

Most of the men coming to Tripler are cases involving 60 to 120 days rehabilitation.

The Vietnam war, for instance, has meant a 500-percent increase in business in the past year for the 10th Air Medical Evacuation Group of the Air Force's 61st Airlift Wing at Hickam.

A spokesman said:

"Three or more air evacuation planes are coming into Hickam each week for every nine flights out of Clark Airbase in the Philippines.

"Six or less of these flights overshoot Hickam, going from Japan to Travis Air Force Base near Sacramento nonstop.

"The new Lockheed C-141 makes this possible. When air evac planes put into Hickam, the men usually go to Tripler for a night's rest.

"They go to Tripler if they are island men, if they need a specialist to look at their problem, if the flight crew needs an overnight rest or if it looks like they can get back to duty in 60 days or so," he said.

#### BLOOD TO VIETNAM

While planes at Hickam unload the maimed for Tripler, the hospital, 2 weeks ago, rushed 500 pints of blood in a week to Vietnam and 600 on one occasion before that.

Steger said, "Normally we carry 150 pints of blood at all times and use between 60 and 100 a week while drawing on 40 to 50 from service sources each week."

At any one time the hospital patient population runs 60 percent in uniform, 40 percent dependents, retired servicemen, and others.

"We're not feeling any great pinch," Steger said, "either in handling battle casualties or having enough doctors and support personnel to do the job.

"If there is any strain, it is on the civilian doctors in the country being drafted because of the war," he said.

That's the rub. A young doctor thinks he's settling down to routine tummy ache cases in some quiet town and then find himself looking at shrapnel wounds at Tripler.

That's when he really knows there's a war on.

### Mrs. Gandhi's View of Fish Protein Concentrate

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress have been anxious to see fish protein concentrate go into large-scale production primarily because of its potential value abroad. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, of India, whose country is at present plagued by massive famine, expressed an interest in fish protein concentrate during her recent visit here.

She pointed out, however, that a major problem would be to "sell" this new form of food to her people. I would heartily concur in this view. If we are truly to help combat malnutrition in this world, we will have to apply some of our efforts to research in new ways to use this product and some of our efforts to educating people about what it is and how it could be used.

Today, fish protein concentrate is awaiting the approval of the Food and Drug Administration. Although fish protein concentrate was developed many

years ago, this inexpensive and highly nutritious product is still not being used for the benefit of those who need it. I concur with the view of the New Bedford Standard Times editorial and ask unanimous consent to place it in the Record. There must be no further delay in putting fish protein concentrate to use. Government and industry must both get to work and "sell" fish protein concentrate.

The editorial follows:

[From the New Bedford Standard-Times, Mar. 31, 1966]

#### EDUCATION REQUIRED

It is not generally known, but India's Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, would like to learn more about the use of fish flour as a food additive.

Approached by a Standard-Times representative during her visit to Washington, Mrs. Gandhi expressed an interest in investigating this protein concentrate and, implicitly raised an important question concerning it.

She wondered about public acceptance of fish flour in her country, and felt her people would have to be "sold" on the product because "they are used to eating their fish in a certain way."

Actually, the "selling" problem may not involve fish flour itself, but rather the introduction of the U.S. product, if and when it is given Federal approval, so that the Indian people can see how it differs from their own.

This is because there has been research on fish flour in India, aided by an exchange of ideas with the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. But the fish used by the Indian scientists was oily (ours is not) like a sardine and, probably for this reason, early reports on experiments in India have not been optimistic.

What seems to be indicated, therefore, is an American education program—since India, plagued by massive famine, could be greatly benefited by fish flour—that would acquaint the Indian people with the completely different nature and manufacturing methods of the U.S. product.

Even though we still are awaiting approval of fish flour by the Food and Drug Administration, it is not too soon for Government and/or industry to start thinking about effective ways of educating potential consumers abroad as to precisely what this food material is, and what it can do for them.

### There Is a God

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an article of unusual interest has been brought to my attention by one of my constituents. It was written by a 14-year-old girl in my district, Miss Pamela Smith of Amboy, Ill.

