Americans. It will be necessary for Republican votes to over-ride the veto.

I hope that national interest of partisan considerations (will be) displayed by Republican members if this appropriation bill is vetoed. In any event, the letter of Bryce Harlow is a most unusual one.

THE UNION OF BURMA

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, among the scores of new independent states born since the end of the last war, the Union of Burma was one of the first in Southeast Asia. Its independence was proclaimed on January 4, 1948; thus came into existence the sovereign Union of Burma.

A parliamentary form of government was set up soon after its birth, with a president and two houses of parliament. For about 14 years this large and important country, with an area of about 260,000 square miles and a population exceeding 26,000,000, was governed under a parliamentary democracy. In March 1962, a revolutionary council of military leaders was instituted as the country's supreme authority. Today the Union of

Burma is austere but high-mindedly governed by the revolutionary government headed by Gen. Ne Win, Chairman of the Council of Ministers.

The Burmese Government has recently relaxed restrictions against foreign visitors and travelers will now find it easier to see the wonders of this beautiful country. Mandalay, Pagan, and other centers of traditional Burmese culture are filled with Buddhist temples, pagodas, and shrines. The country is world famous for teakwood, rubies, sapphire, and jade.

On the 22d anniversary of the independence of the Union of Burma we salute the Burmese people.

CANVAS AND RUBBER FOOTWEAR CRISIS

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, increases in the importation of rubber and canvas footwear continue to threaten a principal employer in my district. The volume and low sale price of the imports have already forced several domestic manufacturers to close down their operations, and I do not wish to see that misfortune befall the industry in my district.

Several thousand working men and women in the district are looking to the Federal Government for some positive action in the direction of allowing them to continue to earn a living. I have asked the State Department to assist by working out agreements to limit imports of these products.

The low cost of foreign produced canvas and rubber footwear is making a mockery of domestic competition in this area. Domestic manufacturers of these articles just cannot compete on an even basis with foreign producers of these items. It is time we implemented the economic realities of our high standard of living into the trade policies which give rise to this grave situation.

In the first session of the 91st Congress I introduced two bills which could remedy the present situation. H.R. 11148, my first bill in this area, is to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to assist domestic industries in unfair competition from foreign imports. My bill would accomplish that result by substituting more flexible relief criteria for the rigid criteria now embodied in the act. Upon introducing the bill, I pointed out that the act, in practice, contains no workable standards for determining at what point the advantages gained from increased imports diminish to the point of damaging domestic industries.

H.R. 15213, my second bill in this area, is designed to encourage the growth of trade on a fair and equitable basis by providing domestic industries with a remedy against the adverse effects of an undue rise in imports on industrial growth, employment, and profits. This bill amends the Trade Expansion Act of

1962 by relaxing the criteria for determination of the question of serious injury to domestic industry and would insure the actual availability of a remedy to industries that have suffered or stand to suffer from rising imports.

The trade policies now in effect may have at one time carried out a national objective of encouraging world trade while fostering, or at the very least, maintaining domestic production, but we now have reached the point of diminishing returns. Both of my bills would make effective again the original congressional intent of promoting foreign trade while maintaining a true reciprocity of economic benefit to all parties involved.

Last week, upon receiving the latest information on the new inroads being made in the domestic market of rubber and canvas footwear, I wrote to the Secretary of State recommending that the Secretary take immediate action toward obtaining voluntary agreements limiting imports of rubber and canvas footwear. Failing action on my legislative proposals to deal with this critical problem, I think agreements for voluntary limitations of imports are absolutely necessary and should be concluded at the earliest possible date.

The text of my letter to Secretary of State Rogers follows:

DEAR Mr. SECRETARY: I am writing this letter because a principal industry in my district is threatened by the rapidly increasing volume of imports of rubber and canvas footwear. The increases in volume of these imports have been tremendous and their import threatens the stability of our industry and employment in this area.

While everyone approves of a reasonable amount of reciprocal trade the volume in the rubber footwear industry has been permitted to increase to an unreasonable and damaging degree.

Statistics provided me by the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations show that during the first ten months of 1969, 25.5 percent of the canvas footwear sold in the United States was imported. For the same period 40 percent of the rubber footwear sold in this country was imported. These figures compare with 30 percent for rubber footwear and 22.5 percent for canvas footwear imports in 1967.

It is my suggestion, therefore, that a voluntary agreement limiting imports in a fashion similar to voluntary agreements now in effect be negotiated with the countries who are principally responsible for the abnormal flow of these articles.

Your cooperation in this matter and the referral of this suggestion to the proper area of the State Department will be appreciated by me. I shall also be happy to have your response to this suggestion at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

I also include a copy of an editorial on this subject from the Waterbury, Conn., American of January 16, 1970:

UNIROYAL'S CRISIS

The rumors of a pending shutdown of Uniroyal's Footwear plant were squelched by a management statement which in itself is ominous. "No decision has been made at this time" is the way a company official put it. This means, of course, that the general topic has been and is still under discussion.

This semi-denial of the rumor, which is not an outright denial at all, should give incentive for immediate action by the state, the

Borough of Naugatuck, the City of Waterbury, and the region's civic and business leaders to look into Uniroyal's problems and find ways of solving them.

Retention of this plant in Naugatuck is necessary for the regional economy. Displacement of some 3,000 production workers and another 1,000 office and supervisory personnel would create an employment crisis which could be detrimental to thousands of families directly and to businesses and the tax bases of many towns.

This is an area which demands involvement by U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan of the 5th Congressional District, as well as Gov. John Dempsey, municipal officials, the Chamber of Commerce and other groups dedicated to promoting regional growth and prosperity.

Uniroyal has disclosed that the footwear plant is in an unfavorable economic position. Increased foreign competition, changes in consumer preferences, and competition from domestic plants paying lower wages were cited as the principal reasons which are making the Naugatuck plant's future here uncertain.

Monagan and other legislators should look immediately into the effect foreign competition has on this domestic industry. Federal aid, if it is warranted, could be arranged through tariff revision. Labor officials can give assistance to Uniroyal in assessing the effect of the wage scales on the future existence of the plant and recommend a form of hold-the-line plan if careful study determines it to be essential.

The changes in consumer preference constitute a problem which only management and its product development officials can solve. Diversification has long been advocated as a means of keeping an industry financially secure. Development of new products should be a perpetual requirement. When consumer interest and taste change, a company should get ready to meet the new demands.

This century-old Naugatuck plant has been a national leader in the footwear field because of the ingenuity of its founders and skills and capabilities of its employees. It does not seem possible, that with outside help and cooperation by everyone affected, it would have to close its doors as a victim of changing times.

INDIANA-ILLINOIS POLLUTION

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet industrial region of Indiana adjoining the industrial area of South Chicago is one of the most outstanding localities for industrial and defense production and manufacturing in the Nation. These huge industries extend for miles in both directions—north and south—on the shores of Lake Michigan. The Illinois-Indiana State line separates these huge industrial complexes. Permeated air and water from the Illinois side blows and seeps across the line into the Indiana area and vice versa. It all depends on the direction the wind happens to be blowing on a certain day. It would be futile for either Indiana or Illinois to clean up its industrial air and water pollution if the other State did not.

Therefore, the cleaning up of air and water pollution in this Indiana-Chicago area is almost essentially the responsi-

bility of the Federal Government. The Federal Government should take complete charge of the air and water pollution menace in this industrial area adjoining and including Illinois and Indiana. As a further explanation of the crisis, I include with my remarks an editorial in the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune of January 19, 1970:

CRYING UNCLE FOR CLEAN AIR

Habitues of the Loop and other residents of Chicago choked out cuss words and cried soot-streaked tears late last week as a south wind bore in unusual quantities of pollution from the industrial areas of that city's south side and our own Lake County. Sometimes it works the other way. Often northwest winds mix Chicago contamination with our own to complicate Northwest Indiana's breathing processes.

What these contrasting realities prove is that air pollution is no one city's or community's problem. Air borne noxious chemicals and particulate matter have even less respect for state boundaries than do big time gamblers. The answers lie not in trading castigations, but in working together. Sometimes that working together will require a super authority.

Chicago, the three major cities of Lake County and, now, Lake County itself all have air pollution ordinances. They are much alike. They also all continue to have air pollution.

Lake and Porter counties of Indiana and the Illinois block of counties surrounding Chicago have been designated as one air pollution area by the federal government. The two states have reciprocal enforcement provisions. Despite those precautions the affected counties all have days of troubled breathing.

Part of the difficulty lies in the obvious fact that it takes years to correct a situation which was so long an accepted part of the industrial scene. Industries insist they try—and they do—but they do not try at a pace which satisfies residents of this area concerned with their own longevity. Part of the trouble lies in inadequate teeth in the air pollution laws.

President Nixon is generally expected to devote considerable portions of his State of the Union message Thursday to various national pollution and other environmental problems. We don't know what he will say. We hope he says that it's time to get tough. We hope that if he does, Congress hears him and acts.

We apologize for besmoggling Chicago's skies. We hope they feel the same concern when they help befoul ours. But it may take our mutual Uncle to give meaning to the apologies.

LEADERSHIP FOR THE 1970'S

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, I was fortunate enough to have been a guest at the National Press Club luncheon where my good friend, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, GEORGE MCGOVERN, was the speaker.

His remarks, which follow, show a perceptive concern for the problems facing this Nation and a great understanding for the solutions we so badly need.

I commend to my colleagues Senator MCGOVERN's address:

LEADERSHIP FOR THE 1970'S: UNIFYING THE COALITION OF SILENCE AND THE COALITION OF CONSCIENCE

The beginning of a new decade, with the Congress reconvening and the Administration starting its second year, is a good time for a man in public life to speak to the National Press Club.

As we enter the 1970's, our nation is in trouble, primarily, I believe, because we still follow a leadership focusing its major energies on external fears instead of internal neglect.

For thirty years—since the traumatic shock of Pearl Harbor, we have been preoccupied with war and preparation for war. Most of our national energy, most of our federal taxes, most of our national debt, most of the inflation, most of the dissen-sion—all of these have been the handmaidens of war and the arms race.

Meanwhile, the nation's most serious internal weaknesses have been allowed to fester until they threaten our survival as a society of dignity and freedom. In the name of national defense, we have been exhausting the sources of national defense.

The key question of 1970 is the same one I raised as a freshman Senator seven years ago: Can we turn away from endless war and contain the military monster that is devouring our resources so greedily as to disarm the nation against its most serious dangers at home.

The first duty of a public man in 1970 is to recognize that if we do not seriously address ourselves to this question with a radical new urgency and restructuring of our policies and institutions, we may well lose our sense of community and nationhood.

Yet, the present Administration, like its predecessor, continues to govern the nation as though our chief dangers were from abroad rather than at home.

Thus, in 1969, the President fought for new billions to build the ABM and a whole range of doubtful new weapons systems. Now he has vowed to veto the Health, Education and Welfare bill because the Congress has added a billion dollars more than he requested. This is done in the name of fighting inflation, although the Congress cut the President's military requests by nearly \$6 billion. Instead of vetoing urgently needed education funds, the President should abandon his expected request for another \$1.5 billion for additional ABM sites.

It is true that our President has expressed concern about the nation's problems. In his 1968 campaign, he dwelt on four of them—crime, inflation, division and Vietnam. But 1969 again offers clear proof that more than rhetoric is needed to heal the nation's troubles.

The President kept his pledge to fire Attorney General Ramsey Clark as a prescription for law and order. But the crime rate increased another 10% in 1969 and rose even more alarmingly in the Nation's Capital.

Inflation now races ahead at the highest annual rate in 20 years, and interest rates are at an all-time high. The 1969 cost of living advanced nearly 6%, as compared to 4% in 1968.

The southern strategy has further divided blacks and whites, while the harsh indictments of the Vice President and the Attorney General have widened the gap between the nation's idealists and their government.

Meanwhile, the war in Vietnam continues with another 11,000 Americans dead in 1969—and with no end in sight.

The Administration in its first year has dealt not so much with our problems as with the politics of those problems. It has sought not to end mistaken policies and priorities but to end criticism. Its goal has been to isolate the dissatisfied citizens of the nation, while claiming to represent the nation's majority interests.

The hallmark of this Administration is the politics of manipulation, when what is most needed is the reconciliation of the nation behind more constructive goals.

There is both an official, front-door policy and an unofficial back-door policy.

The official policy has been to elevate a cheerful blandness to the status of a national virtue. Voices are lowered, silence is encouraged, earnestness is emphasized, controversy discouraged.

Studies become a substitute for action. Conferences are more important than programs. Decisions take a back seat to coordination. Policy councils become ends in themselves rather than preludes to action. Public relations replaces performance.

The official theme is, thus, ordered sweetness and light. It seeks to allay the fearful and disarm the concerned.

But the bland face of the Administration also serves to distract attention from its unofficial policy. And that policy is anything but bland.

It works the backstreets. It seeks to discredit those who disagree. It sets group against group. It tries to frighten the news media, turn old against young, and isolate those who oppose its war policy.

While the President walks the high ground, the Vice President and the Attorney General execute the strategy of fear and division. A few weeks ago, the Attorney General's wife suggested that her husband regarded the liberals of America as Communists whom we would be better off trading for the Russian variety. We were told that the Attorney General would have phrased it in more restrained language. The evidence of that came this past weekend when Mr. Mitchell referred to the younger, liberal members of his own party as "little juvenile delinquents." I leave it to you to judge the relative restraint of the Mitchells.

The Attorney General is the admitted political strategist of the Administration, just as he was the top strategist of the Presidential campaign. He has filled the key posts of the Department of Justice—not with eminent lawyers, but with shrewd political manipulators whose chief public experience, like his own, is in the management of political campaigns. Little wonder that the best law graduates of the nation who were attracted by the leadership of former Attorney General Ramsey Clark are now avoiding the Department of Justice.

The Attorney General, unlike his predecessor, has told us that his Department's mission has nothing to do with policy; rather the Department of Justice is simply a lawyer for its client—the United States Government. Any proper view of the Department of Justice would hold that its clients are the American people, and especially those who have not achieved a full measure of justice. But Mr. Mitchell gives clear indication that he is far more interested in the instruments of political manipulation than the instruments of justice.

The alternating techniques—blandness and divisiveness—go hand in hand. They are the prime ingredients of a politics of manipulation.

Each is indispensable to the other. By itself, an official policy of blandness could not hope to long hold popular support in a period of problems and tensions. Similarly, an open strategy of divide and conquer, by itself, would soon repel an American people who are basically idealistic and principled. Together, however, these political strategies—and that is what they are—complement each other in securing a temporary popularity.

But this kind of leadership reflects a retreat from responsibility. Appearances are placed above reality. Form is exalted above substance. Values play second fiddle to techniques. Principles yield to strategems.

What I object to most strongly is the method the Administration has chosen to repress the interaction of dissent and response that is so vital to the survival of a democratic system.

The President summons forth in his support what he calls the silent majority—an exercise that presumes silence to be a virtue and outcry a sin. It presumes further that silence is respectable and protest the threatening howl of the mob.

The Vice President, as always, is willing to put it more bluntly. He calls what is happening in America today "positive polarization." In effect, Americans are asked to choose sides—against each other. We are asked to eliminate those who dissent too vigorously as we would rotten apples in the barrel.

The President's pledge "bring us together" now appears a determination to bring the right people together. And the right people, presumably, are those who are content with things as they are and hostile to those who would change them. It follows that the wrong people must be those who are dissatisfied, who seek change.

Some might find comfort in this polarization, but it frightens me. It frightens me that we are witnessing the beginning of political apartheid in this country, which casts the silent as Brahmins and those who dissent as untouchables.

That the Administration consciously encourages one citizen to dispute another's right to direct involvement in the affairs of this nation is both dangerous and thoughtless.

In recent months, the news media—and most particularly television—was guilty, by Administration standards, of excessive criticism. The media has the power to resist Administration intimidation aimed at the concept of a free press.

Unfortunately, the young who oppose the war—and the poor, the black and the brown who oppose their continuing exclusion from this most affluent of all societies—do not always have the power or the skill to defend their right to question policies or priorities. And day by day, their activities are distinguished as a little less respectable, a little less patriotic.

If the demands of dissenting Americans were unjust or ignoble, then we could turn away. But what they seek is an end to a foolish war, an end to racial injustice, an end to hunger and misery and ugliness and pollution. They seek, in short, to probe the nation's conscience by underscoring the gap between rhetoric and reality.

Is not this coalition of conscience on higher ground than the coalition of silence?

Let us understand that the consequences of spurning the legitimate claims of the young and other disaffected citizens of our land would be enormous. America was conceived and developed by the idealism and driving energy of the young, combined with the efforts of the dissatisfied who settled the country. We need to ponder what it means to live in a society that has lost the confidence, the enthusiasm, and the contributions of yearning minds. Let us remember that this nation was conceived, its independence won, and its Constitution constructed by a vigorous minority who carried the day against the hostility or apathy of the majority.

What would it cost our nation now for dissatisfied Americans to turn away from participation in our public life because of disillusionment over our political process?

Conversely, silent majorities have not always been right, as witness Hitler's debauchery of the German nation while the people applauded or stood silent. This was the same nation that produced Beethoven, Goethe, and Einstein. History is filled with the wreck-

age of foolish or barbaric policies that were temporarily accepted by silent majorities. I find silence a questionable virtue in the presence of injustice, hypocrisy and neglect.

Frankly, I reject the notion that there is a silent majority of Americans satisfied with the present state of our society. As a middle-class, middle-aged man from middle America, I find my neighbors and constituents dissatisfied with the quality of life in 1970. Their taxes are also being squandered on wasteful military spending. Their sons are also going off to Vietnam. They are also paying the heavy price of inflation, high interest, shoddy merchandise, and a disorderly society.

All Americans are victimized by the present policies and priorities of the nation. Millions of Americans who may be silent are nevertheless ready for a leadership that would unite them with their dissenting fellow Americans in a common effort to face up to the nation's needs.

What would be the agenda of such a leadership? I suggest the following:

(1) An end to our involvement in the Vietnam war, beginning with an immediate ceasefire, including the cessation of bombardment that is now destroying the Vietnamese countryside. Our forces should be deployed entirely in maximum defensive arrangements with their withdrawal taking place as soon as we arrange for the release of prisoners and asylum in friendly countries for those Vietnamese who might feel threatened by our withdrawal.

"Vietnamization"—the Administration's current policy—is simply a new slogan for an old discredited policy. It involves keeping American forces in Vietnam until the Thieu-Ky regime is ready to assume the military burden. That regime has never had the respect of its own people. It will not come to terms either with the rebels who resist it or unify its own silent but hostile majority until we cease our support and begin a definite, systematic removal of all our forces. Even if Vietnamization brought military successes by means of massive U.S.-sponsored bombardment in support of the South Vietnamese mercenaries we have recruited, trained and paid, we should still oppose this policy. This concept of war by proxy is itself barbarism that uses our technology to increase the slaughter in a civil struggle that can only be resolved by the Vietnamese people.

The President could have ended the war in 1969. There is nothing to be gained by indefinitely prolonging it.