In a great Christian nation such as ours, it is indeed encouraging to find a young person such as Miss Smith who still expressed the deep sense of faith and devotion that guided our country to the position of world leadership it enjoys today. The article, as it appeared in the

"Voice of Youth" column in the Chicago Tribune, follows in its entirety:

Many people these days give up going to church with the excuse, "I was out late last night, and I just couldn't make myself get up this morning." Some even don't believe there is a God. I think that now, with the trouble across the sea, we should depend on Him even more.

So, to prove that there is a God, I would like to start first with the Bible. What other book is so internationally known? As old? So well studied? So timeless? There is none to compare with it. What other has so many authors? The Bible, together, has 66 books. Surely these writers all couldn't have been wrong.

When you see a huge tree and realize it has grown from a seed you think, "There must be a force behind this that is greater than you or I." There is. God.

How did Adam and Eve arrive on earth if God didn't put them there? How did the world come into being if it were not created by God? When we truly believe, we don't have to ask where He came from. He's just there. That's enough for true Christians.

When Jesus came to earth, suffered, and died for us, He showed His great love. What about the angel at His tomb? Wasn't that proof? And after we have prayed to God, asking His forgiveness, don't we feel better? If we have prayed honestly, we should.

God is loving, not demanding. This is why He lets each of us make our own choice as to whether we have fear, or love and trust him. He lets us decide if we wish to be saved.

That is why I say, "There is a God."

### Too Few Bombs in Vietnam?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in this day when there is so much controversy over the conduct of the war in Vietnam, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an interesting editorial that appeared in the April 23 issue of the New York Times on the subject of "Too Few Bombs."

In view of recent testimony or statements regarding the need for repurchase of bombs because of supply shortages of arms or equipment in the Vietnam war, I think this editorial timely and appropriate and would commend it to my colleagues for their consideration. Therefore, I would like to have this editorial inserted in the Record:

#### TOO FEW BOMBS?

Secretary of Defense McNamara has met disturbing reports of bomb and other shortages overseas with a denial that is more emphatic than convincing.

Almost 250,000 U.S. troops and 100,000 tons of supplies have been sent to Vietnam from all over the world. There has been "draw-down," as the services call it, on military supply inventories throughout the world. Virtually all ready combat units have been committed to Vietnam or other foreign stations; the strategic reserve in this country has been reduced to training cadres. In a military sense the United States has been skating on thin ice for some time, and the danger is not ended.

# Appendix

## Army's Tripler General Hospital in Hawaii Plays Vital Vietnam Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons for the excellent morale of our combat forces in Vietnam is the knowledge that America's lifesaving techniques have reached a level of excellence heretofore undreamed of. Our soldiers know that should they be wounded they have at their service the most advanced technology of 20th-century medicine.

At their disposal are the better trained medics who give immediate first aid on the battlefield, the helicopter which saves precious minutes by flying the wounded out quickly and even under heavy enemy fire, the well-equipped field hospital with its supply of modern drugs, and finally the jet ride to a fully staffed Army hospital.

One of these hospitals, receiving increased casualties of the Vietnam conflict, is the Army's Tripler General Hospital, located in Honolulu on the island of Oahu. A "veteran" of World War II and the Korean war, the 1,400-bed hospital has, despite the rapid increase in our Vietnam commitment to more than 200,000 troops, managed to make an orderly and smooth transition from its quiet peacetime function to an urgent wartime operation.

According to Tripler's commander, Maj. Gen. Byron L. Steger, the quality of medical care has never been reduced, even when the hospital was overloaded during October and November of 1965. General Steger emphasized the high life-saving ratio of today's combat casualties when he said:

Some have come in here looking like they are about to die and then months later they walk out.

Ideally located halfway to the continental United States, the hospital not only continues its heavy load of routine dependent and veteran care cases, but also performs major operations on combat injuries, ships hundreds of pints of emergency blood to the battlefield, and acts as a stopover point for air evacuation patients.