(2) A reduction in the military budget of \$50 billion in the next three years with a cut of \$20 billion in the coming year. The time has come to discard the notion that Russia is about to roll across Western Europe, or that a primitive China barely able to defend itself is about to conquer the world. We could begin by withdrawing five of our six divisions from Europe. The Europeans are now perfectly capable of providing their military manpower. We should also abandon the ABM, MIRV, AMSA and other needless new weapons systems.

(3) We should establish a National Economic Conversion Commission to assist the transition of our economy from war activities to peaceful pursuits. I introduced such legislation seven years ago and have reintroduced it in this Congress.

(4) We should create a Council of Social Advisers comparable to the Council of Economic Advisers who would draw up social goals for the nation to be measured in an annual report. Those goals would include an adequate diet, housing, education, and health care for our citizens. They would include a "Second Chance Peacetime G.I. Bill of Rights" for every American to permit any adult a new opportunity to change or improve his career by going back to school, college, or other training opportunity. We

need also to greatly expand the public service activities for the young. The nation's social goals should envision doubling our efforts to end crime and disorder, not only by improved law enforcement, but also by cleaning up the ghetto squalor which breeds delinquency and disorder. Every American who is able to work should have the opportunity, with the government serving as "the employer of last resort." Those unable to work who are in need should be assured a dignified method of adequate assistance.

(5) The Council of Advisers on the Environment, created by the Congress in 1969, should be fully staffed and strongly backed by the President. It is imperative that we halt the contamination which now threatens to destroy the thin layer of soil, water and air that sustains life around our planet. This is a central concern for the 1970's which can be the most unifying goal of all.

(6) We need to establish a powerful, well-backed consumer protection agency. That agency should have the power to set high standards for consumer goods. It should be empowered to press consumer cases before the regulatory agencies. Consumers should be able to bring actions in the federal courts for consumer abuses, just as do the victims of anti-trust violations. It is preposterous that one brilliant, dedicated young man, Ralph Nader, is now trying to carry the burden for American consumers that the U.S. Government should carry.

(7) Finally, I urge needed reforms of our increasingly archaic political institutions, notably our political parties and the Congress. As these institutions must help to translate popular will into public action, the elimination of their defects and shortcomings is essential to a vital and healthy democracy.

For too long, the national political parties and the Congress have been insulated from the grassroots, too unresponsive to the ordinary citizen, and too indulgent to special interests. The procedures and practices of the national parties and the Congress are not democratic. Only drastic reformation from top to bottom will make them again effective instruments of grassroots America. As far as our political parties are concerned, the recommendations of the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, which I have been honored to head, are important steps in the right direction. The Commission has urged an open nomination process that will insure rank-and-file party members the opportunity to freely and fairly influence the choice of the 1972 Democratic Convention. Devices which concentrate the effective decision in the hands of a few self-perpetuated party leaders have no place in either party.

Delegates to the 1972 conventions should be openly and fairly selected by rank-and-file party members, and they should be chosen in 1972—not two or three years ahead of the convention. I hope that party members who seek office in 1970 and 1971 will pledge themselves to support the guidelines my Commission has recommended, with special awareness that we must never again have a Chicago-type convention.

Similarly, Congress needs a thorough-going overhaul if it is to become a truly effective and respected political body.

Laws on lobbying need to be tightened up. Seniority should be abolished in committee assignments and positions. Congressmen should make full disclosure of their assets, income, and professional associations. The inefficiency and log-rolling which dominates the Appropriations Committee process should be ended by upgrading the staffs of the authorizing committees and then abolishing the Appropriations Committees.

I believe the American people are prepared to follow a leadership that challenges them with such an agenda for the 1970's. In short, they would respond to a leadership that

called upon them to turn away from military adventurism to the reconstruction of American society. That is a leadership of reconciliation which could unite the coalition of silence and the coalition of conscience for the common good.

**JUDGE CARSWELL WILL BE
CREDIT TO COURT**

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of U.S. Circuit Judge G. Harrold Carswell, of Tallahassee, to the U.S. Supreme Court has given me more personal pleasure than any that I can remember.

I am doubly pleased because of the high regard I have for Judge Carswell as a jurist, and second, because of my personal friendship.

He will become the first Floridian ever to serve on the Nation's highest court and his nomination is viewed with pride by all of the people of our great State.

It is my considered judgment that no finer man could have been named and I commend President Nixon for the wisdom of his selection.

Judge Carswell comes from my congressional district and perhaps the best tribute I could pay to him would be to include in my remarks the very excellent portrait written by the editor of the Tallahassee Democrat, Malcolm B. Johnson. It follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Jan. 20, 1970]
JUDGE CARSWELL HAS COMMON, HUMAN TOUCH

(By Malcolm B. Johnson, editor,
the Tallahassee Democrat)

It is hard to imagine how becoming a Supreme Court justice would pump up the pomp of Harrold Carswell, this friendly fellow who already has risen high in the judiciary without losing his common, human touch.

You should know more about this neighbor, his family and associates—whether or not he ever rises to sit with the almighty.

If he is confirmed, it will be the most important government position ever held by a Floridian.

He has just turned 50, after a momentous year in which his first grandchild was born the day (last June 27) he stepped up from the U.S. District Court bench and took the oath as a member of the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Twelve years as a federal trial judge, after five years as a U.S. prosecutor (experience unmatched by any present member of the U.S. Supreme Court, by the way) has weathered him into a character who looks, acts and talks as you expect from a judge of the old school.

He presides over court with gentle firmness and good humor. There's nothing aloof or arrogant about him, no tacturnity. In chambers, lunching at Angelo's with whom ever sits down with him, or socializing at a party, he's quick to conversation.

He likes the legal anecdote, and he likes it to the point. He gets around with people, talking and listening. Last year, during some of those student fracas at Florida State University, he went out and stood in the background—just to keep attuned to the situation.

Given a few more years on the trial court bench, Judge Carswell could have turned

into one of those venerable jurists who regale you as a story-teller or bore you to death with their memoirs.

He's already past that, new sitting on the appellate court where authority is divided and personality subdued. We might expect him, then, to develop a literary touch—a guest for the proper phrase to lighten and enlighten his judicial opinions in the old manner that has been lost in the recent rush to shuck out rulings as fast as possible for everyone who fancies he has an issue. Some of the Carswell opinions already show the flair over it, without sacrificing lucidity.

I know him better as a man off the bench than on. The judicial bench, that is. We've occupied adjoining seats on the bench of Row 82, Campbell Stadium, for maybe 10 years as coincidental holders of season tickets acquired under long term commitments to help finance the stands.

There's nothing impartial about U.S. Circuit Judge George Harrold Carswell on that bench. He's for FSU all the time, for alma mater Georgia against Florida, and for alma mater Duke with a detached sort of loyalty.

He and his wife, Virginia (a petite Southern belle cheerleader type with a husky "Way to go" yell) play the game hard from those seats, but they don't seem to let it ulcerate them the way it does some friendly Gators the judge especially enjoys gigging. They love the game, and if they move to Washington, the Redskins can make room for a couple more regular fans.

But even in such a prejudicial setting, the Judge is the temperate, deliberate type who never joins in fussing at the referee, coach or quarterback—not even when they seem to ignore our deliberate advice from the top bench.

About that "G. Harrold," with the double-r. A Cracker politician will tell you voters won't take to anybody who's ashamed of his first name and doesn't know how to spell his second.

But the judge has a sufficient explanation:

He's the son of George Henry Carswell of Irwinton, Ga., not far from Macon. (His daddy was for 30 years a member of the Georgia Legislature, Georgia Secretary of State, and lost the governorship in a run-off to now Sen. Richard B. Russell. There's a monument to him in the courthouse square at Irwinton, raised by public subscription when he died during the depression.)

Anyway, Sen. George Henry Carswell and Mrs. Carswell had only daughters who had grown to teenage before our Judge was born. His brother, in the meantime, had given the name "George Henry" to his son so the distinguished name would not expire.

When our Judge was born, his parents wanted another "G.H." but not another George Henry to get mixed up with his cousin. They named him George Harrold (two rs because that's the way Harrold family, kin of Mrs. Carswell spelled it). They called him Harrold to distinguish him from cousin George. Simple, isn't?

Sorting out the Judge's immediate family relationships (as we Crackers love to do) is a tiny bit more complicated. He married his brother-in-law's niece. Let's not go into the kinship possibilities of that.

The Judge's older sister Ellen, married Ramsay Simmons of Bainbridge, one of the four brothers who inherited a crate and box mill business from their father. Ramsay runs the mill in Bainbridge, Jack the one in Tallahassee, William the one in Macon and Thomas the mill in Tennille, Ga. Together, they probably produce more wooden fruit and vegetable containers than anyone in the world.

When the future judge's mother died, he went to live with his sister and Ramsay Simmons and to attend high school in Bainbridge. From that visit sprung his romance and marriage with Virginia, daughter of Jack Simmons, in 1944.

Most members of the family live in the same neighborhood, on Lake Ridge drive, in houses fronting on Lake Jackson. The Carswells live in a fine house, but not a mansion, compatible with the salary of a federal judge and big enough for the family of four children they had when it was built.

The two girls are married, Ramsay (Mrs. Fenton Langston), whose husband has recently graduated from FSU Law school and now is on Governor Kirk's legal staff, lives next door and the Judge plays daily with his little granddaughter, Nan (Mrs. Radford Cherry) lives in Tampa, where her husband is with a national accounting firm. The two boys, George Harrold, Jr., and Scott, are in college in Tallahassee.

Solid, proper, estimable people—good enough and smart enough to sit with anyone on the Supreme Court; and a whole lot more respectable than some who have been sitting there.

**POLITICAL SENSITIVITY OF U.S.
TROOPS IN VIETNAM**

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a young New Yorker who served for 2 years in Vietnam as a volunteer development worker in Khanh Hoa Province. He makes some rather critical observations about the conduct of American troops in Vietnam—particularly with regard to their political sensitivities. He also offers some proposals for change which I think are well thought out and bear careful consideration by responsible officials. The letter from Mr. Dyle G. Henning, now a graduate student at Columbia University, follows:

DEAR SIR: I have been challenged to write this letter by a friend, a United States AID representative, who thinks people have too many complaints about the war in Viet Nam, without supplying realistic conclusions and constructive recommendations. Herein I hope to cogently describe what I have seen of American conduct in Viet Nam, suggest the consequences of that conduct, give some possible reasons for it, and provide a series of recommendations that perhaps could help to correct negative aspects of our conduct abroad. These recommendations are relevant, I believe, to Viet Nam and to other nations where the United States is involved, both for the present and for the future.

The writer recently ended a two-year tour as a volunteer development worker in Khanh Hoa Province, living closely with the Vietnamese, while maintaining contact with the Americans. I speak Vietnamese adequately. My work in a rural-suburban area has been in education and youth activities. I have considered myself generally in favor of the theory of American aid to Viet Nam, excluding combat troops.

Intelligent people concerned with the Viet Nam War consistently have talked about the interplay of political-socio-economic factors in this conflict; they have also often stressed this type of warfare is really to be fought and won in political, not battlefield contests. Certainly this is the underlying premise of the American support for the Land-to-Tiller Program, and of the Chieu Hoi Program. But in practice it seems the American effort here rests on its military conduct, and falls on its lack of consistent positive individual and group conduct as it affects the political-socio-economic arena of the war. It is

through our individual conduct, as well as through our group conduct, that we Americans manifest understanding and appreciation for the Vietnamese people and culture, or lack of it. I stress individual conduct, that of one person or a small group, because it is this conduct that combines to create an image of general group conduct, and is the way individual Vietnamese are in turn affected. Our actual conduct is approximately opposite the values maintained by our adversary, who in practice fights a more intelligent political-psychological war than he does a military one. His practice follows both his values and what we express our values to be in theory.

The American effort is obviously at an initial tactical disadvantage; we are strangers, foreigners, to the Vietnamese. Our adversary knows not only the geographical terrain, but also the customs, history, and sensitivities of the Vietnamese people. Whether he is Viet Cong or North Vietnamese, he is Vietnamese. Others have faced situations similar to ours. What did the British do in Malaya? T. E. Lawrence is famous for his exploits in Northern Africa. Writing in the August 1917 issue of the *Arab Bulletin*, he emphasized: "Learn all you can about . . . the tribes . . . get to know their families, clans, friends and enemies, wells, hills, and roads . . . get to speak their dialect . . . not yours."

The American presence is a very obvious one. Not only do we now represent between three and four percent of the population in Viet Nam, but many areas, especially urban ones, have much more significant concentrations. Certainly this is true of Nha Trang. The areas of infrequent direct contact are in the countryside, and are those areas where Viet Cong propaganda is most effective. (As proximity increases, the Vietnamese tend slightly to see us more as people—good and bad—but they still exhibit great difficulty in understanding us.) Moreover, our presence is magnified by our direct and indirect control of communication resources, by our massive introduction of military and civilian aid, by our scale of employment of Vietnamese nationals, and by our constant mobility throughout Viet Nam.

Therefore, it is unargued that our conduct in Viet Nam strongly affects the Vietnamese. If that conduct were uniformly positive, there would be tremendous positive pressures. But I must agree with many American and Vietnamese observers that our behavior is at best mixed (and, therefore, rather confusing to the Vietnamese) and more realistically on balance negative, with resulting political repercussions.

Every day many examples of American civilian and military conduct are to be observed. I believe that most Americans are generally good people. I have observed such widely varying types of conduct as giving Vietnamese hitch-hikers rides, helping accident victims, helping with school construction, giving scholarships and materials of all sorts, learning about customs and language, training people for jobs, and generally creating real friendships. But most Americans have no significant involvement with the Vietnamese. In some cases that is perhaps preferable, given problems of difference in customs, age, and education.

On the other hand, I have witnessed conduct of other sorts—conduct which doesn't occur so overtly in our own nation. Civilians sometimes have been the actor, but military men are the majority of the American population in Viet Nam, as well as the youngest and least educated segment. While good people and good actions may be a plurality or a majority, the Vietnamese impression of our conduct can still be negative. First, some of the conduct we think is good or natural, may be seen as negative by the Vietnamese. After all, it is not really what we do or say that is important; rather it is what the Viet-

namese think about what we do not say. They perceive things differently in ways we don't often seem able to understand. For example, many soldiers like to give candy and cigarettes to children, because they like children and want to make friends. But many Vietnamese parents resent this, because it suggests to their children that the parents don't give them enough, because it makes some children into beggars of a sort, and finally because it weakens the authority of the family and has an adverse effect on the conduct of the children. The second characteristic of conduct is that normal conduct is in unequal competition with bad conduct. Examples of bad conduct, though small in proportion, stand out to form the image for Vietnamese not closely associated with Americans of good conduct. Of course, our adversary helps his cause along by picking out the conduct Vietnamese see as bad and blowing it up. That, of course, is intelligent political warfare—magnifying your enemy's weaknesses in the eyes of the contested, and that, of course, we do also by making the North Vietnamese appear more villainous to the Southerners.

Let us briefly review the various types of American conduct that might be considered negative by the Vietnamese; most of these are things I have observed and have been told about by my more forthright Vietnamese friends. Most Vietnamese tell us what we want to hear; our real friends tell us the truth from their viewpoint. Such criticism comes hard for Vietnamese friends, because they feel criticism is very dangerous to personal relationships.

On some main Nha Trang streets it is a common sight to see drunken soldiers, often with sloppy dress, swearing and yelling; this, of course, is most common in late afternoon and evenings, especially on weekends. Fights, including use of firearms, and angry discussions among Americans or Americans and Vietnamese, often occur. Rumors of such happenings soon pass from town to countryside, although quite changed in form or in degree. In Nha Trang the most obvious American presence in the central city is in and around the bars that consistently have grown in number and location. The next most obvious, and probably greatest point of individual contact, is in the surrounding off-base or compound residential areas where hostesses, "housekeepers," and plain prostitutes make their rather highly-paid living. Adult friends have been upset, not only over the actual behavior, but also the realization that they are getting so little comparatively for socially desirable work. Since no area of Nha Trang is off-limits to soldiers or civilians (in my observations), and since seeming thousands are allowed to live off base, legally or not, there is no area where Americans aren't seen visiting or living with their "wives."

Many Vietnamese remark about how few Americans seem to try to speak Vietnamese or to learn about Vietnamese customs or to eat their food. Although this may have been said to back-handedly congratulate me for trying to learn, it also represents the quite natural Vietnamese belief that they have a long and often valuable culture, worthy for foreigners to learn something about, as we expect of foreign visitors to our own country. Many will use "papa-san," "number one," "beaucoup," "chop-chop" to deal with the Americans they contact, but what impressions are left? Americans seem to forget that the Vietnamese are not a backward, uneducated, and simple people.

Indeed, even the very ubiquitousness of Americans is a point of irritation; the Vietnamese feel that they can't escape. They are always reminded of our large foreign presence. Nights of curfew in Nha Trang are nights of relief, nights for taking walks and for relaxation. On these nights *ao dais* once again outnumber the mini-skirts, which are

most frequently worn by prostitutes in Nha Trang. Young ladies and young people in general are everywhere, because this night they know there are no soldiers to create incidents. But this night, and every night, they can find shops full of American PX goodies, and they know and have seen both Americans and our local allies, the Koreans and the Filipinos, selling these goods or paying off their prostitutes, who sell to black-market operators. They find others exchanging plasters and MPC and dollars. And they no doubt recall that we often say that they are corrupt. They, of course, think most of us are already fairly well off financially. Several students have asked me about the illogic of this corruption among an affluent people. They then asked how with such corruption (and with racial intolerance) we can hope to "help" their country to be better than that. The Viet Cong manage a distinctly more disciplined image.

But let me mention a few specific incidents that I saw in the countryside, where contact is more infrequent and stereotypes more prevalent. A number of times soldiers riding in trucks or jeeps have reached out to touch or grab girls, country girls who don't even publicly hold hands with their husbands. A few may not mind, but most do. In any case, the reaction of their boy friends, husbands, brothers, and fathers is stronger and more important. I find anti-Americanism much stronger among the men, especially the younger ones. No Vietnamese man has actually spoken to me of it, but indirectly a number have said things that clearly show that they feel inferior to and in competition with American men. This probably seems amusing and ego-building to most American men, but it shouldn't be. Men often act on a basis related to their feelings of masculinity. How exactly Vietnamese men are reacting deserves serious study.

On other occasions, soldiers have struck people on bicycles or motorcycles with hands or objects (e.g., sticks and cans). At other times, a person has thrown a beer can at a roadside altar or houses near the road. The wife of a Vietnamese friend went to interview for a job at an American installation in Cam Ranh, and not one, but two, different civilian interviewers insisted on trying to hold her hand.