I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a newspaper article on Tripler Hospital's commendable role in helping to meet the Vietnam crisis. The article, written by Reporter Lyle Nelson, appeared in the Thursday, April 14, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

### VIETNAM CONFLICT'S IMPACT ON TRIPLER HOSPITAL

(By Lyle Nelson)

The scene is Tripler Hospital, that big pink building on the hill.

A leg has to come off.

Frozen skin comes out of the icebox for transplanting.

A bullet is left in a man because it went in clean and hot and taking it out would cause more problems.

An amputee from years back quietly reassures a despondent new amputee.

Hands are rebuilt with metal parts like a robot.

A good leg is shortened, bone cut out, because the other shattered leg had to be shortened.

Pints of blood are rushed to Vietnam.

New doctors and nurses check into Tripler.

#### DRAMA IN BUILDING

These are a few of the dramatic things that have been happening inside that big pink building, mostly in the last 6 months. Tripler has gone to war.

But Maj. Gen. Byron L. Steger, Tripler's commander, prefers not to paint a picture of drastic changes at Tripler—of a hospital turned upside down because of American casualties in Vietnam.

"It was pretty rough last October and November and we had to work pretty hard and steadily but not to the detriment of quality medical care," Steger said.

"We received more casualties at that time and it put a load on our staff," he said.

"But there is a relative lull in the fighting now and things have tapered off a little," he said.

#### ONE HUNDRED PATIENTS NOW

Right now Tripler has about 100 patients direct from Vietnam, some with gunshot or mine wounds, others with noncombat illnesses, like malaria.

Yet most of Tripler's current patient load, about 550, are routine, sick servicemen, wives having babies, and kids with runny noses.

But what has changed things at Tripler since the United States pumped 200,000 men into Vietnam has been combat wounds.

"We get every known type of missile wound, gunshot, shrapnel, machinegun slugs, mines," Steger said.

"Some have come in here looking like they are about to die and then months later they walk out," Steger said, proudly.

Col. John D. Ashby, chief in orthopedics, has seen practically all the wounded GI's in the last year.

"We've had three amputations, all local men," he said.

"I had a war veteran from Korea come up to talk to this one fellow, give him a little pep talk, some reassurance, show him how well he does his job and gets around town on one leg.

"We are doing hand reconstruction work.

"Some carry plenty of shrapnel fragments, many so small we leave them there, since they don't really bother a man.

"Shrapnel and bullets are sterile when they go in. It is only if they take dirty clothing in with them that we sometimes have to dig them out," Ashby said.

"One man lost four inches in the thigh bone and later we will shorten a leg so he can walk easier," he said.

#### A SAD CASE

Then there was one sad case of a burn victim who had lost an arm. His buddies in the wards volunteered blood—only he died of a blood clot in the lungs later.

Steger told about an island man, Lt. William Olds who came off the Vietnam battlefield with wounds in the thigh and pelvis.

Olds was put on a striker frame which made him a sandwich between two metal frames so doctors could turn him over for simultaneous treatment both front and back.

"It was an amazing case," Steger said, "and now he has returned to duty at Fort Benning, Ga."

While the war has had its impact on Tripler, there has to be a great deal of business as usual in the treatment of sick servicemen and their dependents.

"We are set up with 1,400 beds but when we reached our war peak last November, we were only slightly over 1,000," Steger said.

Any hospital has to have more beds available than patients it can handle.

#### ISOLATION NEEDED

That is because people with contagious diseases have to be isolated, men must be separated from women, children from adults.

Steger said, "Our job is to take care of people's needs in internal, surgical, and psychiatric medicine.

"And we have to handle war casualties as well as support the local military population, its dependents, provide 75 beds for the Veterans' Administration, and support certain other Government employees."

Steger said, "We had 785 patients from Vietnam in 1965.

"Of these, 66 were psychiatric cases, the rest almost equally divided between medical, like malaria and ulcers, and surgical."

The surgical workload included fixing shattered bones and brain damage work performed by neurosurgeons.

#### FIFTY-FIVE PHYSICIANS

The Tripler staff includes 55 physicians on the teaching staff, 65 residency trainees in various fields, 36 interns, and another 20 in the dental department, all with college degrees.

A staff increase of 55 civilians and 58 military has been authorized because of the Vietnam war and most of these new people have checked in. Most are, not doctors.

The Tripler staff, including nurses, custodians, and others, totals 1,250 people, 450 of whom are civilians, and 450 enlisted servicemen.

The Tripler outpatient load runs to 19,000 a month, that is, persons who come to see the doctor even if junior only has a runny nose.

The routine case of the child who needs cough syrup usually can be taken care of at dispensaries at Hickam, Pearl Harbor, Schofield Barracks, and other places without checking into Tripler's outpatient division.

The departure of the 25th Division from Schofield cut into Tripler's normal workload.

Steger added, "More available beds in the Far East, particularly in Japan and Okinawa, has also helped take the load off us."

#### TO PHILIPPINES

A man wounded in Vietnam often is flown quickly to the Philippines for 2 days.

From there he goes to Japan if it looks like he can get back with his outfit within 60 days.

A2225

In the past few weeks the evidence of strain has become pronounced. Seven hundred and fifty-pound bombs, sold as surplus some years ago to a German commercial contractor, have been repurchased by the Government at more than 10 times their sales price for use in Vietnam. More than 33,000 officers, experienced noncoms and specialists are being transferred from Germany to Vietnam or to units being trained in this country. They will be replaced by 18,000 green privates. Aircraft sorties in South Vietnam have been materially reduced in recent weeks because of local shortages of bombs, matching fuses, tail fins, and other ordnance. There are undeniable scarcities—actual or impending—of many military items, including trained military manpower.

The reasons for these deficiencies vary, and it is certainly true that no war ever has been fought without some shortages. But Mr. McNamara does himself no credit by trying to deny the obvious.

This newspaper has long questioned the wisdom of large-scale bombing in terms of American objectives in Vietnam, but we believe unreservedly that whatever strategy the administration embarks upon must not fail for lack of arms or equipment. Far greater candor on the part of the administration, a candor lacking throughout the Vietnam war, would provide greater assurance to the Nation that the men who are doing the fighting and dying in Vietnam get all the support they need.

**Cotton Must Compete**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
 OF**

**HON. E. C. GATHINGS  
 OF ARKANSAS**

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
 Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, after studies and hearings before our House Committee on Agriculture in February, the House took up and approved on March 3 a bill to enable cottongrowers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research and promotion to improve the competitive position of, and to expand markets for, cotton.

This bill, H.R. 12322, presently is pending before the Senate.

On April 14, the Jonesboro, Ark., Sun, made editorial comment on the need for such authority and such programs. The Sun serves a great area in the Arkansas Cotton Belt and reflects the views of growers that such programs are essential if we are to firm up the role of cotton in our economy. If any item is newsworthy, you will see it in the Jonesboro Sun. It is a pleasure to bring this editorial to the attention of Members of the House and the Senate and to express the hope that early action by the Senate will enable the Congress to forward this legislation to the President for his signature:

**COTTON MUST COMPETE**

The cotton surplus is expected to reach a record of more than 16 million bales by August 1, necessitating a severe acreage cutback to curtail production. Less acres in cotton, of course, mean less need for all the goods and services required to produce a crop, pinching the economy in all cotton areas.

More than 342,000 people in Arkansas derive all or a big part of their incomes from

cotton. Receipts from farm marketing of cotton and cottonseed amount to about \$240 million a year, not to mention the additional revenue they generate.

Cotton, however, is going into warehouses while manmade fibers are being used in products that once were all cotton. Their consumption has risen to more than 11 million bales, exceeding that of cotton by 2 million bales.

For the time being, cotton is reasonably competitive with rayon due to a Government subsidy. Fibers making the biggest gains, however, are the noncellulosics which sell for 80 cents per pound or more. In 5 years they have taken more than two-thirds of the 6-million-bale growth in the domestic market.