Various friends have given, directly and indirectly, some subtler, but perhaps more damaging observations. They see the amount of goods, the size of houses, and the amount of playtime, and they wonder if we really come to fight a war or to enjoy the good life at their expense. They see the great quantity of goods and money we use for their benefit, but wonder why we don't give more of ourselves. "Could it be because the Americans consider us inferior, or because they don't care?" The Vietnamese see us allow ourselves to be taken advantage of (from bad bargains to governmental corruption), and they wonder if we are stupid, if we are so rich we don't miss it, or if, again, we simply don't really care whether these materials actually help anyone. They see so much go for war materials and much less for building; they question our priorities, our understanding of guerrilla warfare, and our motivation for being there. They see us giving so much away for which we ask or require no cooperative effort on their part. They notice everything from the numbers of Vietnamese employed by Americans to all the things we build and do for them. "Do the Americans not understand this makes beggars of our people?" Moreover, the Vietnamese see us and GVN begin to talk of doing so many things that they never see begun, or if begun, never finished, that they don't feel that they can trust what we say. Finally, the sins and virtues of our allies are often pinned on us. No doubt you know the general reputation of the Koreans and Filipinos in our area.

So what are the consequences of our conduct, remembering the important thing is how the Vietnamese perceive it, rather than what we may intend? As suggested above, some types of American conduct strongly suggest condescension, weakness, insensitivity, and/or corruption. The sense of superiority often comes across strongly even from advisor to advisee, and they question whether we are any different from the French. Putting aside the ways that the Viet Cong use our conduct against us, all conduct must strongly affect the pro-NLF, the uncommitted, and the pro-government Vietnamese's respect, trust, liking, and corresponding negative attitudes toward us. Most Americans to whom I suggested this replied, "So what!" or words to that effect. Some said they were owed the right to anything they wanted to do for risking their lives, and these men indicated the Vietnamese also thought they deserved it. Many more in fact said that most Vietnamese didn't care, or that individual conduct was of almost no importance in the war situation. But they misjudge the Vietnamese and the nature of modern psychologically-oriented warfare. Most people will put up with it, because they don't feel that they have any immediate alternative. But one major group of people within this group are the nationalists, who are needed to support a viable GVN, but who stay neutral and uninvolved, not only because they don't see GVN performing effectively, but because they don't have any, or enough, respect for, or trust in, the Americans who are keeping this government afloat. Some of the most potentially effective people in my area remain uncommitted or only marginally involved, not only from fear of the Viet Cong, but for inability to support the present non-Communist alternative. These are the real nationalists, whom we must reach in Viet Nam or any other nation, to build a strong non-Communist movement or government. Some other nationalists perhaps can't justify waiting in an uninvolved way and join the Viet Cong, like the Viet Minh before, as the only active alternative.

What, I have often thought, are the possible reasons we too often present the appearance of poor conduct to the Vietnamese? Are they right that we really don't care, either because we think that only military action affects the outcome of this war, or because we really don't care about the Vietnamese? Are we only fighting against Communists and not for the Vietnamese? Are we too weak, unable to discipline ourselves to the extent necessary in political warfare? (If so, consider what this means for any further effort in Viet Nam and for future involvement in national development and/or counterinsurgency warfare in other nations.) Could it be that we lack sufficient leadership of a high caliber to control our actions? Does it mean that our effort somehow has resulted in a quantity of people and goods to the detriment of quality results? Or could it be that we are prejudiced, paternalistic, and superior in such a way that we can't interact equally with a Vietnamese? Is it our bigness and richness that seems to magnify our mistakes in Vietnamese eyes? Is it that the Vietnamese do not understand what we are really like?

Whatever reasons you might find to be more important or more right than others—probably they all have some validity—it can't be disputed that most Vietnamese find some of our conduct offensive, and that some, perhaps the most influential people, find it intolerable. What then am I venturing to recommend could be done to change this reaction, to build and strengthen human bonds between Americans and Vietnamese, and thereby change the psychological climate of conflict in Viet Nam (and other countries)? Below let me suggest some general and specific ideas for the present in Vietnam and perhaps for future United States development and/or counter-insurgency involvements elsewhere.

1. The most logical recommendation would be to remove from Viet Nam most of the combat and support troops, who by youth and background may be more unaware and undisciplined. For counter-insurgency commitments anywhere that would require a continued and lengthy American involvement, this means few regular combat troops and at the most, highly trained and highly psycho-politically sensitive advisors. (Many of the Special Forces soldiers that I met in the Khanh Hoa area would not qualify. Only a handful could speak Vietnamese, or tried to. The interpersonal relations between the majority of these soldiers and their Vietnamese CIDG troops were poor; a number of Vietnamese actually told me how much they disliked individual American soldiers. At the same time, the local people generally viewed the CIDG, and by association their American sponsors, as the local "cowboys"—that is, wild, aggressive, bad-mouth youth. Before I left, one Special Forces officer moved his Vietnamese "girl friend" into my small town, despite a clear understanding that it was "off limits" for such activity. Many soldiers seemed to think they had to constantly prove to the Vietnamese the image of Green Beret virility. I must note, however, I did know several highly competent Special Forces officers and soldiers.)

2. Thorough political education of soldiers and civilians seems desirable. The Viet Cong and NVA use highly developed techniques, but we seem to think that either our soldiers already understand, or if taught, it wouldn't matter or would not do much good. On the contrary, perhaps if the individual could see his role more clearly, understand the people with whom he will relate, and appreciate the effect of his behavior on people of another culture, he would be more concerned with his actions.

This education should cover history, language, customs, religion, and any matter likely to influence relations. This is the subject matter of a political education program; our programs should not and need not be the type of highly propagandistic and distorted exhortation so evidently used by our adversary. Our strength is in dealing in a more open way with all areas of problem and opinion. This general program could be constructed to include a general orientation for people just coming to the foreign nation and continued required study while in that nation. For example, courses with and without university credit could be taught on any one or several aspects of Viet Nam, Vietnamese life, and the United States role in Viet Nam. Special lectures, by Vietnamese teachers, as well as American, could be arranged on pertinent topics. Radio and TV broadcasts could include frequent shows for Americans on Vietnamese life and culture. (I saw almost no such things on TV and heard very little on radio. The few presentations I did see here, mostly originating in Saigon, were quite good.) Naturally, the various educational programs would vary according to educational level and roles of the various participants. They would not be mass lectures, pro forma and inane in quality; study would be done in small groups.

I don't suggest the reverse situation, where we directly undertake to educate the people of a host nation, because there is already a great amount of learning going on, although subtle, and sometimes too much of the wrong type. A few open and intelligent radio discussions of American and Vietnamese life styles and problems in working together might be useful for everyone. Of course, the fact that it is done is of much greater significance. But we should always remember to prove to them that we do consider ourselves friends and guests, and polite guests, as good friends do, always seek to find out more about their hosts than they tell about themselves.

3. Living arrangements need re-structuring. Seeing the general negative effects of so many soldiers, and sometimes civilians, living throughout Nha Trang, it could be recommended under the current situation that all soldiers be required to live on base or in restricted military housing. Civilians could also possibly be checked from time to time to see if they are causing negative impacts in their neighborhood, and if so, assigned to restricted housing. This may be a curtailment of personal freedom, but a highly political war requires consistent, intelligent political action. However, some highly politically sensitive and disciplined soldiers and civilians could be selected to live among the population.

4. Corruption involving Americans and their allies or American goods should be tackled diligently, forcefully, and consistently. A few visible improvements have been made in the past year, but the situation in Khanh Hoa and other parts of Viet Nam still appears to be out of control. This has important consequences, not only on the war, but on the Americans, Filipinos, Thais, or Koreans returning to their own country. So many soldiers (and civilians) were talking about making fast money out of the war, and too often in illegal form. This kind of atmosphere and learning experience is hardly a healthy one for American or Vietnamese society.

5. Off-base bars should be put off limits to Americans. Enough American installations exist to quench a thirst. Some prostitution seems to be inevitable, especially where large numbers of soldiers exist, but it should be restricted and supervised for health and political reasons. Most especially, it should be kept away from center city, residential areas and rural communities. More American women in-country might also take some of the pressures off and create a more normal "community" environment. Men and boys away from family and women in general develop a quite distinctive set of social values.

6. General restrictions on access to towns and cities are needed. Seeing what the bars and blackmarkets are doing to the Vietnamese, and to us as well, our leaders should make the hard decision to heavily restrict or put them off-limits to soldiers. Depending upon the situation, this perhaps could be done in a number of ways and degrees: (a) Total restriction, some officers have said, is too hard on their men, but it would be the most honest and perhaps the most effective way of minimizing negative contact, especially if combined with programs to foster positive contacts, as suggested below. (b) Restrict all the city, except an area around the base (if not in center city), which removes some of the continuous abrasion on the Vietnamese. (c) Restrict most of the city and especially residential and central-city business area. (d) Restrict the city on all nights, the weekend, and perhaps most days of the week. There are no doubt more approaches to this, but in all cases (e) Restrict all small towns, villages, and hamlets for all Americans, except those with legitimate and carefully approved work there, e.g., doctors, priests, ministers, community developers.

7. On the positive side, there should be programs for encouraging American—host-country national relationships. As some of the previous ideas, this may sound somewhat idealistic or unnecessary, but in situations of cross-cultural inter-relationships, it is very much a vital concept. Small group tours and individual home visits could be arranged for those soldiers and civilians judged to be disciplined, politically sensitive, and interested. A goodly number of Vietnamese now speak some English; interpreters and students are available. Similar programs are organized in other nations, including Southeast Asia. A center could be set up on bases where Vietnamese would be invited to come and share

their thoughts on Vietnamese life and other topics. Such a program could be coordinated through specially chosen staffs, set up independently of the psychological warfare, civic action, or special services divisions.

A number of special programs could be initiated to further the interest, capability, and atmosphere for mutual inter-action and understanding. Special days would be organized with activities to emphasize aspects of Vietnamese life. Musical concerts and other cultural presentations would be given; more Vietnamese conversational classes would be organized (even on TV and radio); picnics and athletic contests would be planned to bring families together with small, selected groups of Americans. Again, radio and TV provide an excellent medium for reaching the American community. They are not really used for much of value now. For those Americans who learned Vietnamese and/or studied various Vietnamese subjects, special tours and programs could be organized as incentive and reward. I am certain you are aware of ways that better personal relationships between American soldiers and Vietnamese soldiers could be developed. All of this programming should (a) educate and sensitize us (b) educate and sensitize the Vietnamese, and (c) provide a more healthy environment of inter-action in personal, and therefore, working relationships.

8. Propaganda and information should be made more credible for American and US-GVN programs. In general, we could talk less about what is going to be done and discuss more honestly what has been and what is being done, what hasn't been accomplished, and what the problems are. Many Vietnamese do not believe the Viet Cong, but they also have trouble believing us and GVN. How can the balance of credibility be swung strongly to the American side?

9. "Giving" things away should be stopped. "Are these things really needed or desired," we should ask ourselves. In all things that we decide to give the Vietnamese, from cement to candy, we should expect and ask them to do something to earn their receipt. If the goods are useful, they will act. For example, if a school is to be built, the Vietnamese should always put up some of the money for materials and/or for the workmen, or do some of the work themselves. Each situation will determine how much would be done. A settled community has different needs and resources than a newly-arrived refugee group. Not only does the Vietnamese contribution allow them to earn that aid which is needed, but it requires them to organize and to work together. Both organization and cooperation are values that need to be built and reinforced in Vietnamese society. If our aid is too freely given, it strongly decreases the incentives for the Vietnamese to organize and to cooperate among themselves. This I saw happen all too often in my area, an area of generally moderate income.

If we gave less, but made sure of its use, our effort would have greater results. Strong action is needed when goods are diverted by the Vietnamese; for example, either the situation is immediately corrected or we withdraw some aid they want, but which doesn't harm the people who lost out in the first place. Even on the simplest level, we can learn to give things in the proper manner, so we do not appear to concerned Vietnamese to be creating a beggar nation.

Finally, we should find ways of implementing the following guidelines, given by T. E. Lawrence, but equally relevant today: "Do not try to do too much with your own hands. Better your allies do it tolerably than you do it perfectly. It is their war, and you are to help them, not to win for them."

Admittedly, there is so much more that could be suggested as recommendations for

action. But all the good ideas and good intentions are of no value unless the people having them attempt to make them effective. So in the end, both our problems and our possible means of diminishing them are tied to our will to discipline and to commit ourselves to doing the very hard things that must be done. In the present changing Viet Nam situation or in other present and future involvements, the question remains: Are we willing to structure our behavior to achieve our stated goals?

Thank you for your consideration. These views are solely my own responsibility, and I hope they have been clear and perhaps constructive. I am certainly ready for further discussion of the problem if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,
DYLE G. HENNING.

AND TO ALL A GOOD NIGHT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 1969 Christmas season has passed, but I would like to share with my colleagues and others the text of the very interesting and original greeting which I received from the Washington correspondent of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News.

Lucian C. Warren, a native of western New York, has been on the Washington scene for the past quarter century. Since becoming head of the News bureau a year ago, he has focused his attention upon coverage of the White House and the new administration.

In poetic form, he has referred lightly to some of the developments of the year and I include his full text as follows:

THE NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS

(With apologies to Clement C. Moore and Santa Claus)

'Twas the time before Christmas, when all 'round White House,
Many creatures were stirring, but mostly to grouse.

Nixon's stockings were hung by the chimney with care
In the hope they would bulge with just more than hot air.

Men in Congress were meeting, not yet gone to bed,
As some visions of tax cutting danced in their head.

But in White House the boys were avoiding the rap
And had settled their brains for a long winter nap.

When below on the street there arose such a clatter
They all sprang to TV to see what was the matter.

"Stay away from the window, and away from the bash,
And close tight all those shutters, and nail down the sash.

"For it's certain John Mitchell and Martha will know
How to handle the liberals' protesting below."

Just then what to their wondering eyes should appear
But a mammoth parade, with some marchers sincere.

There were marshals a-plenty so lively and quick

But a few, without doubt, were sure full of old Nick.

From the north, south, east, west—from all over they came—

And they chanted and shouted and cheered some by name:

"Now Ben Spock, Coretta, McGovern, Goodell

"And Peter, and Paul, and Mary as well.

"At the top of our lungs, at top pitch we do hawl

"For cease firing, withdrawal, no troops there at all."

As dry leaves that before the wild hurricane fly

When they meet with an obstacle, mount to the sky

So quite close to the White House protestors updrew—

Many girls, many boys and some elderly, too.

But at Justice, the view as was seen from the roof

Was alarming John Mitchell, who felt there was proof

That those violence-prone pinkoes were too much around.

As they stormed at the flagpole they had to rebound

When the riot squads gassed 'em from head to the foot.

But now hark, someone else is all tarnished with soot.

As one Spiro T. Agnew goes forth to attack,
It's the media press that is taken aback.

TV Comment, unsound, surely biased, un-merry,

And the Washington Post, New York Times he would bury.

Very droll Spiro's talk 'gainst unchosen elite,
'Gainst the instant reactions from snobs so effete.

Let us face it, old friends, he hit hard in our belly—

It's shaking from shock like a bowlful of jelly.

'Twas not clubby to fire upon such as our self,

And he's hardly the type to be jolly old elf.

One cold look from his eye, baleful shake of his head

Surely gave us to know we had something to dread.

But enough about Agnew, our duty not shirk:

Let us fill Nixon's stockings, drive Congress to work

By our giving unslanted all sides of the news,
Let us live and let live and give everyone's views,

USA is the land where must none blow the whistle

On our freedom of speech, even sharp like the thistle.

And we're here to proclaim, 'ere we drop out of sight:

"Happy Christmas to all, and to all a good night!"

The LUCIAN WARRENS.

DAVID O. MCKAY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a truly great American and

a distinguished spiritual leader with the passing of Mr. David O. McKay, president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Mr. McKay has been described as "the missionary president" and the growth of the Mormon Church during his tenure has been impressive indeed. Prior to Mr. McKay's administration, for example, there were only eight Mormon temples throughout the world—one of which, I am proud to say, is located in my hometown of Mesa, Ariz.—Whereas today there are 13 temples situated from Switzerland to New Zealand, not to mention the thousands of places of worship throughout the globe.

David O. McKay made the Mormon Church a worldwide organization, but he will also be remembered by people of all faiths as a warm, decent man having a lifelong devotion to those values which are the very foundation of this country.

COURT WITHOUT A COMPASS

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Florida is a great State made up of good people. We have problems like any other section of our Nation and we are making good-faith efforts to correct those problems.

I refer in this instance to the chaos which has erupted in our school systems. School boards have been ordered to bring about artificial integration by February 1.

It is the timing which is so severe and which has created such havoc and ill will among the people of a State which I believe is one of the leaders in the Nation in honestly and sincerely meeting the very serious social problem of school integration in our time.

Boards which went to the courts with plans that were praised were not given time to implement them. Children are being uprooted, teachers are being summarily transferred, and the parents are so frustrated and angry that they find it difficult to be reasonable.

The courts of this land can only operate as long as they have the respect and support of the people. This one action has done more to cause ill will than any of which I know. It is the indifference with which children of all races are being treated that makes the situation so heartrending.

We need the understanding and compassion of the people of this Nation. We have men of good will on our county school boards and officials who have made and will continue to make honest efforts to comply with the law of the land.

In this instance, they have been dealt a staggering blow of intolerance and indifference. It is a sad situation and our educational system is suffering because of it.

The Tampa Tribune of January 14 had an editorial which I think makes a very valid point in this regard, and I would like for the other Members of Congress to ponder on the situation expressed therein. The editorial follows:

COURT WITHOUT A COMPASS

There is a greater degree of segregation of Negroes in the public schools of Chicago than in Miami.

Cleveland, Ohio and Washington, D.C., have proportionately as many all-black schools as Tampa.

Segregation in Gary, Ind. schools exceeds that in Polk County (Bartow).

These statistics from a survey by the Federal Health, Education and Welfare Department illustrate the inconsistency of Federal court orders which are creating turmoil in Southern education.

The orders are designed to force artificial integration of the races in schools which, by normal attendance patterns, would be almost wholly white or black.

And the orders are directed only at Southern schools, despite the fact that the same type of segregation exists in Northern cities with substantial Negro populations.

Schools in Florida and other Southern states are under court command to achieve complete integration by February 1.

It is patently foolish to order a change involving radical transfers of students and teachers in the middle of a school year.

As State Education Commissioner Floyd Christian pointed out yesterday, such a move may require some schools to close temporarily; it will also impose unanticipated new costs, especially in busing, upon already hard-pressed school systems. It will, too, intensify the resentment among parents whose children are uprooted in such a fashion.

The timing is bad enough.

The principle is worse.

While the Constitution clearly forbids discrimination against any race or class of citizens by forced segregation, by no reasonable interpretation does it compel integration. If a school is all white or all black because of the racial character of the neighborhood, no discrimination exists and there is no ground for court intervention.

Moreover, in adopting the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Congress wrote a specific prohibition against integration for integration's sake. Nothing in that law, it said, "shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils from one school to another or one school district to another."

Yet lower Federal courts have ignored the law and so has the Supreme Court. This week it refused to disturb an order of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals rejecting neighborhood attendance zones for the schools of Indianola, Miss.

The court conceded the attendance zones were drawn without regard to race—but since they resulted in little integration the judges said some other plan must be used to eliminate segregation.