The 14 giant corporations producing synthetics are spending more than \$200 million per year for research and promotion, compared with a little over \$10 million spent on cotton.

How can 500,000 cotton farmers across 18 States combine their resources to compete with these centrally controlled rivals? Leading growers are sponsoring a bill which provides for uniform collection of funds for cotton research and promotion. It contains all the necessary safeguards for grower control in that it does not become effective unless approved by cotton farmers in a referendum; and grower could obtain a refund; and the program would be initiated, developed, and conducted by a beltwide producer organization whose members would be selected by State or area cotton farmer groups.

This program gives the cotton farmer an arrangement through which he can save himself with his own money if he wants to. It deserves the support of all who are interested in a healthy cotton economy.

**Tosans' New Magazine To Rally Young  
 Conservatives**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
 OF**

**HON. GLENN R. DAVIS  
 OF WISCONSIN**

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
 Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, two intelligent and intellectual young constituents of mine, the Wheeler brothers, Richard and Timothy, have recently launched a new national magazine named "Rally." They thoughtfully forwarded to me a copy of their trial issue, which I found to be interesting and stimulating.

Recently Loyal Meek, chief editorial writer of the Milwaukee Sentinel, left his desk to go back on the reporter's beat. He called on his two Wauwatosa neighbors, the Wheeler brothers, with the results shown in the following Sentinel story:

**TOSANS' NEW MAGAZINE TO RALLY YOUNG  
 CONSERVATIVES  
 (By Loyal Meek)**

Rally, a national magazine for young conservatives, is in the hatching stage in Wauwatosa.

Richard S. and Timothy J. Wheeler, brothers, are the founders. They have published one trial issue and hope to begin regular monthly publication by mid-May.

The brothers typify the young conservatives to whom Rally is to appeal. Timothy is 28 and has credentials to serve as a conservative publisher by virtue of 4 years of expe-

rience as an associate editor of National Review, a leading conservative publication.

Richard is 31 and is to be the editor of Rally. He recently returned to Wauwatosa from Washington, D.C., where he was on the staff of Reader's Digest.

"Rally will be largely aimed for conservative readers under 40 on down to the college level," said Timothy. "There may be some high school students who will be interested in it, although probably not very many."

One of the main reasons for the founding of Rally, according to Timothy, "is to provide a market for the many young conservative writers who have come along in the last few years."

While conservative in ideology, Rally intends to be liberal in paying its writers, and especially the younger ones, Timothy said.

Rally will be an advocate of private enterprise, the free market system, limited government, individualism and for voluntary welfare work by the independent sector, as distinguished from the public and private sectors.

While supporting capitalism, Rally itself will not be a business intent only on making a profit. For the Wheeler brothers, it is going to be mainly a labor of love.

The Wheelers now are devoting much of their time and energy to arranging for the necessary financial backing.

One of the reasons for establishing headquarters in Wauwatosa is that Milwaukee has the advantage of being a "good conservative advertising base." Timothy estimates that "approximately 40 firms here have shown themselves to be willing to support such a publication with their advertising."

In addition, he reports, they have been given support and encouragement from several businessmen, here and in Indianapolis.

To make the magazine self-sufficient, a circulation of 8,000 will be necessary. It is hoped that this base figure can be reached within a year—and, of course, that the number of subscribers will go higher, up to about 18,000. Introductory subscription rates are \$5 for 1 year, \$9 for 2 years and \$12.50 for 3 years.

Establishing a magazine, especially one with a select market, is a hard and chancy undertaking. The Wheeler brothers are convinced, however, that there is a place for Rally. They point out that there are more than 100 liberal and leftist publications but relatively few conservative and rightist publications, and none in the area they have staked out—a serious, high quality and fully representative journal for conservatives in the 20 to 40 age group.

The Wheelers use the word "serious" in their promotional material, but they hasten to emphasize that Rally will not be stuffy. They promise to make it bright, lively and witty.

"Ever since conservatism has come of age," Timothy said, "its spokesmen have been spending most of their time yelling at each other and exchanging diatribes with liberals. We hope to establish a better dialog between the right and the left. We want to direct our time and energy toward solving problems—nongovernmental solutions."