Governor Kirk asked the Cabinet yesterday for advice on legal moves to seek a delay of the Supreme Court order for Florida schools until next September. A delay would be helpful; but it would not reach the basic problem.

That problem is the indifference of the Supreme Court to the realities of human relations and the principles of law. It is a problem which must concern both Congress and President Nixon. The President, by judicial selection, and Congress, by legislation, should seek to return a Constitutional compass to a court which now seems to be guided by the misty stars of social theory.

EUROPEANS STILL HAVE CHEERS FOR HEROIC AMERICANS

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about anti-American feelings abroad, I felt it would be heartening to learn of just the opposite among a great number of Europeans.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 17, 1970]
EUROPEANS STILL HAVE CHEERS FOR HEROIC AMERICANS

(By Alice Widener)

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM.—The weather outside the movie theater here in Brussels was the same as inside on the screen—bitter cold and snowing.

Filled with viewers of every European nationality, Brussels is now as international as Rome and all roads lead here.

The theater was filled to capacity and the scenes on screen went straight to the heart and soul of each adult.

Only the little children and teenagers looked at the events on screen as incomprehensible or merely historical.

The documentary film was about an American general—George Patton, by name—and our GIs in the Battle of the Bulge after the Nazi breakthrough against Allied forces in the dead of winter at Christmastime in the Ardennes during World War II.

There he was, Gen. George Patton, bundled up to the ears in a greatcoat, standing knee-deep in snow, his jaw jutting out over a turned-up collar in invincible determination, unconquerable spirit and immortal courage at a time of near despair for our side.

Tanks rolled by with near-frozen GIs huddled on top.

Black-faced, white-hooded gunners fired heavy weapons into thick naked forests. General Patton lifted both arms high, clasped hands, and gestured in praise and encouragement at a group of wounded men crouched in an icy ditch.

"Bravo!" suddenly called out a man sitting directly in front of me at the cinema. "Ils ne passeront pas!" (They shall not pass!)

"Bravo! Bravo!" The whole audience was cheering.

"Bravo, Patton" called out a little boy, imitating his father and not knowing why.

Now, on screen, there were scenes of the American cemetery at Ardennes—rows and rows of white crosses as far as the eye can see. Then came a close-up of the "Nuts" Museum in honor of General McAuliffe, who sent the famous message "Nuts!" to a Nazi commander demanding that the surrounded Americans surrender.

"Nuts!" called out a middle-aged Belgian woman sitting back of me.

"Nuts! Nuts!" went up a chorus of young and old voices in the movie theater.

Again there were scenes on the screen of exhausted, grim-faced GIs trudging along in the snow, each step an heroic effort. Again there was General Patton, urging them on, calling out to them, putting an arm around a limping GI born with a black face.

Suddenly I felt my face. It was wet with tears.

How good it was to be in a jam-packed movie theater at one in spirit with hundreds of foreigners, no one of whom boomed or jeered or made an obscene gesture at sight

of the American military and American flag and American generals—Patton, Eisenhower, Bradley, McAuliffe.

"Si nous avons eu un si bon Reveillin, c'est du a lui," said a mother to her son sitting next to me, as a close-up of the Patton Memorial appeared on screen. ("If we had such a Happy New Year, it's due to him.")

Out in the narrow Brussels streets, as some Belgian friends and I walked home from the movies, I didn't mind the penetrating cold and snow blowing in my face. We had such a warm feeling of kinship and exhilarating optimism, we who have lived through so much of the worst in life.

Going along single file on a cobbled, 16th Century sidewalk not more than two feet wide, we came face to face with a longhaired, bearded young hippie in a thick, swinging cape and a bareheaded girl with long straight hair parted in the middle and an Indian band around her forehead.

"Conformistes ignorants et irresponsables," commented a French newspaper reporter. "Next to a Patton—zero!"

It seems there is in this international city of Brussels a not-so-silent majority.

THE FAILURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ON CONSERVATION ISSUES

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the President will address the Nation. He will imply that he and his party are the party of conservation.

But obviously, if the President calls for new conservation legislation, he has not looked at the record of his own party in the House of Representatives on conservation and pollution. I am sure that the majority party will support the strongest possible pollution control and conservation recommendations. Unfortunately, the record shows that the President's own party will not.

During the past 15 years the Republican Party has been the party of recommitment, not the party of conservation. Time and time again the Republicans in this Chamber have sought to make conservation bills as weak and underfunded as possible. It has been only through the vigilance and dedication of the House Democrats that real conservation bills have passed the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the record a list of votes taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on major conservation issues before the House since 1956. A majority of the House Republicans voted against stronger efforts against water pollution in 1956, 1959, 1961, 1967, 1968, and 1969. A majority of the Republicans in the House voted against the Air Pollution Act of 1963 and voted to cut air pollution funds in 1966. A majority of the President's party voted against estuary preservation in 1966, and the creation of three new parks—including Indiana Dunes Lakeshore Park—in 1966.

The Republican record on conservation has not been the result of any revolt in the ranks; it is the result of the efforts of the Republican leadership which has

voted with the party on nearly every issue. But these are surprising times; a Republican Governor in California tries to claim that he is a conservationist and a Republican President tries to provide congressional leadership on conservation but his own party does not follow.

Conservation has become a life-and-death issue, a bipartisan issue. Yet the President who claims to be for conservation has just "realigned" the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and created a new post of Associate Commissioner—and filled that post with the former deputy staff director of the U.S. Senate Republican policy committee. In addition, in a news release of January 9, four regional directors of the FWPCA were rotated—with only a few days notice to them—and the Great Lakes region post, which has had an excellent and devoted expert director since 1956—is left vacant. A leadership post in the most polluted area of the country is left vacant.

It is my hope that in the future, Mr. Speaker, more Republican support will be given for pollution control and conservation. In the meantime, the Democratic Party will, I am confident, be the party concerned for the American environment.

The vote record on major conservation issues for the period 1956 through 1969 is as follows:

1956

WATER POLLUTION

May 21: The House Public Works Subcommittee (Rivers & Harbors) reported a bill to strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. H.R. 9540 authorized \$5 million in each fiscal (1957-1961) to states and interstate agencies to develop water pollution control programs. It is also authorized an appropriation of \$500 million (in amounts no more than \$50 million a year) to help pay for state and interstate agency sewage treatment plants.

Floor Action—June 13—The House passed S. 890 to authorize federal money to help states fight water pollution. A recommitment motion by J. Harry McGregor (R-Ohio) was defeated by a 165-213 roll call vote. He moved to eliminate the section regarding grants for sewage disposal plants because it would be an expensive precedent.

A conservation vote is a nay vote:

Yeas:		
Democrats	-----	25
Republicans	-----	140
Total yeas	-----	165
Nays:		
Democrats	-----	176
Republicans	-----	37
Total nays	-----	213

Then the House on June 13 passed H.R. 9540.

A conservation vote is a yea vote:

Yeas:		
Democrats	-----	190
Republicans	-----	148
Total yeas	-----	338
Nays:		
Democrats	-----	5
Republicans	-----	26
Total nays	-----	31

On June 27, the House and Senate adopted by voice vote the conference report on S. 890.

Eisenhower signed S. 890 into Public Law 660. He said the bill, by providing federal grants to localities to pay part of the cost of constructing sewage treatment works, went beyond legislation he recommended.

The 1956 amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 (P.L. 845, 80th Congress) increased federal funds available to states for development of water pollution control programs and authorized a maximum of \$500 million to assist communities to build sewage treatment works.

1959

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS

H.R. 3610 was to subsidize the building of municipal sewage treatment plants, up to 30% or \$500,000 whichever is smaller. The total authorization was \$100,000,000, twice the previous authorization. The House rejected an amendment by Cramer (R-Fla.) to require matching state funds.

On Amendment—A nay vote is a vote for conservation:

Cramer Amendment, June 9:

Yeas:		
Democrats	-----	29
Republicans	-----	127
Total yeas	-----	156
Nays:		
Democrats	-----	227
Republicans	-----	13
Total nays	-----	240

Final Vote on H.R. 3610:

Yeas:		
Democrats	-----	187
Republicans	-----	27
Total yeas	-----	228
Nays:		
Democrats	-----	28
Republicans	-----	115
Total nays	-----	143

H.R. 6441 increased sewage treatment allotment from \$50 million to \$80 million for fiscal 1962, \$90 million for 1963, and \$100 million for 1964-1967. The Federal Government is to pay 30% of costs or \$600,000 whichever was less only after state aid had been applied for. An effort was made to recommit with instructions to cut final (1964-1967) authorizations from \$100 million to \$75 million.

On recommitment a nay vote is a vote for conservation:

Recommittal:

Yeas:		
Democrats	-----	21
Republicans	-----	144
Total yeas	-----	165
Nays:		
Democrats	-----	232
Republicans	-----	24
Total nays	-----	256

Final vote on H.R. 6441:

Yeas:		
Democratic	-----	229
Republicans	-----	79
Total yeas	-----	308
Nays:		
Democratic	-----	22
Republicans	-----	88
Total nays	-----	110

H.R. 5786 Cape Cod Seashore: To establish a national seashore and provide funds for the purchase of land.

A yeas vote is a vote for conservation:

Final vote on H.R. 5786, June 10:

Yeas:	
Democrats	198
Republicans	80
Total yeas	278
Nays:	
Democrats	14
Republicans	68
Total nays	82

1962

LABOR-HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE FUNDS

In bill H.R. 10904, the House Appropriations Committee endorsed the President's February 27 Health Message proposal for a joint government-industry effort to solve air pollution and added one million dollars for an \$11,069,000 total for research in air pollution. It also added one million dollars to funds for studying water supply and water pollution control, declaring that "more needs to be done than can be accomplished with the budget request (\$23.6 million)."

The House on March 27 passed H.R. 10904, amended, by voice vote. Prior to passage, the House rejected by a 24 to 373 vote, a motion by Representative August Johansen (R-Michigan) to recommit the bill. A nay vote is a vote for conservation.

Yeas:	
Democrats	1
Republicans	23
Nays:	
Democrats	231
Republicans	142

1963

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

H.R. 6518, Air Pollution Control, to replace the 1955 Act. H.R. 6518 increased funds from \$5 million per year to \$25 million for 1965 to \$30 million for 1966 and to \$35 million for 1967. A motion to recommit the bill by Representative Harvey (R-Indiana) was defeated by 29-41 in a standing vote. The bill was passed on November 7; a Conference version was passed on December 10, 1963.

Bill passage, November 7, 1963:

Yeas:	
Democrats	206
Republicans	87
Total yeas	273
Nays:	
Democrats	10
Republicans	92
Total nays	102

Conference passage, December 10, 1963:

Yeas:	
Democrats	204
Republicans	69
Total yeas	273
Nays:	
Democrats	15
Republicans	94
Total nays	109

1966

LABOR-HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE FUNDS

H.R. 14745—Some provisions were: Environmental health services, \$24,298,000; Air pollution control, \$35,561,000; Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, \$233,063,000.

There was a motion by Representative Bow to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to amend it to limit the expenditures for agencies and programs funded by H.R. 14745 to 95 per cent of the total expenditures estimated in the 1967 Budget for these programs. The motion was rejected by a 143-236 vote. A nay vote is a vote for conservation.

Yeas:	
Democrats	35
Republicans	108
Nays:	
Democrats	215
Republicans	20

INTERIOR FUNDS

H.R. 14215—Some provisions were: National Park Service, \$118,068,800; Office of Water Resources Research, \$6,894,000; Indian Health Activities, \$73,671,000; Land and Water Conservation Fund, \$110,000,000; Forest Service, \$780,000.

By a 157-233 roll call vote, the House defeated a motion by Representative Frank Bow to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to require an overall five per cent cut in spending by agencies covered by the bill. A nay vote is a vote for conservation.

Yeas:	
Democrats	30
Republicans	127
Nays:	
Democrats	227
Republicans	6

ESTUARY PRESERVATION

The House on October 3 rejected by a 209-108 roll call the Administration-backed bill (H.R. 13477) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to select and preserve certain areas surrounding estuaries. It established a National System of Estuarine Areas, which was to include Federal, state, and local areas which the Secretary determined needed protection. Most of the opposition came from Republicans. A 2/3rd's vote was needed under suspension of the Rules.

Yeas:	
Democrats	175
Republicans	34
Nays:	
Democrats	31
Republicans	77

WOLF TRAP FARM PARK

S. 3423—P.L. 89-671 established under the National Park Service, a cultural center and recreation area at Wolf Trap Farm in Fairfax County, Virginia. It was the first National park to be devoted primarily to the performing arts. The House, prior to passing the bill October 10, had rejected it September 19 by a 195-105 roll call vote—again under suspension of the Rules, requiring a 2/3rd's vote.

Yeas:	
Democrats	153
Republicans	42
Nays:	
Democrats	46
Republicans	59

PICTURED ROCKS NATIONAL LAKESHORE

(H.R. 8678—P.L. 89-668) This bill provided for a 67,000 acre park along the south shore of Lake Superior.

The House passed the bill September 19 by a 248-70 roll call vote:

Yeas:	
Democrats	206
Republicans	42
Nays:	
Democrats	10
Republicans	60

INDIANA DUNES LAKESHORE

"Congress in 1966 climaxed one of the most emotional battles in the 50-year history of the National Parks System" by passing a bill (S. 360 P.L. 89-761) creating the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore along 13 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline.

The House passed H.R. 51 by a 204-141 roll call vote:

Yeas:	
Democrats	187
Republicans	17
Nays:	
Democrats	45
Republicans	96

By voice vote the House then substituted the provisions of H.R. 51 for those of S. 360, passed S. 360, and returned it to the Senate.

1967

H.R. 9029 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION

The appropriation was 1,256,365,350, which was 95% of the executive request. There was a proposal to recommit by Bow (R-Ohio) with instructions to make a 5% across-the-board cut. The bill was passed later that day, 6/12. A nay vote on recommitment is a vote for conservation funds.

Recommitment:

Yeas:	
Democrats	24
Republicans	134
Total yeas	158
Nays:	
Democrats	192
Republicans	39
Total nays	231

Bill:

Yeas:	
Democrats	214
Republicans	163
Total yeas	377
Nays:	
Democrats	0
Republicans	11
Total nays	11

1968

H.R. 17354 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION

The appropriation was 1,415,789,300 which was 90% of the executive request. A motion to recommit by Rumsfeld (R-Ill.) with instructions to limit expenditures to 1,383,432,068 was offered. The bill was passed the same day, 6/11.

Recommitment:

Yeas:	
Democrats	30
Republicans	144
Total yeas	174
Nays:	
Democrats	178
Republicans	29
Total nays	207

Bill:

Yeas:	
Democrats	207
Republicans	157
Total yeas	364
Nays:	
Democrats	0
Republicans	14
Total nays	14

1969

H.R. 14159 (DATE: 10-8-69) WATER POLLUTION CONTROL APPROPRIATION

The vote in this case was on the previous question, which if approved, would prevent an amendment to raise the appropriation from \$600 million to its full authorization of \$1 billion.

Yeas:	
Democrats	92
Republicans	123
Total yeas	215
Nays:	
Democrats	135
Republicans	52
Total nays	187

A Nay vote was a vote for conservation.

ARROGANCE OF THE PEACENIKS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker I am pleased to report that in retirement, our former colleague, the Honorable August E. Johansen, continues to take an active in-

terest in the problems with which our Nation is confronted.

With justifiable pride, his daughter, Mrs. Judy Rush, recently provided me with the text of an address my good friend delivered on Veterans Day, November 11, 1969, before the Winter Park, Fla., University Club.

It is a fine speech, and I am glad to have an opportunity to share it with my colleagues—particularly those who had the honor, as I did, of serving with this distinguished American. The speech follows:

ARROGANCE OF THE PEACENIKS

Doubtless it can be attributed to a hardening of the arteries—and of my own prejudices—but I still prefer to think of this historic date of November 11 as Armistice Day.

I have an incorrigible addiction to the goal of victory in war, and for me Armistice Day, 1918, remains a shining symbol of such victory.

Certainly that armistice was a true "cease-fire." It was not unilateral. And it worked. Sometimes it seems that our Communist enemies are the sole remaining, practicing adherents to the Douglas MacArthur doctrine that in war there is no substitute for victory. Every pronouncement the enemy makes reaffirms the goal of total victory—a total propaganda, diplomatic, political and/or military victory.

I have no quarrel with so-called Vietnamization of the war, providing this is not a semantic disguise for peace at any price or haste at any cost. But I see little point or purpose in Vietnamization if its objective is anything less than victory—victory in the sense of successful resistance to Communist takeover.

Do not misunderstand my reference to Armistice Day. I do not begrudge designation of November 11 also as Veterans' Day. But the richly merited tribute to those gallant men and women who have served their Nation in time of war is most appropriate, it seems to me, when it is linked with an event symbolic of their dedication to victory.

My topic for today, "Arrogance of the Peaceniks," is prompted by both long-term and immediate developments: (1) Revolutionary activities of recent years in this country—on the campuses, in the streets, and at focal points of governmental operations; and (2) the newest round of so-called anti-war protests scheduled for later this week. These include mass demonstrations in Washington, D.C. sponsored by NEW MOBE (the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam), a unique, radical united front of more than a dozen Old and New Left organizations, including both the Communist Party USA and the Students for a Democratic Society.

Perhaps a more appropriate title for these remarks would be "Arrogance of the Revolutionaries," or "Arrogance of the New Left," as you may well conclude after you hear me out. I say this because I intend to talk about the broad spectrum of revolutionary leadership and activities, rather than about the anti-war aspect exclusively.

Let me also say something about the first word of my announced topic—"Arrogance."

From the outset of my preparation of these remarks I had wondered about the connection in meaning, if any, between the noun "Arrogance" and the verb "to arrogate." Fortunately, from my standpoint at least, I pursued this point early in my efforts.

I consulted "A Modern Guide to Synonyms," published in 1968. My curiosity was promptly and most effectively satisfied. "Arrogance" is synonymous with "overbearing," an attitude prompted by "an exaggerated sense of self." To "arrogate" is to "usurp." And then the clincher: "Arrogate means to

claim, demand, or take that which belongs to another. . . . The arrogant person takes upon himself more power or authority than is rightly his."

What began as passing curiosity became the central theme of this presentation.

(As an interesting footnote, I should comment that the editor of the book I consulted was a former Professor of English and Speech at San Francisco State College. If he ever finds time or opportunity to prepare a revised edition of his book on synonyms, he will bring unusual and totally new credentials to the subject of arrogance and arrogating. This gentleman is probably the outstanding single leader on the front line of the mortal struggle against the forces of revolutionary arrogance and usurpation. His name? Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, battle-scarred, brilliant and courageous President of San Francisco State College.)

To put it in simplest terms, then, arrogance is primarily an *attitude*; arrogation is an *action* word. Arrogation is activated, implemented arrogation—it is arrogance at work.

And it is about both the attitude of arrogance, the overbearing egotism of the contemporary American revolutionist, and the effort at usurpation, the attempt to translate that attitude into "more power or authority than is rightly his," which is producing audacious and all-too-successful ventures in arrogation, (it is about these) that I speak today.