Another reason for locating Rally here, in addition to the good advertising climate, according to Timothy, is to give it more of a midwest viewpoint. Almost all journals of opinion are published in the East, he adds, and hence reflect the viewpoint of the eastern establishment.

Although it will give more attention to domestic issues, Rally will not ignore international matters.

Arrangements have been made to have an anti-Communist column as a regular feature, written by an intelligence analyst whose name can't be revealed.

Rally, Timothy emphasizes, will not be a radical rightwing haranguer. "We will, for instance, discuss civil rights," Timothy

April 26, 1966

said, calling it an issue young conservatives believe in.

He sees the problems of urban life—sprawl, decay, environmental pollution—as the big issues of the coming decade. "Conservatives—and Rally—will be in the forefront of channeling thought toward urban progress and development," Timothy said. "It is a part of conservation, and conservation is close to conservatives' hearts."

The third reason for locating Rally here is that Wauwatosa is the Wheelers' home town.

Timothy and his wife and son, Christopher, 3, live at 7401 Watson Avenue. Built in 1877, the house has been in the Wheeler family ever since. The brothers' grandmother, Mrs. L. C. Wheeler, lived in the house for 64 years, until her death in 1964.

The brothers' parents, Mr. and Mrs. S. Lawrence Wheeler, live at 7720 Rogers Avenue. Richard is making his home with them.

The brothers are graduates of Wauwatosa East High School, Richard in January 1953, and Timothy in June 1955.

Richard attended Northwestern University and the University of Wisconsin. Between times, he studied at the Pasadena Playhouse and tried writing plays. On the Madison campus, he wrote a controversial column for the Daily Cardinal and helped establish Insight and Outlook, a pioneering conservative student journal. Before joining Reader's Digest, he wrote editorials for the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette and was chief editorial writer for the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune.

Timothy also attended the University of Wisconsin. After 2 years at Madison, he joined the Army and was engaged in intelligence work overseas. Discharged in March 1961, he returned to the University of Wisconsin and became interested in conservative writings and political journalism. He met the former Mary Fox of River Hills on the Madison campus, and they were married in 1962. Shortly thereafter, he joined the staff of National Review.

#### OPENSPIRING OF DISSIDENT

What is the purpose of Rally? The following is excerpted from a "Statement of Purpose" by the editors in the magazine's introductory issue:

"We seek no patent to improve society except to the extent that we are able to improve ourselves, and to the extent our success in doing so persuades others to do likewise.

"We do not refer to ourselves as participants in a 'movement,' feeling that movements are artificial, nihilist, relentlessly activist and insufferably busybody. We have no marching orders. We build no utopias. We bathe, shave, and wear shoes. 'Revolt' is more descriptive of our shared assumptions, and what we mean by the term is the rising rejection among the younger generation of the contemporary liberal orthodoxy. \* \* \*

"Within the last 10 years or so a great many young people have become dissatisfied with [the] intellectual climate, among whom we count ourselves and virtually everybody who has helped construct this journal. The sum of our dissent has justly been called the 'Revolt on the Campus,' for ours is indeed revolutionary dissent in the sense that it extends to all, or very nearly all, of the prevailing liberal orthodoxy. In a better sense, however, it is restorative, and involves a modern recommitment to traditional values. We rally in defense of the great tradition of the West, and dedicate ourselves to its restoration in our own persons. Those traveling the same road we invite to join us; there are good things to come."

## Uncle Sam Offering a Windfall to Investors

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an article which appeared in the New York Post on April 25, 1966, opposing the President's proposed loan pooling scheme as a "windfall."

The theory of the Post is that the profits of participation purchases will go to institutional investors like banks and insurance companies. The Post feels that the whole thing is tantamount to giving out a "windfall" in exchange for a budget gimmick.