This analysis and appraisal of the contemporary revolutionaries is presented under two main headings, as already intimated:

I. Arrogance in attitude and approach—Which, inevitably and increasingly, moves beyond that to

II. Arrogance in action which, of course, is arrogation or usurpation.

By way of a necessarily condensed documentation, I propose to offer three categories of illustrations and examples under each of these two headings.

1. *The first evidence of the revolutionaries' arrogance in attitude and approach is found in the steadily increasing openness of their activity and advocacy.*

This openness is really the newest thing about the New Left. Sometimes it seems as though it is carried to the point of cockiness. For example:

In the October, 1966 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Director J. Edgar Hoover described SDS as "a militant youth group which receives support from the Communist Party and which in turn supports Communist objectives and tactics."

Just a week later, the official SDS newspaper, "New Left Notes," ran an article containing this statement:

"Well, for once J. Edgar Hoover is right. There are some communists in SDS. Every regular reader of 'New Left Notes' must be fully aware of that fact, and he must also know that some of these communists have openly admitted their membership in both organizations . . . SDS is an open organization which welcomes all who seek for solution to the problems of our day."

No doubt clandestine conspiratorial activity persists, but there has been a dramatic switch from the covert to the overt. Presumably this new arrogance of openness is a necessary price of staging open violence on the campus and in the streets.

Perhaps it is also the measure of the New Left's confidence in its strength and success.

And not only the New Left. Gus Hall, secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—openly branded a square by some of the exuberant crop of new revolutionaries—has recently said: "Fronts are things of the past—we don't need them." And he added:

"We've got the DuBois Clubs, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the Students for a Democratic Society. We have them going for us and they are not fronts in the usual sense of the word."

In the 1969 FBI Annual Report, Mr. Hoover says:

"Several SDS leaders publicly identified themselves as revolutionary communists. The SDS openly espouses the overthrow of our institutions of free society (called the 'Establishment') through violent revolutionary action."

Thus David Dellinger, one of the eight (now seven) defendants in Federal Judge Hoffman's Court, SDS leader, MOBE chairman, and a key figure in the NEW MOBE, has declared: "I am a communist, but I am not the Soviet-type communist."

There has been, also, an increasing openness of revolutionary advocacy with respect to specific activities or objectives. Another SDS leader and co-defendant with Dellinger is Rennie Davis. Speaking at a rally in Grant Park, Chicago, August 28 of this year, he said:

"The reason we are here tonight is to try to figure out how we can get the kind of mutiny that Company A started in South Viet Nam and spread it to every army base, every high school and every community in the country."

Bernardine Dohrn, inter-organizational secretary of the SDS, is quoted, in a report in "New Left Notes" on an SDS delegation conference with North Vietnam representatives in Cuba, as pledging "to open another front in the United States . . . to speed up complete defeat of U.S. forces" in Viet Nam.

And Martin Jay, teaching fellow in social science at Harvard's School of General Education, Harvard University, told the Fifth Annual Conference of Socialist Scholars, in September of this year:

"Our movement is a movement which, in effect, is a total break with America."

Even in 1964, during my last year on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the new and arrogant openness of the new breed of revolutionaries was becoming evident. It is an ominous sign of the times.

2. A second current phenomenon is the arrogance of obscenity and vituperation, the hate technique.

Talk about arrogance being a synonym of "overbearing"!

Public documentation of this form of arrogance, by all the rules of decency, has to be very much condensed, censored is the proper word.

Unfortunately the public—men and women alike—are increasingly being exposed to this tactic.

I'm talking, of course, about the villification of police as pigs . . . the bombardment of a U.S. District Judge in open court with such epithets as "liar," "fascist dog," "rotten low life."

But I have in mind other, unprintable, unquotable epithets directed at the judge.

I have in mind the lead sentences of a news story by a woman staff writer for the Washington Post in the newspaper's Sunday, June 1, 1969, issue, and I quote:

" . . . or get off the pot."

"The full, obscene demand was shouted over a seized microphone last Sunday night as more than 5,000 of the Nation's social welfare leaders convened to hear an opening address by their president."

This "invasion" occurred in the grand ballroom of the New York Hilton at the National Conference on Social Welfare annual forum. There was a three-hour confrontation that night and when delegates undertook to walk out en masse they found exits blocked by pickets. Harrassment continued for three remaining, turbulent days . . . Upshot of this pressure tactic by the militants was approval of a \$35,000 contribution to pay the way for 250 "poor" to attend next year's conference in Chicago where a similar confrontation has already been "promised", according to the news report.

I have in mind the confrontation at George Washington University in April dur-

ing SDS seizure and occupancy of the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, accompanied by demands for termination of this and other government supported activities on the university campus.

This particular episode involves a personal friend of mine, the University vice president for student affairs. His late father was a Washington attorney and one of my most loyal supporters and advisers during my ten years in Congress. His grandfather was a predecessor of mine in the U.S. House of Representatives from the Third District of Michigan.

When this University official gave notice to the group of sit-in trespassers that an injunction would be served upon them if they failed to vacate within 15 minutes, the mob's response was an incredibly vicious and obscene blast.

An excerpt from an SDS underground publication, boasting of this vile outburst appears in printed hearings of the House Internal Security Committee, titled "Investigation of Students for a Democratic Society."

This House document is replete with other SDS articles from which similar obscenities have been deleted and the footnote added: "The deleted word appears in original exhibit retained in committee files." In the instance of the exhibit I have just cited, presumably through oversight, the deletion was not made.

Al Capp, in recent testimony before the McClellan Committee of the Senate, referring to similar overbearing obscenity observed that it involves—

"(A) new and most cowardly form of brutality—because you can't show the scars they inflict on your manhood or your reverence for your mother in court, and collect damages . . ."

And in referring to the obscene, vituperative, hate vocabulary of the revolutionaries, I have in mind the Rennie Davis speech already quoted. This speech is published by the indomitable Alice Wagner in "U.S.A." and contains a reference by Davis to the SDS insistence on a program which "kicks the ass of every Hayakawa, every Reagan, every Nixon every Daley in this country."

I recall the eloquent plea before a Washington church group of the liberal Washington Post editor, J. R. Wiggins in February, 1968 for both majorities and minorities to extend "to each other that decent deference and toleration without which no society of origins as diverse as ours can long survive."

The revolutionaries' overbearing arrogance of obscenity and vituperation has no place, obviously, for such bourgeois concepts as "decent deference and toleration."

3. My final "exhibit" under the heading of "arrogance in attitude and approach," I describe as "the arrogance of the blank-check demand."

In an interview published in the Feb. 24, 1969 U.S. News & World Report, Dr. Hayakawa said:

"Insofar as the white revolutionaries are concerned—the SDS—it is becoming increasingly clear by their record over the past few years they simply want to destroy for the sake of destruction. In their view this society is thoroughly corrupt and hypocritical, and deserves to be 'blown apart'. When you ask: 'What kind of society would you like to see in its place?' they answer vaguely or are silent."

J. Edgar Hoover has said of the New Left: "Their chief aim . . . is to destroy, annihilate."

William A. Stanmeyer, associate professor of law at Georgetown University, describing the "ideological criminals" of the violent New Left, whose heroes are Che, Mao and Lenin, says he is "driven by a vision . . . (a vision) that his destructive action will bring about a better world" . . . (He has) blind con-

fidence in the constructive power of tearing things down."

James Forman and the Black Manifesto adopted by the National Black Economic Development Conference in Detroit last April reveal not only a goal of "reparations" financially but Black seizure of state power . . . "total control of the U.S." The U.S., it is declared, "is the most barbaric country in the world and we have a chance to help bring this government down."

Total control, it is added, means placing "the total means of production . . . into the hands of the state for the welfare of all the people." As for any other details of "the type of world we want to live in", reliance is to be placed exclusively on the plea that once in control "we (the Blacks) must exercise the humanity which is inherent in us."

Here, as with the SDS, the silence and the vague generalities add up to a demand for a blank check of acquiescence—voluntary or enforced.

I am reminded of the familiar advertising slogan of a prominent American transportation system—and I apologize for paraphrasing it: "Go Communist and leave the driving to us."

There is no greater arrogance of attitude and approach than this demand for blind and stupid faith: Smash whatever is, and trust the future to us.

Make no mistake about it . . . these revolutionaries are not only against the government—they intend to become the government.

Forget the horsefeathers about a generation gap. Target of this arrogance is not we old fuddy-dudds but today's youth and the next and succeeding generations of citizen. To convey this understanding to this category of Americans is the best hope and promise possible that these tyrannical ambitions will be defeated.

Enough about arrogance in attitude and approach.

More ominous than what the revolutionaries say is what they have done and are doing . . . their arrogance in action—action which, in 1968, included major disruptions on some 225 campuses. Here we get down to cases in the arrogance of arrogation, of usurpation, of taking power and authority not rightfully or lawfully theirs.

Here I can offer only two or three broad propositions—generalizations, however, for which you and I can fill in the specifics of actual happenings which continue to this hour.

1. Freedom out of hand, the license of the revolutionaries and their mobs, can match, and has matched, any of the potential excesses and abuses of government out of hand—the very excesses and abuses the Constitution and Bill of Rights forbid to government.

Are the guarantees of freedom of speech and peaceable assembly any less abrogated when it is done by mobs than when it is done by government? Ask, I suggest, Robert McNamara, driven from the speaker's dais at Harvard; or pundit Jimmy Reston at New York University; or Mayor Alloto of San Francisco at George Washington University early this spring.

Are the safeguards against "unreasonable searches and seizures" or the "right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects" any less abrogated when it is done by revolutionary mobs than when it is done by officials or agents of government? Ask college deans and presidents of scores of universities whose offices have been seized, papers stolen or destroyed, wastebaskets filled with human excrement, and they themselves held hostage.

Is the citizen, as an individual or as a member of a church, a welfare workers' conference, medical convention or a bankers association, any less deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law because

it is done by a mob, seeking for example, to extort reparations for past wrongs, real or alleged, rather than by government? (Incidentally these guarantees are part of the revolutionaries' favorite Amendment—the Fifth).

I think the point is adequately made. It underscores the ominous answer given a panel member on "Face the Nation" (CBS television program May 11) by SDS Secretary Klonsky. Klonsky was asked, apropos of radicals arming themselves, "whether my home is going to be safe."

His answer:

"It depends on what side you take. If you think you have got something to protect in the society—if you think you have got a stake in being white, for example—then it might not be so safe."

(Mr. Klonsky, I hasten to add, is not—repeat not—a black man.)

2. Revolutionary arrogation involves a literal usurpation of legislative power and authority and exercise of an extra-legal and illegal veto power.

Civil disobedience is, itself, just such an arrogation. And so is mob-imposed abolition of voluntary ROTC; physical disruption of selective service operations; violent prevention of military or industrial recruiting; and, with respect to local government and legislative powers, this quaint phrase, "OFF the Pig", which, being translated means, prevention by force or coercion of police training courses on campus, one of the current SDS demands. Incitement to mutiny, to desertion, even to physical attacks on superior military officers, overt interference with defense research contracts—is clear usurpation or frustration of the Constitutional mandate to Congress to "raise and support" the nation's armed forces.

Even the Constitutional responsibility of the House and Senate, respectively, to impeach and try a President has been arrogated to themselves by the revolutionaries. Don't take my word for it. Take the testimony and solemn warnings of a Dean Acheson or the columnist David Broder. And take the boastings of revolutionaries themselves.

Acheson has denounced the "habit of destroying Presidents" and warned that "we're going to have a major constitutional crisis" if we persist in this habit.

Broder's judgment is that "it is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969"—with this most important difference; that Johnson was broken at the end of his term whereas now the attempt is to break the President within the first year of his administration.

Broder further makes very clear he is not talking about legitimate dissent but about "mass movements aimed at breaking the President by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table."

The conclusion drawn by Mr. Broder is that the president-breakers, the "Nixon-next" lynchings I would call them, should either put up or shut up by resort—if their convictions or objectives so dictate—to an effort to impeach him.

I'm sure this suggestion evokes no enthusiasm from the president-breakers. Look who they'd be getting if this procedure worked! (I say that, I hasten to add, with no purpose of derogating the able and courageous Spiro Agnew.)

With the mounting evidence of arrogation of legislative powers by the revolutionaries, perhaps Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon now better understands the full import of the arrogant answer she received from militant student leaders when she invited them to testify at a congressional hearing on campus unrest. That answer, which Mrs. Green found incredibly shocking, was, in her words:

"They informed me that if they accepted

the invitation it would indicate they recognized the legitimacy of Congress."

3. The third form of arrogance by arrogation and usurpation is, of course, in the crucial area of foreign policy. It is not just being talked about by the revolutionaries—it is being actively exercised. Its manifestations are many—the mass demonstrations; the campus moratoria; the overt assurances, direct and indirect, to enemy representatives of plans for "staging a series of turbulent massive disturbances" specifically designed to aid the enemy; the enthusiastic reception by domestic militants of exhortations of North Vietnamese leaders "to pool your efforts in achieving great success in the fall struggle phase" and the enemy plea for "active and massive participation of the American youths and students in this fall struggle movement."

This brazen arrogation of diplomatic authority is typified by the role assumed by, and permitted to, revolutionaries or their counsel to negotiate with the enemy in Paris or in Hanoi over possible release of American war prisoners. This procedure reached an ultimate of outrage and indecency the other day when Communist spokesmen in Paris bluntly told wives of American prisoners that if they hoped to see their husbands again they should "go back home and join the demonstrations."

Through all this the revolutionaries have reserved their venom for those who, like Vice President Agnew, have ventured to suggest that American peaceniks repudiate the blandishments and the blackmail and unprecedented intervention in American debate and decision-making.

Let all true Americans, including the silent majority which is becoming increasingly vocal and articulate, face the facts about the revolutionaries and their arrogance of attitude and approach and their catastrophic arrogance of arrogation.

And let these Americans—all Americans—heed the warning and sustain the valiant stand of the President of the United States: "As President of the United States, I would be untrue to my oath of office if I allowed the policy of this nation to be dictated by the minority who . . . attempt to impose it on the nation by mounting demonstrations in the street.

"For almost 200 years, the policy of this nation has been made under our Constitution by those leaders in the Congress and in the White House who were elected by all the people. If a vocal minority, however fervent its cause, prevails over reason and the will of the majority, this nation has no future as a free society."

MANPOWER PLANNING AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Robert Ristau, program administrator for vocational education of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, has written an excellent article on the importance of manpower policy in the development of vocational education.

Mr. Ristau has reviewed the implementation of vocational education systems in several foreign countries and in the United States. He notes that:

As society tends to advance technologically, demand for manipulative, skill-based operations decreases, and demand increases for workers with broader backgrounds of knowledge and skill. In advanced countries, education and training tend to be geared to

flexibility rather than to specialization, since rapid changes in technology affect skills and occupations at all levels. Adjustments to do job changes will be easier if young people have an education which enables them to learn new skills rapidly, and to develop an understanding of modern science and technology as a part of their training.

A central and vital challenge to vocational education is that it "stay in tune" with the labor market needs and requirements of today and tomorrow. Basic to this challenge being met is the availability of a system of occupational analysis and manpower planning that provides the kinds of information needed.

Because Congress will be considering legislation to improve our manpower planning and policy during the coming year, I commend this article to my colleagues. Vocational education and manpower policy have a reciprocal role to play in the development of our economy and an understanding of the function of each will, I think, prove valuable in the work ahead. At this point I would like to include the complete text of Mr. Ristau's article, "Manpower Planning and Vocational Education" which appeared in the August 1969 edition of the Delta Pi Epsilon Journal:

MANPOWER PLANNING AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE RESPONSE TO AN ECONOMIC REFORM BY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN SEVERAL COUNTRIES

(By Robert A. Ristau)¹

(ABSTRACT.—A vital challenge to vocational education is that it reflect labor market needs of today and tomorrow. Manpower planning systems, operational in many countries today, provide needed information and have an impact on the development of vocational education.)

Vocational education is characterized by programs of education and training which have as their primary objective the preparing of young people for entrance into the labor market. Although in some circles vocational education may be relegated in concept to basic programs in farming and to shop-type courses which teach only manual skills, in other circles it may be associated with high-prestige and technical occupations.

Vocational education historically has been associated with public systems of schooling, yet there has been some controversy concerning the extent to which the private business and industrial sector should provide its own training. Another common concern is with the extent to which all students in public schools should be served by vocational education, although it is also generally recognized that most forms of basic and general education contribute to the development of competences needed by beginning workers.

In this discussion, vocational and technical education will be considered as a single program and will be treated as a program of education and training which specifically provides a preparation for a wide range of occupations and operates within the public school system.

A central and vital challenge to vocational education is that it "stay in tune" with the labor market needs and requirements of today and tomorrow. Basic to this challenge being met is the availability of a system of occupational analysis and manpower planning that provides the kinds of information needed.

It is the premise of this paper that manpower planning systems are operational in

many countries and that the results of manpower planning have an observable impact on the development of vocational education. More specifically, it is hypothesized that an economic reform, characterized by an increasing demand in the labor market for workers with greater cognitive abilities and a lessening demand for manipulative skills, has a particular impact on vocational education. This impact is manifested in vocational education becoming a more integrated part of the total system of public education, with an accompanying increase in emphasis on other than formal skill training as well as a tendency to offer more vocational education programs at a post-secondary level. This impact is assumed to be particularly observable when a society moves into advanced stages of economic and technological development.

MANPOWER PLANNING

General considerations

As a practice in various nations, the manpower planning concept is a relatively new one. Economists for some time have advocated it on behalf of furthering the development of the economy, and many suggest the need for relating it to education for the total well-being of the nation.

In the United States, a report on a recent Princeton Manpower Symposium concluded that manpower planning was necessary for the effective development and full utilization of the nation's human resources.² Following extensive testimony in 1965 before a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, the Symposium chairman reported: "We are coming to the time when we shall have to engage in some of the same long-range national planning and coordination which nearly all of the nations of Western Europe have adopted since the end of World War II." In analyzing the situation in partially developed countries, Harbison and Myers noted a "widespread consciousness of the need" for rapid economic development, yet they say "no clear-cut strategy for achieving it."

Even when manpower planning systems are operative, problems are inherent in providing the kind of information which permits manpower needs to relate to education. Parnes, in discussing the relation of occupational and educational qualifications, cites the problem of the heterogeneity of occupational classification. He explains that "once one moves outside of the relatively few occupations for which there are legal educational requirements, it becomes very difficult indeed to establish rigid links between education and occupations." Often manpower information is quantitative rather than qualitative and falls short of the education planner's expectations. Harbison and Myers point out that the conversion of occupational requirements into educational requirements is one of the most perplexing problems in manpower analysis. They further point out that the relationship of occupations to educational levels varies from one country to another and that frequently the manpower analyst must rely on judgment rather than precise data. A report on the economics of manpower planning in India states that manpower planning and educational planning should be closely related but they seldom are.