I am inclined to agree. The program certainly is not a "windfall" for taxpayers, who will pay through the nose for this expensive means of Government fundraising, but it may well be a windfall for a select group of large-scale investors. The fat profits to be made helping the President disguise his budget deficit will attract institutional funds that would otherwise go into mortgage lending and other forms of lending that "help the little guy." This program—this institutional "windfall"—will help the "big guy" and hurt the "little guy" who needs cheaper credit.

What amazes me in viewing this whole administration fiscal and monetary chess game is the silence of the self-anointed friends of the "little guy." Where is the voice of the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, so frequently raised in opposition to anything that smacks of profits to the big city bankers? I think that the Post article is right in saying that the administration has made loyalty to deception a test of virtue.

The article follows:

#### UNCLE SAM OFFERING A WINDFALL TO INVESTORS

WASHINGTON, April 25.—There is a multi-million-dollar windfall for private investors in President Johnson's plan to sell shares in Government loans.

Even the "little fellow" with a few thousand dollars to invest will be able to earn an unusually high return on his money at no risk.

If Congress OK's the plan, private lenders could pocket over \$100 million in extra earnings over the next 2 years—courtesy of the taxpayers.

Presumably most of this bonanza will go to large institutional investors—banks, insurance companies, and pension funds.

But the Treasury Department says you can probably get a piece of the action for as little as \$5,000 at your neighborhood bank. There's even talk of lowering the minimum investment to \$1,000.

Your money will earn premium interest—estimated at from a quarter to a half of 1 percent above regular Government funds.

At current interest rates, that means you'd be getting around 5½ percent return or

more on your money, with all the work and worry taken care of by Uncle Sam.

Here's how the plan would work:

The Government holds outstanding loans totaling about \$33 billion it has made to farmers, small businessmen, colleges, students, etc.

The President wants to get rid of some of these loans—partly to make his budget look better, partly to tap unused sources of credit in the private money market.

For a number of years, a few Government agencies—principally the Federal National Mortgage Association—have been selling off loans to private buyers.

Now the President was to expand this plan to cover any of the nearly 100 agencies which lend money to the public.

Instead of each agency selling off its own loans, big batches of them will be lumped together in "pools."

Shares in the pools (called certificates of participation) will be sold to private investors by FNMA, which has experience in this business.

The money will go into the Federal Treasury, cutting down the red ink on L.B.J.'s election-year budget.

#### GOVERNMENT DOES WORK

The actual loans will still belong to the Federal agencies, which will do all the work of collecting payments, foreclosing on defaulters, etc.

Twice a year, interest payments—allied dividends—will go out to holders of the certificates.

The President hopes to sell at least \$4 billion worth of loans in the coming year, and another \$4 billion the year after.

At a one-quarter of 1 percent premium, that would cost the taxpayers about \$44 million over the next 2 years in higher interest payments to private investors.

If the premium runs one-half or three-quarters of 1 percent, the windfall would reach \$88 or even \$132 million, in the first 2 years of the program alone.

Understandably, many Members of Congress are unhappy about the proposal.

Congressional sources said administration lobbyists put on intense pressure for the loan sale plan.

Unless a real revolt develops in Congress, investors will be diving for profit this summer in this new Federal money "pool."

## Reform of Parcel Post Laws

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GALE SCHISLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, many newspapers have taken note of the legislation now being considered by the House Post Office and Civil Service Commission to reform existing parcel post laws.

The Atkinson-Annawan News, Atkinson, Ill., the Galesburg-Register Mail, Galesburg, Ill., and the Moline Dispatch, Moline, Ill., all recently published articles concerning H.R. 12367 which is designed to end illogical limitations placed on the Post Office Department's parcel post handling.

April 26, 1966

In short, section 241 has now been so construed as to fit precisely the action taken by the leaders of the Free D.C. movement—the action of picketing and boycotting Washington merchants in order to force them to support home rule for the District of Columbia. Indeed the identical reasoning used by the Court to sustain the count of an indictment charging interference in the right of Negroes to use public streets and highways could be used to sustain an indictment of Free D.C. leaders who interfere with the right of Washington merchants to put stores on public streets and enjoy the custom of passers-by who wish to shop.