Efforts in various countries

In spite of the difficulties involved, manpower planning efforts, both formal and informal, have provided educational planners with certain kinds of data that have been of use to them. Through a variety of working relationships with employment security bureaus, ministries of labor, and various na-

² Frederick H. Harbison and Joseph D. Mooney (eds.), *Critical Issues in Employment Policy, A Report of the Princeton Manpower Symposium, May 1966* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966), p. vii.

¹ Mr. Ristau is Program Administrator for Vocational Education of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

tional and international economic groups, as well as through advisory committees with which vocational educators have traditionally worked, critical areas of employment needs, demands, and expectations have been made known. Dr. Walter Arnold, formerly the United States Office of Education's Assistant Commissioner for Vocational-Technical Education, wrote that a good master plan permits vocational education to be revised when significant changes occur in the labor market, in industrial development, and in other aspects of the economy. Dr. Grant Venn, currently an Associate Commissioner of Education in the United States Office of Education, states that "no longer can manpower needs or manpower preparation be considered apart from the national problem. Education and work have become directly related and inter-dependent on a national scale. Kazamais, reviewing educational development in Greece, noted that economic development plans and manpower studies and reports by foreign experts stressed education's role in economic growth and development, and education as a form of investment. A coordinated manpower planning program has been developed in Egypt, and manpower planning which involves both economic planning and educational planning has recently evolved in Latin America. In Nigeria, an economic development report, known as "The Ashby Study," served as "a guide for the educational development programme" which was drawn up coordinately with the report. In India, manpower planning is cited as a relatively recent concept, but it is pointed out that it complements the generally accepted concept of economic planning, with quality of the work force now being given as much attention as the quantity of labor required. A system of committees on technical education in France "permits the adaptation of vocational training to real needs on the local as well as the national scale. It is reported that in Brazil there is a "national plan for vocational education intimately linked to the country's economic development"; and in Yugoslavia, as is true in many nations with a highly centralized form of governmental control, there is an orientation of the educational system to the requirements of national planning for the Communist society.

The economic reform

Efforts to report manpower needs and requirements reflect an economic reform which is particularly observable in the developed countries where the economy is at or advancing toward a significantly high level of automation and technical development. In general, as an economy advances and achieves a higher level of technological development, there is a generally decreasing demand for workers who are prepared with physical manipulative skills and an accompanying shift to a demand for a greater development of cognitive powers.

The United States, with its advanced technology, is analyzed by the economist Ginzberg as having significant signs that point to the increasing dependence of the economy on people with a high order of skills and competence. He points out that the advancement of workers based on education in industry demands a broadening of the accessibility of education and training opportunities provided within the educational system. Ginzberg cites that our rate of economic progress depends more than ever on the availability of educated and broadly-trained people than on any other factor in the economy. A report of the International Labour Organisation reveals that in 1956 for the first time in the United States non-manual workers exceeded manual workers. The Clark Subcommittee concluded that "a complex revolution is underway in the kind of labor force needed to man the American economy" with men moved from production to services.

United States Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, reporting before the Clark Subcommittee, referred to the shift away from unskilled jobs, with virtually all occupations which provide expanding employment opportunities requiring "long periods of education and formal training." Much of this reform is related to developments in automation, and Childs Killingsworth testified that "the effect of automation on jobs is to reduce greatly the number of simple repetitive jobs where all you need is your five senses and an untrained mind."

Dr. Grant Venn issued a plea for greater flexibility in the total program of vocational education in the United States. He notes that the former emphasis on blue-collar operative and skilled tradesmen has given way to a "new technology which has led us into a further state of work activity in which the emphasis on manipulative powers has shifted to an emphasis on cognitive powers."

Analyses of work requirements in other advanced technological societies produce similar kinds of observations. Economists and labor representatives viewing the situation in the U.S.S.R. make many references to the general trend toward less manual labor as automation in industry increases. The International Labour Organisation in its study of the Soviet metal-working industry observed great need for developing theoretical knowledge, for enlarging the scope of knowledge application, and for stressing the mental component of work.

In England, it is observed that intellectual powers will be in increasing demand in the skilled manpower labor market. It is further cited that in the United Kingdom the technological advance is bringing about a decline in the emphasis on "physical strength and purely manual skill" and that it is necessary for workers to develop skills in the use of words and figures. In Sweden, it is cited that technical progress and a changing economic structure have brought with them an increasing demand for qualified workers with a good educational background. A manpower report for Japan states "technological change has created a demand for a new type of technicians and skilled workers" with an emphasis on higher levels of education and training. In Poland, changing emphasis in economic planning of consumer goods, services, and research is affecting various levels of education and occupations.

General conclusion

Manpower planning, though not as refined as it might be, has an important relationship with the educational system and has an input of consequence for vocational education. As a society tends to advance technologically, demand for manipulative, skill-based operations decreases and demand increases for workers with broader backgrounds of knowledge and skills.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

General responsiveness

The response by vocational education programs to manpower needs and requirements can occur in various ways. Individual instructional programs typically are modified through joint efforts of teachers and advisory committees as curricula are reviewed and evaluated; however, such modifications are not normally visible in the absence of an exhaustive and intensive analysis of the individual content of specific courses. A more deliberate and visible response is the tendency to broaden the base of vocational preparation programs, to integrate vocational education into a comprehensive educational program at both the secondary and post-secondary levels, and to encourage the development of more programs at the post-secondary levels.

The response within the society as a whole also can be observed in the tendency to extend compulsory education to higher age levels while at the same time strengthening

vocational education programs within the total general public education program. Vocational education programs become more broadly oriented to clusters or families of occupations and generally become more flexible in nature. The relationship between manpower demands and requirements and the extension of compulsory education can be observed in various educational and manpower planning reports.

Harbison and Myers observe a heavy commitment by advanced countries to education. They note that education and training tend to be geared to flexibility rather than to specialization, since rapid changes in technology affect skills and occupations at all levels. They further note that in western countries and in post-war Japan is a conviction that broadly trained people may be more effective participants in an advanced industrial society.

A basic objective in the general change pattern in vocational education is that of providing flexibility in the training of graduates who become entrants into the labor market. Harbison and Myers observe that adjustments to job changes will be easier if young people have an education which enables them to learn new skills rapidly and to develop an understanding of modern science and technology as a part of their training.

Testimony before the Clark Subcommittee in the United States reflected on the demand for a higher level of educational attainment and an accompanying need to have vocational education in the mainstream of education. Support was also given to the development of vocational education at the post-high school level and for expanded programs of continued education for persons in all occupations.

The Fifteenth International Conference on Education held in Geneva in 1962 showed a tendency to give gradually more importance to scientific and technical education at an advanced level, with a view to satisfying the growth demands for qualified personnel in industry.

The United States

The United States, one of the most advanced nations in terms of technological and economic development, has historically given federal legislative support to vocational education. Beginning with the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and with further acts up to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, there was a pattern of categorical aid provided to support identified areas of needed vocational education and training. Early acts provided funds earmarked for programs which provided training in such areas as agriculture, mechanics, and home economics; beginning with the period represented by the George-Barden Act in 1946, other occupations including retailing and selling, were included.

Dr. Grant Venn, following his extensive research on education in the United States, observed that the hope of providing the quantity of workers demanded by advancing technology is in the educational system.

In 1963, the 88th Federal Congress wrote a vocational education act that provided funds for vocational education in light of current and projected labor market requirements. Previous categorical-aid legislation remained on the books, however. The impact on the general and the vocational education systems in the United States can be observed in part by a wider variety in the types of occupational courses offered. Business and office education, emphasizing courses which pointed toward clerical, secretarial, and data processing positions, flourished under the new act. Enrollments in all areas of non-manual work increased substantially. Enrollments in post-secondary programs also increased significantly.

The 90th Federal Congress, following a report by the National Advisory Council which evaluated vocational education after five

years of implementation under the 1963 act, enacted sweeping vocational education legislation at the close of its Congressional session. The new legislation passed unanimously in both Houses, and it repealed all previously enacted vocational education laws. The new act, known as the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, provides for significantly increased authorization for funds in terms of a block grant, with monies to be used for the general support of vocational education as dictated by current needs and requirements of the labor market without any categorical aid for specific occupational areas. At least 15 percent of the available funds to each state must be used for post-high school programs, and annual evaluation of the total vocational education program in each state has been made mandatory. A provision in the new bill calls for funding some manpower planning activity in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor, and manpower planning agencies are to be included in the compulsory state advisory councils.

The movement of vocational education into the mainstream of the United States educational system can be observed by efforts in states, such as New York, to put an end to their separate vocational schools and to incorporate vocational education in the comprehensive high schools. In the State of Wisconsin, a massive effort was begun to develop programs of flexible vocational education within the comprehensive high schools of the state. An evaluation of the Wisconsin program conducted in 1968 revealed that those programs adapted themselves well to the philosophy of the comprehensive high school; both a general and vocational education were provided for the school's graduates, and those programs were developed in harmony with current and projected employment requirements.

In general, vocational education in the United States has responded to the manpower needs and requirements for workers with higher cognitive powers by generally moving vocational education into the latter years of the secondary school program, while at the same time developing vastly improved programs of vocational education at the post-high school level. Comprehensive high schools have moved toward a system of broader-based courses with elements of the general or academic portion of the school program linked with the training of young people for occupations.

Other advanced countries

The Soviet system of vocational education, under the direction of a highly centralized government, is responsive to labor market needs, with 25 percent of all workers trained in the vocational schools. Considerable study of automation has resulted in a reorganization of technical institutes which have then developed a "broader output." A response to the development in technology which leads to a cultural and technical advance of all working people is "polytechnization of the school in which the process of education is closely linked with productive labor."

A reorganization of public education in the U.S.S.R. in 1958, which was adopted by the Supreme Soviet, increased compulsory education to eight years, with the objective of providing fundamentals of general and polytechnical knowledge to all people. The new "P.T.U." school, a new and unified type of technical school, provides general education as determined by the demands of the occupations concerned, in addition to high levels of theoretical and practical training. The International Labour Organisation, in studying the impact of the Soviet metalworking industry on education, noted the trend toward training for broad skill profiles, with vocational education including subjects normally coming within the competency of engineers.

In Sweden, the International Labour Organisation observed growing pressure in

favor of prolonging general education and postponing occupational choice. They further noted that the majority of young people chose more theoretical courses reflective of the desire for broad educational backgrounds to better meet changing requirements of modern technology.

The major objective of the French National Plan is full employment and a corrected distribution of employment by occupations and skills to achieve the greatest possible social welfare and economic growth for that country. The decree of January 6, 1959, introduced reforms to relieve the congested lycées and to guide pupils who were not adapted to traditional classical education to more practical and technical studies. The reforms reportedly will produce a greater diversity of education courses and at the same time introduce a greater specialization. The new program aims at providing a broad basis for specialized training in a number of related trades; to give a background for careers in management, public service, secretarial, and so forth; and to provide general background for semi-skilled jobs.

In the United Kingdom, "the early allocation of children to different types of schools at a relatively early age was disputed and noted to be particularly undesirable under modern technological and social conditions." Vocational training, as such, does not form part of the general school course during the years of compulsory education up to age 15, and an increasing number of children are staying beyond the compulsory attendance period to take advantage of vocational training. In the United Kingdom, the problem of training for flexibility is being faced and vocational education will extend the scope of training into the broader realms of education. The division between vocational and nonvocational activities is ending.

Other countries

Kazamais, in writing on Turkish education, reported that the Gymnasias had perpetuated a narrow conception of humanistic education and contained a curriculum emphasis which contributed to unemployment and underemployment among its graduates. Reform plans initiated in 1964 stressed the need for more coordinated and expanded systems of technical and vocational education within the public schools.

Pakistan's First Five-Year Plan noted that narrow training required for specific occupations tended to sacrifice essential objectives of the educational system, and suggestions were made that pressure be put on the employers to provide training which is needed.

In Egypt, vocational education was expanded greatly by law in 1956. The secondary schools aim to provide the market with highly skilled technicians with backgrounds of technical and general knowledge to help facilitate an expansion of industrial, commercial, and agricultural projects.

In India, the general training of the mind is too closely connected with preparation for occupational life to permit attention only to specialized training and not to general education. There is a tendency today to postpone specialization and to provide a broad-based program.

In Hungary, a long-range plan for education aims at an extraordinary extension of education and vocational training so that young people who enter the labor market for the first time will have a smooth initiation.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, there is growing recognition of rapidly changing occupational requirements and a shift in vocational education from instruction and skill perfection in one specific trade to broader training in more general skills. Increasing demands on workers has led to an extension of compulsory education.

Harbison and Myers, in discussing countries which are in the early stages of economic and technological development, note

some tendency to combine academic, technical and teacher-training institutions into one.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Many indicators point to an advancing technology which requires workers with greater emphasis of cognitive rather than manipulative abilities. Manpower planning reports, as well as reports from various economists and labor organizations, document the above trend and establish current and projected needs for consideration by the vocational educational system.

Vocational education systems in the various countries examined in this study vary considerably in structure and in approach; nevertheless, there can be noted a trend in most countries toward a more general approach to vocational education in which the more highly specialized training programs are postponed until late in the compulsory educational pattern or until on-the-job training is available. General education and vocational education tend to be offered in the same institutions or they are both given an important emphasis within specialized institutions.

Warren's comparative study of vocational and technical education brought out some common trends based on numerous educational reforms which occurred in the last seven years; among the trends are increasing emphasis since 1945 to integrate vocational education into the general secondary education system, an increasing emphasis in all countries on liberal studies as a necessary complement to vocational studies, and a rapid expansion of post-school full-time education of a vocational character.

This study also has provided evidence that the public system of education is looked to more and more by an advanced technological society to provide for its labor market workers who are well-educated and well-trained.

It is generally concluded, then, that the vocational education system does show visible signs of responding to the economic reform in manpower needs although the response has been observed to exist in a variety of ways.

Vocational education is a viable program within public education; it must be so to achieve its objective and to make its contribution to furthering of the economic development of the nation and the people which it serves. The General Conference of UNESCO in 1962 adopted a recommendation that seems to sum up well much of the thought that has pervaded this discussion:

Technical and vocational education should be an integral part of an overall system of education and, as such, due consideration should be given to its cultural content. It should do more than train an individual for a given occupation by providing the persons concerned with the necessary skills and theoretical knowledge; it should also, in conjunction with general education, provide for the development of personality and character and foster the capacity for understanding, judgment, self-expression and adaptation to varying environments. To this end, the cultural content of technical and vocational education should be set at such a level that the inevitable specialization in technical and vocational education does not stifle broader interests.

THE WOMEN'S REVOLUTION

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, not only am I a black, but a woman. Therefore, I feel I have a responsibility to speak

out in behalf of the unrepresented female majority, as I did in the following article, which appeared in the Baltimore Afro-American.

I have had numerous requests for copies of this article; therefore, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it will be readily available to the general public and to bring it to the attention of the male "majority":

THE BLACK WOMAN IN CONGRESS

(Article for Afro-American Newspapers, by Shirley Chisholm, U.S. Democratic Congresswoman from the 12th District of Brooklyn, N.Y.)

(NOTE.—In 1968, New York City sent its second Negro to Congress and it marked a first in American life. The second Negro was a woman, Mrs. Shirley Chisholm. A small number of white women with outstanding political records had successfully run the gauntlet of discrimination against sex, and served in the House of Representatives. Only one had been successful enough to reach the United States Senate, Mrs. Margaret Chase Smith of Maine. Mrs. Shirley A. Chisholm goes down in the annals of history as the first Black woman to achieve such a national post by election. She was a Democrat, born in Brooklyn, New York, graduated from Brooklyn College with the bachelor of arts degree, *cum laude*, and the Master of arts degree from Columbia University. Her educational training in early childhood education made children the center of her interest. She became a nursery school teacher and later a director, 1946-1953, moving on to the directorship of the Hamilton-Madison Child Care Center of New York City, 1953-1959; and subsequently educational consultant in the New York Division of Day Care, 1959-1964.

(Her first legislative experience was in the New York State Legislature, a victory she achieved in 1964. Because of reapportionment, she ran again in 1965 and 1966.)

For those of you who may have forgotten, there are revolutions going on throughout the world. It is true that some of them are false—designed to build the ego—cleverly camouflaged in order to sell a product that in the final analysis may be harmful to the purchaser's health.

But some of them are revolts by people who are refusing to accept age-worn patterns of doing things and who are carving new ways that are more suitable and satisfactory to their needs.

And finally some of them are revolutions in deadly earnest—designed to strike off the shackles of oppressed people throughout the world.

Both the so-called Black Revolution and the Women's Liberation Movements fall into these last two categories. Black people are in deadly earnest about freedom from oppression and women are beginning to refuse to accept traditional and stereotyped roles.

Because I am both Black and a woman I would like to make some comments and observations about both.

First the Black Revolution is not solely Black. I think that what Black people in America are doing, is participating, in a world-wide rebellion that encompasses all aspects of human life.

Therefore when we talk about the "Black" Revolution we immediately attempt to limit the goals of the Black man, attempt to strip black revolutionaries of the right to be idealistic, attempt to strip the Black man of the right to feel that what he wants is not just freedom for himself but wants a totally new—totally free world.

When we separate the so-called Black Revolution in America from the other revolutions; in literature, in the Church, in the arts, in education and throughout the world we attempt to maintain our own peculiar form of slavery.

One of the most noted and most quoted black revolutionaries in this day was Malcolm X. While Malcolm was on a trip to Africa he sent back a letter that read in part:

"You may be shocked by these words coming from me, but I have always been a man who tries to face facts and accept the reality of life as new experiences and knowledge unfold it. The experiences of this pilgrimage have taught me much and each hour in the Holy Land opens my eyes even more . . . I have eaten from the same plate with people whose eyes are the bluest of blue, whose hair was the blondest of blonde, and whose skin was the whitest of white . . . and I felt the same sincerity in the words of these "white" Muslims that I felt among the African Muslims of Nigeria, Sudan and Ghana."

As Eldridge Cleaver so aptly pointed out there were many blacks in America who were outraged and felt that Malcolm had betrayed them with that statement. It may very well have been Malcolm's signature on his own death warrant but the point that I want you to bear in mind is that it is exactly that type of personal courage and integrity that marks the true revolutionary.

Malcolm X was certainly aware that as an established Black leader who consistently and continually assailed the "white devil" here at home he was jeopardizing his position. But I think that he also knew what a Roman slave, Epictetus, had in mind when he said: "No man is free unless he is master of his own mind."

Almost no one in America is yet free of the psychological wounds imposed by racism and anti-feminism. A few weeks ago while testifying before the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, I noted that anti-feminism, like every form of discrimination, is destructive both to those who perpetrate it and to their victims; that males with their anti-feminism maim both themselves and their women. Bear in mind that this is also true in terms of black and white race relations.

In *Soul on Ice* Eldridge Cleaver pointed out how America's racial and sexual stereotypes were supposed to work. Whether his insight is correct or not it bears close examination.

Cleaver, in the passage "The Primeval Mitosis", describes in detail the four major roles; there is the white female who he considers to be "Ultrafeminine" because ". . . she is required to possess and project an image that is in sharp contrast to . . ." the white male's image as the "Omnipotent Administrator . . . all brain and no body."

He goes on to identify the Black female as "Subfeminine" or "Amazon" by virtue of her assignment to the lowly household chores and those corresponding jobs of tedious nature. He states that the Black male is expected to provide society with its source of brute power through his role as the "Supermasculine Menial"—all body and no brain.

What the roles and the strange interplay between them have meant to America, Cleaver goes on to point out quite well. There is only one thing that I want to point out; because of the bizarre aspects of the roles and the strange influence that non-traditional contact between them has on the general society—blacks and white—males and females—must operate almost independently of each other in order to escape from the quicksands of psychological slavery. Each—black male and black female—white female and white male must escape first from their own historical traps before they can be truly effective in helping others to free themselves.

I have pointed out time and time again that the harshest discrimination that I have encountered in the political arena is anti-feminism—from both males and brain-washed "Uncle Tom" females.

When I first announced that I was a

candidate for the United States Congress last year, both males and females advised me, as they had when I ran for the New York Assembly, to go back to teaching, a woman's vocation, and leave politics to the men.

I did not go back then and I will not go back as long as there exists a need to change the politics of this country.

On May 20th of this year I introduced legislation concerning the equal employment opportunities of women. At that time I pointed out that there were three and one-half million more women than men in America but that women held only two percent of the managerial positions; that no women sit on the AFL-CIO Council or the Supreme Court; that only two women had ever held Cabinet rank and that there were at that time only two women of ambassadorial rank in the Diplomatic Corps. In the Congress there were only ten Representatives and one Senator. I stated then as I do now that this situation is outrageous.

In my speech from the Floor that day I said:

"It is true that part of the problem has been that women have not been aggressive in demanding their rights. This was also true of the black population for many years. They submitted to oppression and even cooperated with it. Women have done the same thing. But now there is an awareness of this situation, particularly among the younger segment of the population."

"As in the field of equal rights for blacks, Spanish-Americans, the Indians and other groups, laws will not change such deep-seated problems overnight. But they can be used to provide protection for those who are most abused, and begin the process of evolutionary change by compelling the insensitive majority to reexamine its unconscious attitudes."

In a speech made a few weeks ago to an audience that was predominantly white and all female I suggested the following if they wanted to create a change:

"You must start in your own homes, your own schools and your own churches . . . I don't want you to go home and talk about integrated schools, churches or marriage when the kind of integration you are talking about is black and white."

"I want you to go home and work for—fight for—the integration of male and female—human and human. Franz Fanon pointed out in 'Black Skins—White Masks' that the Anti-Semitic was eventually the Anti-Negro. I want to point out that both are eventually the Anti-Feminist. And even further, I want to indicate that all discrimination is eventually the—Anti-Humanism."

Women in this country must become revolutionaries. We must refuse to accept the old—the traditional—roles and stereotypes.

Because of the present situation the tactics of revolution used by black women will be, as they must be, slightly different than those used by white women but the long-range goals can be the same.

The goal must be more than equality of the sexes, political freedom or economic freedom. It must be total freedom to build a society that is predicated on the positive values of all human life. It must be freedom from the waste and ravages of all natural resources including human resources.

Our task will not be easy—it will be hard but it must be done. Perhaps the greatest power for social change—for a successful Social Revolution is in our hands.

But it is not an unlimited power nor is it an invincible power. We must further understand that the exercise of power will always cause a reaction, therefore we must use our power well and we must use it wisely.

**A.T. & T. MANAGEMENT MUST TAKE
THE BLAME**

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out on a number of occasions in the recent session decrying the decline in telephone service in New York City and other urban areas throughout the country. Accompanying this decline in service has been a history of rising local rates while interstate long distance rates, which benefit primarily the more affluent users of telephone service, have been reduced. The most recent reduction in interstate rates went into effect on January 1, 1970, and was the largest such reduction in history. A further reduction is scheduled for February 1.

These trends must stop. Having a telephone in the home has become a necessity in modern urban life. The cost of this service should be kept as low as possible.

The following article from the December 27, 1969, issue of *Business Week* documents very well the decline in the quality of service in New York. It also outlines the history of recent telephone rate increases granted by or pending before State regulatory bodies. The growing size of A.T. & T. has made it almost impossible to regulate. I urge my colleagues to take a moment to read the following article:

**COMMUNICATIONS: WHY YOU HEAR A BUSY
SIGNAL AT A.T. & T.**

At 195 Broadway in New York, executives of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. are sitting in the middle of a disaster. It is not the normal kind, caused by a labor dispute or an act of God. Instead, it is a catastrophe brought about by the drastic decline of telephone service in New York City.

The current chaos is so vast that it cannot be patched over or swept under the rug. And the painful fact is that the blame seems to lie squarely in the lap of the management of New York Telephone Co. and its parent, AT & T.

Until early this year, New York telephone users, accustomed to good service, shrugged off the increasing incidence of delayed dial tones and circuit-busy signals as a temporary annoyance.

Deterioration. But as spring wore into summer, service got worse. In the first eight months of 1969, the New York Public Service Commission received more than 4,000 "serious" complaints about service—three times as many as in the whole of 1968.

On streets and in stores, more and more pay phones fell into disuse as they broke or were vandalized and nobody fixed them. Today, even in posh midtown areas, brightly colored "Out of Service" stickers are a common sight, a dubious distinction formerly reserved for New York's ghettos.

Businessmen have been as hard hit as the general public. Told by telephone company representatives to expect installation delays, they have warned their office managers to count on two to three months' lead time for changes in phone service.

New York's telephone troubles have had more than local impact because of the city's strategic position as a business and communications center. In San Francisco, Phoenix, Houston, and other cities, phone users have suffered through scrambled sig-

nals, unintelligible beeps, or just plain silence as they called New York. Ironically, it has sometimes been hard to raise the Bell System's headquarters in Manhattan.

CHALLENGES

Unfortunately for AT&T, if there was ever a time the Bell System needed to be reliable and efficient, this is it. The communications giant faces change and challenge on many fronts. Demand for all kinds of telephone service—local, long distance, data and record services, and private lines—is rising rapidly. With Picturephone service due to begin in 1970, the company will have the task of virtually rewiring the whole country in the next 10 years.

In the 1970s, AT&T not only must go to the financial community and the public for the tens of billions of dollars it needs to grow, but must push through dozens of unpopular rate increases just to stay even with the rising costs of wages and materials.

In its 91 years of existence, AT&T has survived political hostilities and financial depressions. But it has never been confronted with problems of today's staggering size. A lineup of the crises and hurdles ahead:

Pressures are intensifying in Washington, where voices are demanding a whole new look at telecommunications policy in the light of new elements on the scene. These include communications satellites, cable television, and computer networks, all of which are clawing for growing and changing markets. Ultimately, new laws will be needed to clarify policy and establish regulatory boundaries.

Public scrutiny, exemplified by hearings at state and federal regulatory agencies, once the lonely preserve of AT&T lawyers and technical advisors, is heating up. Such hearings are now thronged with consumer protection groups, labor unions, industry associations, computer companies, the Defense Dept., new communications service competitors, and the Antitrust Div. of the Justice Dept. Everybody, in fact, seems to be minding Ma Bell's store these days, with the result that hearings often drag interminably as each participant has his day in court. State regulatory commissions are now even objecting to closed-door negotiations between Bell and the Federal Communications Commission.

The spark of competition for domestic communications services and products has already been struck. Some AT&T adversaries have won decisions before the FCC that have had a direct impact on Bell's protected domain. Among them are the right to connect non-Bell devices to the telephone network, and the still hotly contested right of carriers to offer private line services in competition with existing interstate facilities.

Labor shortages, especially in the centers of big cities, core of the company's business, are growing worse. There is a particular lack of a steady and dependable supply of people to fill the lower-echelon jobs. Computers and automated equipment are of little use in stringing wires, splicing cable, or calming a frantic housewife whose house is on fire. AT&T and its subsidiaries which employ 900,000, need tens of thousands of recruits and replacements each year. Training new people, many of whom are barely literate, is hardly a job that the telephone system can handle alone.

The threat that Bell might sink under this complex burden carries its own irony: The U.S. communications system, which has led the world in innovation and service for decades, is largely the product of the management skills of the Bell System. It was developed, engineered, manufactured, installed, and operated by AT&T and its operating company and subsidiaries. A single management produced fantastic machines and fabulous success. Now that very success threatens to pull its creators under. At least

part of the trouble is that the telephone itself changed from a luxury convenience to a necessity of mid-century society.

With its size, the Bell System (made up of AT&T, a holding company that also operates the Long Lines Div., Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc., Western Electric Co., Inc., which manufactures equipment, and 24 regional operating companies) now seems likely to find it progressively more difficult to respond to change, stay loose, and be alert to the early warnings that signal trouble.

AT&T executives, from Chairman H. I. Romnes down, scoff at suggestions that the giant corporation is suffering either dinosaurian decline or hardening of the arteries. Yet the critical case of New York telephone service is certainly a disturbing symptom, even though the management of New York Telephone Co. is autonomous and runs its own show.

THE NEW YORK CRISIS

The surprising thing is that management didn't see the New York crisis coming until it blew up in their faces.

That happened when the Plaza-8 exchange in midtown New York simply choked on its overload last June. It was particularly dismaying to New York Telephone and AT&T, since Plaza-8 has a spanking new electronic switching system, of a type the whole Bell System is counting on to perform a number of new, revenue-producing services. But it was too much regular traffic that virtually shut down Plaza-8. Enraged at the lack of service, one large Plaza-8 customer, Benton & Bowles, Inc., advertising agency, ran a full page advertisement in *The New York Times* containing the names of all its 800-odd employees, explaining that they were still there, even if unreachable by telephone.

Since then, a number of others have copied Benton and Bowles' idea.

In July, New York Telephone brought in 1,500 reinforcements from other telephone companies to help its New York metropolitan maintenance crew. It also put an emergency infusion of money in the construction budget and promised that things would get better next year. But New Yorkers find service is still getting worse. After working a 13-hour day last week, one tired telephone installer sighed: "We're never going to catch up."

New York Telephone is under heavy pressure, and undoubtedly will restore good service, given time. Company spokesmen hope things will return to normal by the end of 1970.

Spreading blight? In other cities, AT&T service is almost universally better than in New York, at least according to most businesses and state regulatory commissions queried recently. There have been, and still are, some problems in the Boston area, most of which can be attributed to the aftermath of a lengthy installers' strike and to a sudden concentration of computer-communications systems in the Cambridge-Route 128 area. Portions of Florida, where residential housing has been booming, have suffered installation delays, and Bell called for emergency troops. Otherwise, most complaints seem about isolated incidents.

New York's problem has increased nationwide sensitivity to telephone performance, however. The California Public Service Commission, for example, reports a moderate rise in service complaints, and some businessmen in Philadelphia say their system is beginning to show signs of mimicking New York's crankiness.

It is almost impossible for an individual or even a company to get much of a handle on how the telephone system is actually performing. It is hard enough for the Bell System's own management to plow through the blizzard of performance figures that the system generates day by day. One critical document, a monthly report on performance and status of all 24 operating companies in

the Bell System, runs to more than 50 pages of detailed charts and graphs alone. Although it is confidential and contains instructions that it should be destroyed after use, some 7,000 copies are reportedly distributed.

WESTERN UNION

One customer with a national system big enough to yield significant data on the Bell System's service level is Western Union, which leases about 80% of its communications lines from AT&T and has facilities in virtually all telephone territories. According to Russell McFall, president of WU, New York is the outstanding mess. "We might have a couple of leased lines inoperative for 24 hours or more in Chicago on a typical day," he says, "but in New York last week it was over 400. And some of those lines have been inoperative for a long time."

Hubert L. Kertz, vice-president of the Operations Dept. of AT&T, insists that the New York situation is unique, correctable, and has been effectively quarantined so that other operating companies won't catch the bug. "I simply cannot emphasize enough that fears of the New York situation spreading are groundless," he says. Nevertheless, New York City's reputation as a leading indicator of the problems associated with large concentrations of people makes New York Telephone's problems a justifiable concern of those in other cities. "I won't be satisfied that it won't spread," says Western Union's McFall, "until I hear a rational explanation of what happened in New York City. So far, I haven't heard one."

Such a "rational explanation" does not exist yet but AT&T executives are hunting for it, and hunting hard. "We aren't presenting excuses," says John D. deButts, vice-chairman of AT&T, "we are exposing the reasons." So, far there seem to be almost too many for tight analysis.

In 1967, for instance, New York Telephone, expecting a flat spot in the gross national product growth curve for 1968, and at most a continuation of a 4% growth trend in its own services, cut its construction budget. The company admits to its forecasting error.

The trading boom on the stock market also contributed. It boosted telephone traffic unexpectedly in New York's financial district. "The Wall Street central office is almost totally different from any other," says AT&T Chairman Romnes. "Demand changes very quickly, and in the Wall Street area we may have to develop more flexible systems."

Owing to its melange of private wires and data lines and its wild swings of telephone usage, New York's financial district may not have totally satisfactory service until 1971. The problem is aggravated because lower Manhattan is one of the toughest places in the world to lay cable or install new switching facilities; there is simply no room left under the streets.

Unexpected changes in calling patterns apparently caused as much trouble as the surprise increase in the volume of calls. Normally, telephone cables are installed to meet slowly growing demand. Much of that demand is predictable. Business centers tend to talk to business centers, for example, and high-income suburbs tend to call other high-income suburbs.

But New York's residential and business area have been changing more quickly lately, and on top of that, welfare clients in New York were recently allowed to have telephones paid for by the city. Typical of the changes was the huge increase of calling between Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant district and Manhattan's East Harlem. The change affected the whole system because calls that could not go directly because of blocked lines were automatically switched through other offices and circuitous routes.

Urban blight. "Changes in the infrastruc-

ture of the city undoubtedly contributed to the over-all increase in telephone traffic," says Henry Boettinger, director of AT&T's new management-science department. Boettinger theorizes that as New York's traffic snarls intensified, as its subways grew uglier, and as its streets grew more dangerous, people stayed home and telephoned more. His management-science group is working on ways to include such effects in simulations.

The change in city environment leads to other new problems as well. For example, Boettinger says, as robberies of homes and apartments increase, more people tend to leave their telephones off the hook when they go out. That's to fool thieves who may call to check if anyone is at home. In older exchanges with stepping switches, such off-hook conditions can seriously tie up central office equipment.

WHY DID IT HAPPEN?

With the benefit of hindsight, many outside critics claim New York Telephone was caught because it depended too heavily on historical trend-line planning. "Our companies do use trend lines," says deButts, "but we also try to talk to everyone we can to improve our forecast. We're well aware that it is possible to drown in a stream that is an average of six inches deep."

Boettinger claims that the spurt in New York's telephone usage was completely atypical of the behavior of "large statistical populations." He says, "The curve took a sudden jump that looked like a temporary aberration, but it never came down as expected. It went up and stayed up." As an extra preventive measure against more forecasting bloopers, AT&T's Operations Vice-President Kertz is making sure that operating company managers are trained in "four different planning techniques."

The New York embarrassment has consumed an inordinate amount of executive time at AT&T headquarters, but by bringing top management face-to-face with an operations crisis, it could expose some open circuits in the communications system of the giant organization. Though management's pep talks constantly repeat the theme of Bell System's grave responsibility to the individual subscriber, top management has been isolated from all but the gravest crises.

Some remoteness at the executive level is necessary, of course, but AT&T is so big, so specialized, and so set in its traditions that the managerial hierarchy tends to treat its customers as if they were merely parts of the smooth contour of a distribution curve.

Corridors of power. The 26th floor of 195 Broadway is where the long climb through the hierarchies of Bell System management bureaucracy ends. There, bare corridors wind past dark metal door frames inset with frosted glass lettered in the old style: Mr. H. I. [for Haakon Ingolf] Romnes, chairman; Mr. de Butts, vice-chairman; Mr. Gilmer, president; Mr. Moulton, vice-president and general counsel; and a dozen more.

Beyond the doors lie spacious suites of offices, which, though tastefully carpeted and paneled for their tenants, have a pervasive institutional flavor. Indeed, the ultimate prerequisites of top AT&T executives—the largest offices, roomy secretarial areas with widely separated heavy wooden desks, private baths and sitting rooms, fine china and silver luncheon services—have scarcely changed since 1916, when builders completed the first half of W. Welles Bosworth's design for a pillared palace of industry in downtown New York.

Like its unchanging executive suites, much of AT&T is cast in a rigid mold of its own traditions that outsiders find unfamiliar and stultifying. A key element of that mold is a strict policy of promoting from within middle and top managerial ranks. Those jobs are occupied by career men, almost none of whom have ever worked for any significant

time for any other company. In 1970, there will be some changes at the top, when Ben S. Gilmer, president, reaches mandatory retirement age. But at AT&T such shifts are smooth.

Chairman Romnes, who rose to his \$295,800 job from Bell Laboratories through the presidency of Western Electric, is aware that the personnel policy has faults. "But in the balance," he says, I believe its advantages outweigh its deficiencies. Above all, we need the kind of people who can honestly devote themselves to providing a service to the public. If a man wants to buy companies and is primarily interested in speculative gain, he should be in the conglomerate business."

Conservatism. Unquestionably, AT&T has attracted a remarkably loyal and capable staff that believes it is serving the country and its customers in the best way over the long haul. But it has also created a closed society that sometimes shows symptoms of parochialism.

Understandably, perhaps in view of its responsibility for providing service that can be critical to national and individual security, the emphasis at AT&T is on operating, protecting, and improving the basic telephone service. As a result, the company has little resemblance to giants such as IBM and General Motors, where management ranks are loaded with marketing men. "Telephone service representatives don't always know what is available," says a telephone consultant. "If you want something special, you have to pry it out."

Gauntlet. New products and services must travel a long, rough road before they get Bell System's grudging nod of approval. For example, although Bell Laboratories invented the transistor in 1948, it took 10 years for the device to win general approval for use in equipment. And only in the last few years has solid-state circuitry begun to replace the system's electromechanical equipment. Bell expects it will take 40 years to complete the changeover to electronic exchanges.

New products or services for customers are viewed with the same caution. Where most companies would be overjoyed at finding a winner, AT&T managers speak of the difficulties of satisfying the "avalanche effect": If an innovation is made anywhere in the system, it must be made everywhere.

Red tape. Marketing at AT&T is undeniably hobbled by the regulatory environment. In charge is William M. Ellinghaus, whose title, vice-president of marketing and rate plans department, is a firm reminder that whatever AT&T sells must be priced out and meticulously described in the small print of tariffs filed with federal and state regulatory agencies. "Pricing was simpler where we had only two or three service offerings," says Ellinghaus. "Now we are offering a much wider variety of rate structures and services so the customer can tailor-make the services he needs. That complicates planning enormously."

Because it is a regulated utility and its profits are limited to a percentage of investment on plant and equipment, AT&T's marketing motivations have more of an internal focus than those in a company whose profits are limited only by its performance.