If the Department of Justice does not wish for technical reasons to invoke section 241, I suggest that it follow the method it has sometimes used in the South—that of informal negotiations to persuade local authorities to prosecute on the basis of local statutes. I need hardly tell you that the local authorities in Washington would listen with great respect to representations made by the Department of Justice, inasmuch as they are after all part of the Federal Government and the local U.S. attorney is in fact one of your subordinates. There is a local antiracketeering law which is applicable. I know that it is applicable since the mention of its possible use caused the leaders of the Free D.C. movement to desist from their original intention of collecting money by intimidation. It also caused them to cover up—or rather attempt to cover up—their boycott purpose by confining their public program to mere picketing of merchants who have not declared for home rule, while spreading private instructions to their followers to boycott these merchants.

These superficial modifications do not remove the criminal purpose of the Free D.C. movement or make the movement less subject to criminal prosecution. If the extortion of money is a crime, the extortion of a belief is also a crime. It is even a greater crime, for to paraphrase Shakespeare, he who extorts money extorts trash, while he who extorts beliefs filches a man's good name and his very conscience. The District of Columbia authorities are therefore recreant in their duty when they fail to take action against the picketing and boycott program even in its present form.

I submit, Mr. Attorney General, that the Free D.C. movement has to be stopped in one way or another if we are not going to encourage, by inaction, the subversive trend of transforming government by law into government by mobs and racketeers.

I commend the Department of Justice for its courage and zeal in protecting the civil rights of Negroes. I would commend it still more if it took the lead in protecting the civil rights of all of us.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN GINZBURG.

## Vietnam and Disarmament: A Paradox

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

## MR. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, last week I sent to my constituents a newsletter containing my views on how our Nation's policy regarding South Vietnam is related to the issue of arms control and disarmament.

Under unanimous consent, I include my statement at this point in the RECORD.

**VIETNAM AND DISARMAMENT: A PARADOX**  
(By RONALD BROOKS CAMERON, member, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives)

Unless the most pressing problem facing the human race is resolved during this third of the 20th century—it may well be the last third of the last century for humanity as we have known it.

With the rapid increase in technology and its almost universal application to destruction of fellow humans—there is today no doubt of the validity of Albert Einstein's comment that he had no idea what weapons would be used in a third world war but he knew the weapons in the fourth world war—"sticks and stones."

#### TOTAL WEAPONS CONTROL

To my mind, the objective of complete and total world control of nuclear weapons and ultimately all aggressive weapons should be the prime objective of our foreign policy, as well as the first order of each of the other 130 sovereign states of this earth.

Surely there is no question but that foreign policy must be based on that hackneyed phrase "enlightened self-interest." Hackneyed though it be, this phrase has acquired new urgency as a result of our rapidly increasing technology. Enlightened is the key word that has taken on this urgency—because of the technological advances in communications that were designed primarily for war but, thankfully, have collateral civilian benefits.

When it is possible to have instantaneous worldwide communications of voice, and soon of picture, it is obvious to all that it is not possible to keep secrets. When Russia makes a soft landing on the moon and England manages to secure all of the photographic benefits of the landing, is there any doubt that there are no secrets? That all mankind is fast becoming totally interdependent?

#### MANY PROBLEMS FACE US

In attempting to bring about arms control, there are myriads of practical problems—but the most serious of all of these problems is coming to a resolution in part because of the world's increased ability to communicate.

There is an old political joke about the public official being out front of his constituents just far enough to be leading and not so far that he is being chased.

This increased ability for leaders of each country to communicate with their constituents is making it possible for them to lead more rapidly—to get further in front—because of the ease with which the necessity to move can be explained—and understood.

Though progress toward arms control has been precious little, a world climate has been created in a few short years that makes it possible for world leaders to publicly discuss the subject without being subjected to the type of abuse and ridicule that was heaped upon the late Adlai Stevenson following his H bomb testing speech in October of 1956, a speech in which he said:

"It is no accident that the instinct of survival which is common to all men and all nations is slowly but surely compelling the most practical and hardheaded statesmen to