Legally, AT&T's monopoly and utility status is based on the changing interpretations of the loose definition of "communications" for "convenience and necessity" of the public. It is not easy for the company to judge which of many clamoring voices it should serve. Critics suggest that too many regulatory decisions have been made for the "convenience of Bell and the necessity of profits." At the same time, most admit that the company does have a deep sense of service and that only because it has dominated regulatory policy has it been able to produce the finest telecommunications system in the world.

Bullying. But Bell System acquired a fearsome reputation for using its power during its great acquisition and consolidation periods from the 1880s to the 1930s. Then, it gave no quarter, and to gain leverage against potential competition expanded into such areas as electric appliances and motion picture sound services. Now, under the Communications Act of 1934 and an antitrust consent decree signed in 1956, it is limited to providing communications services, manufacturing products used in those services, and performing government work.

The limitations have hardly hurt corporate growth, and the outlook for more use of more kinds of communications services has never been more bullish. If anything, the huge corporation will be pressed to meet demand.

Bell executives become defensive and resentful when critics suggest that their company may not be able to meet that demand. But they do not look kindly on competitors operating in their regulated domain.

Unintentionally, perhaps, Bell's self-protective reflexes have created an atmosphere of fear that may well muzzle deserved criticism. Few companies dare take on the behemoth in direct litigation.

THE GROWING COLOSSUS

The cost of building and rebuilding AT&T's interstate and local networks during the next decade produces figures that compare to other nation's gross national products. AT&T's deButts estimates the tab at \$70-billion, but admits upward revisions are likely.

The interstate network must provide much more capacity, and according to deButts, "75% of the total interstate facilities required in 1980 have yet to be built." The company expects voice traffic alone to double in the next decade, and Romnes believes business data communications traffic will continue to increase at 25% per year for the foreseeable future. At that rate, by 1980 7% to 10% of the company's enlarged network capacity will be occupied shuttling data.

Nice to see you. In the wings, of course, is Picturephone, which will begin commercial service in 1970 in New York and Pittsburgh. Romnes calls it development a "speculative investment"; most businessmen would consider it a sure bet.

"It will be expensive," warns Romnes. It could add billions of dollars to the company's financial burden. DeButts hopes a large part of the money will come from bond issues, providing the company is permitted to earn a "reasonable" rate of return that is high enough to attract investors.

The "reasonable rate" AT&T would like is between 8% and 9% on its invested capital. But the FCC and state regulatory agencies believe rates between 6½% and 8% will suffice. In the communications utility field, rate of return is a never-ending argument.

One extra source of money that AT&T hopes to draw on for rewiring the country in the 1970s is accelerated depreciation. The company has never used it in the past since, from a utility standpoint, it simply reduces the rate base more quickly, and the regulators usually insist that the savings it yields flow back to the telephone customer.

What telephone utilities prefer, and are generally willing to use, is "accelerated depreciation with normalization." This permits companies to reinvest savings in new plant so that the money goes back into the rate base. FCC approves of this concept, but most state regulators, faced with the largest rate increases in a decade (chart), are adamant that accelerated depreciation savings should go to customers.

Rate rows. This is not the only battle between states and the FCC in which AT&T finds itself in the middle. State agencies are opposing the recent \$150 million rate reduction on interstate toll calls worked out by

AT&T and FCC and effective from Jan. 1. Instead of reducing tolls, the states say, AT&T's Long Lines Dept. should pay local telephone companies more for the use of facilities involved in interstate traffic.

They have taken their case directly to Congress, where they are likely to get a favorable hearing, particularly in an election year.

This battle over the disposition of long-distance revenues is another conflict that AT&T will have to wrestle with indefinitely.

Technology. "Technology has smiled on transmission," says Richard Hough, vice-president of AT&T's Long Lines Dept. "The trend is toward more circuits and less switching." On high-density routes high-capacity microwave and coaxial cables have dropped circuit costs by as much as 80%. With even more capacious waveguides undergoing installation tests—each pipelike guide will carry 250,000 voice circuits or hundreds of Picturephone signals—there is no doubt that Long Lines will be able to meet capacity requirements.

The interstate network has always been the backbone and mainstay of the Bell System. It is the least likely to be disturbed in the turbulent times AT&T will face in the next few years. They will be years, Chairman Romnes admits, in which the Bell System will change. It will carry the signals from other companies' devices on the ends of its lines; it will compete, if necessary, for private line business; it may have to endure another reexamination of its right to control the manufacture of its equipment; and it will struggle to clear the lines of communication in its own management hierarchies, whether it takes computers or educational facilities of unprecedented scope.

The question only the 1970s will answer is whether, in the midst of conflicts and turbulence, this conservative leviathan of a company can react fast enough and be sensitive enough to change to prove that New York's troubles are truly an isolated circumstance. "We can't invent everything," says Romnes, "but I think we will be able to continue to move toward our main business purpose: providing a channel that will carry any kind of information from any place to anywhere."

THE EMPIRE RULED FROM "195"

"What's the word from 195?" is what most communications and financial men ask when they're looking for news about AT&T. Whatever they hear, it most probably emanated from the landmark Broadway skyscraper from which AT&T controls its vast empire.

Behind that numeral lies the bellwether of the securities business, the largest corporation in the world, a monolith whose 900,000 employees make up more than 1% of the entire U.S. labor force.

The company of more than 3-million stockholders has issued \$14-billion worth of triple-A bonds, more than any other corporation. The book value of its nationwide plant, soon to include its 100-millionth telephone, is \$45-billion. It transmits about 350-million telephone calls a day, with New York generating more than one call in ten. In 1970 it will spend \$6.5-billion just to expand its physical facilities.

And AT&T is still growing vigorously: In 10 years, its annual operating revenues have nearly doubled, from \$7.9-billion to \$15.5-billion. Indeed, its power and wealth make it one of the strongest political forces in state and federal government.

Even apart from size, AT&T is unique. It is a double monopoly.

It has exclusive rights to serve customers in its operating areas.

Its subsidiaries make most of the equipment it buys; its Bell System consumes about 90% of the telephone equipment sold in the United States.

The system has firm control over its marketplace. It can determine the rate of introduction and obsolescence of its products

and services. It also has direct control over the definition and pricing of its product offerings. (It carefully calls them services and meticulously describes them in reams of highly technical, small-print documents known as tariffs, which it must file with more than half a hundred federal and state regulatory agencies.)

So big. Entrusted with a U.S. vital necessity, the national communications system, AT&T maintains extraordinary corporate stability. Its creators—pioneering executives, such as its early President Theodore N. Vail, as well as the powerful New York bankers who backed the Bell interests before and after the turn of the century—purposely designed the corporation to be almost impregnable to the thrusts of competition or the hazards of financial raids.

AT&T's stock is now too widely held for any group of individuals or institutions to attain control. Its debt ratio, though controversially low for a utility (less than 40% bonded indebtedness), keeps its bonds top-rated in the securities markets. And direct competition is discouraged or prohibited by the government's regulatory policy and by AT&T's dominance of its industry.

Giant brain. Of all companies in the world, AT&T has perhaps the best access to the basic technologies it needs—and the greatest mastery of them. No other organization has even come close to making as many and varied contributions to technology as have been produced by its Bell Telephone Laboratories.

Achievements range from the invention of sound movies, to the transistor and laser, and onward into vital abstractions of information theory and network analysis.

Outspoken critics, such as FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson, claim that AT&T has grown so large and so complex that its activities simply cannot be regulated in detail—at any rate, not by under-staffed, low-budget agencies. Now, an even more disquieting fear is rising among some of Bell's big-city customers. As AT&T grows ever larger, they spot symptoms that the system is getting too unwieldy and unmanageable—even for AT&T.

State phone rates go up and up—Increases granted (date, State commission, and company)

	[In millions]	Rate increase
1/68, California, Pacific Tel.....		\$50.2
2/68, Florida, Southern Bell.....		5.8
2/68, North Dakota, Northwestern Bell.....		1.2
3/68, Montana, Mountain States Tel..		2.9
3/68, New Mexico, Mountain States Tel.....		2.9
9/68, Nevada, Bell of Nevada.....		1.9
2/69, Colorado, Mountain States Tel..		5.8
5/69, Utah, Mountain States Tel.....		2.1
9/69, North Dakota, Northwestern Bell.....		.5
10/69, Missouri, Southwestern Bell....		30.6
11/69, Washington, Pacific Northwest Bell.....		14.0
11/69, Maryland, Chesapeake & Potomac Tel.....		22.7
4/69, Rhode Island, New England.....		9.2
Total rate increases on file.....		653.0

1968-69 total rate increases.... 137.7

INCREASES PENDING

8/68, Michigan, Michigan Bell.....	\$59.0
11/68, Louisiana, South Central.....	17.0
12/68, Washington, Pacific Northwest..	26.7
12/68, Wisconsin, Wisconsin Tel.....	21.6
2/69, Oregon, Pacific Northwest Bell..	11.8
3/69, New York, New York Tel.....	175.0
4/69, Connecticut, Southern New England Tel.....	23.9
7/69, Massachusetts, New England Tel..	52.2
8/69, Ohio, Ohio Bell.....	80.0
8/69, Georgia, Southern Bell.....	29.5

8/69, Florida, Southern Bell.....	\$32.0
11/69, D.C., Chesapeake & Potomac...	13.2
12/69, Illinois, Illinois Bell.....	86.5
12/69, Ohio/Kentucky, Cincinnati Bell	15.4
Total rate increases on file..... 653.0	

A LESSON OF THE PAST—RACE MIXING GUARANTEES VIOLENCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, few Americans take time to study the lessons taught by history which produced our laws and the unwritten customs of society.

Barely 100 years ago the Southland lay in stark devastation, her leaders and patrons were either dead or political prisoners of the Union Army. Confederate servicemen and participants in the "cause" were denied voting rights by Federal occupational decree.

Louisianians, like citizens of other Southern States, found themselves at the guided mercy of a new society composed of collaborators, moderators, and the newly freed black vengeance. Such a coalition of forces sat down to organize a biracial State government, with the express intent of creating a "State ordered under the law" to remove forever the racial barriers between white and black.

The efforts of the new biracial experiment of government in Louisiana is to be found in the Louisiana Constitution of 1868. Its forceful laws and regulations far exceeded the race-mixing provisions of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964. Yet there—just over one lifetime ago—native southerners were by their own act establishing laws for permanent extinction of racial distinction. And for 11 years, Louisianians, under their constitution calling for forced equality, tried to solve the color problem.

Consider that the Louisiana Constitution of 1868 provided, article I:

All men are created equal, and have certain inalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. . . .

Article 13, public accommodation:

All persons shall enjoy equal rights and privileges upon any conveyance of a public character; and all places of business or of public resort or for which a license is required . . . and shall be open to the accommodation and patronage of all persons, without distinction or discrimination on account of race or color.

Article 98, voting rights:

Every male person of the age of twenty-one years . . . resident of this state one year . . . ten days in the parish . . . shall be deemed an elector . . . except those disfranchised . . . (Constitution provided that those disfranchised were all who held office, civil, or military for one year or more in the Confederacy, those who registered themselves as enemies of the U.S., those who were leaders of guerrilla bands, and those who in the advocacy of treason, wrote or published newspaper articles or preached sermons, etc.)

Article 100, oath of equality:

Members of the General Assembly and all other officers . . . shall take the following oath. "I (John Doe) do solemnly swear that I accept the civil and political equality of all men, and agree not to deprive any person or persons, on account of race, color or previous condition, of any political or civil right, or immunity enjoyed by any other class of men. . . ."

Article 113, biracial adoption:

The General Assembly may enact general laws regulating the adoption of children, and emancipation of minors . . . but no special law shall be passed relating to particular or individual cases.

Article 135, integrated schools:

The General Assembly shall establish at least one free public school in every parish throughout the state. . . . All children of this state between the ages of 6 and 21 to the public schools, or other institutions of learning . . . without distinction of race, color, or previous condition. There shall be no separate schools or institutions of learning established exclusively for any race by the State of Louisiana.

Louisiana Statutes of the 1868, section 2177, biracial marriage:

The said right of making private or religious marriages legal, valid and binding . . . shall apply to all marriages of all persons of whatever race or color, as well as to marriages formerly prohibited by Article 99 of the Civil Code . . .

Think—a mere 100 years ago by Louisiana law, our ancestors were subjected to a public accommodation law, universal voting rights for all without educational qualifications, all elected State officials were forced to take an oath of belief in equality, all public schools were integrated, and racially mixed marriages were legalized. All in hope of a lasting peace by abolition of the colored problem. A removal of discrimination and white supremacy forever.

Was it successful? Read the pages of history, not burned, for yourself. Ask your preacher, your lawyer, or elected official why such a wondrous government of equality ordered by law was not preserved and passed down to this generation.

Why, if the racial problem had been solved a mere 100 years ago, are we and our institutions again under cultural attack under the purported guise of resolving the racial problem?

The Louisiana Constitution of 1868 suffered trial until 1879. Its 11 years were beset with a record of blood, violence, and suffering by all Louisiana citizens.

Race riots, strife, and lawlessness became the rule of the day, not the exception.

The ordinary citizen came to realize that social laws, when enforced, compel honest men to rebel and become social law violators if for no other reason than personal conviction and pride. Oppression can but breed contempt and disrespect for law and order. The racial problem worsened rather than becoming solved.

Eventually, good men, of all colors, were by reason compelled to agree that the theory of an ordered equality of men was for the classroom and theoretician,

but that peace of mind, and security of person and property was a far more desired role of government—even if it called for a society separated by color.

The new constitution of 1879, prepared by men who socially experimented for 11 years to make biracial government a reality, contained at article I a restatement of the role of government:

All government of right originates with the people, is founded on their will alone, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed. Its only legitimate end is to protect the citizen in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and property. When it assumes other functions it is usurpation and oppression.

What a dynamic lesson from history by the trials and errors of those who preceded us. Yet, the intellectual heretic and the social experimenter refuse to profit from history. In fact, they would conceal these lessons and sufferings from our children.

History, when honestly studied, and clearly appreciated, reveals for all times that the race-mixers but create the problem and offer no solution.

Just average people who must live day by day and look to peace of mind and the protection of their homes and loved ones have many times in history solved the racial problem. Their answer to us, "equal but separate facilities."

SIGNOFF FOR "THE VACHER"

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, "Sports today with Bob Vache." So opened the best of Arizona sports broadcasts for more than 25 years.

Before an automobile accident brought his career to a tragic end last Sunday, Bob Vache was sports director for KTAR Radio-TV in Phoenix and was known throughout the State as the "voice" of the Phoenix Suns basketball team since that club was organized, as well as an impartial broadcaster of major college football and basketball games.

"The Vacher," as he is known by his colleagues, was born in Phoenix 45 years ago and started his broadcasting career there after serving as a combat bomber pilot in World War II.

Bob Vache took his work seriously and was selected five times as the State's most outstanding sports announcer by the National Sportscasters and Sports-writers Association. He also served as the energetic president of the Phoenix Press Box Association.

But objective marks of achievement are never the full measure of a man, as the Arizona sports world knows. Dave Hicks, of the Arizona Republic has given us an insight into the professional character of this individual and the loss that the people of Arizona feel in his passing. His article follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Jan. 18, 1970]

SIGNOFF FOR "THE VACHER"

(By Dave Hicks)

"Sports today with . . ."

My God—with who?

A telephone call at 3 a.m. jackhammers an icy wedge of disbelief into the overnight.

As effectively as a 45-year-old Tolleson native met a career rife with radio and television deadlines, unreality seizes the night as if its absolute "air time" is 3 a.m.

The "Vacher" is gone.

No, damnit, he's not, but yes, damnit, he is, and the tragedy is related until a reluctant final accord with fact.

And in the muddled hours that follow, an ethereal tape recorder, always slightly out of reach, unwinds a decade of sharing hotel rooms, cab rides, sports tales, airplane small-talk, a deepness shared with few (if, indeed, any others), a mutual professional admiration a stronger personal esteem.

Bob Vache, of course, would condemn the maudlin.

Knowing that, one would congratulate himself, in retrospect, that during a 3 a.m. telephone call he scudded merely agast.

Strong, calm in adversity, collected in the face of shock.

The "Vacher" would have appreciated that, so there is little need to add that the strong, calm, collected came apart afterward, because a man prefers to do his crying in private.

Let me tell you how Bob Vache regarded himself professionally.

"I'm not the most knowledgeable," he would say, "so I have to do it with preparation."

Whatever his adopted attack, the "Vacher" came to be, rightfully so, the acknowledged best sportscaster in Arizona.

This did not materialize from his routine daily broadcasts via radio and TV. Because Vache always was engaged in a struggle to get more air time, and if you knew him, this was never a selfish play to get more Vache before the public—just more sports.

One timely and towering tribute to Vache (there was forever the problem of making that come out, in print and TV-radio on the road as Vash-a, rather than Vash), crops up, ironically, in TV Guide for the week Jan. 17-23.

An article points up that, in today's sports world, slanted accounts of games are not only allowed, but encouraged. This is irrefutably true.

What this is, is extremely and unforgivably bush.

Let this be said: Vache did not concur with this juvenile approach, simply because he was a conscientious newsman who told it like it was.

To him, or their, inescapably discredit, someone or some few asked Vache to become this sort of shill during his broadcasts for the Phoenix Sun.

Do you know what he said: NO.

That simple, endearing gesture cannot be adequately appreciated in this era when, as TV Guide indicates, the club broadcaster is a shill.

The "Vacher" never would have succumbed to that.

He was a self-admitted "14th man on a 14-man Tolleson basketball squad" way back when few people were granted the privilege of getting close to this someone special.

"Sports today with . . ."

My God—with who?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 22, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Thou shalt remember all the way the Lord thy God led thee.—Deuteronomy 8: 2.

Eternal God, who didst lead our fathers to these shores that they may bring forth a just and a free nation, give Thy grace to us their children that we may be ever mindful of Thy presence and ever eager to do Thy will, without whom people cannot prosper, races cannot reason reasonably, and nations cannot live together in peace.

Grant that by the aid of Thy spirit true democracy may come to new life in our land, that government and industry and labor shall faithfully serve our people, and that our people in a real spirit of unity shall love our country with undying devotion.

Bless our President as he speaks to us and to our Nation this day. Make him wise with Thy wisdom, strong in Thy strength, good through Thy goodness and may he lead us in the paths of peace.

Bless our Nation abundantly and make her a blessing to all the peoples of the world.

In the spirit of the Pioneer of Life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13111) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments numbered 4, 50, 51, and 56 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment numbered 83 to the bill (H.R. 13111) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the second part of the House amendment insert: "Provided further, That those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and 1969 that set mandatory funding levels, including mandatory funding levels for the newly authorized programs for alcoholic counseling and recovery and for drug rehabilitation, shall be effective during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970: Provided further, That of the sums appropriated not less than \$22,000,000 shall be used for the family planning program."

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 477 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M.

Miller, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS; the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to order of the Senate, the following Senators are appointed to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber: Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia; Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana; Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia; Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania; Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Michigan; Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota; and Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered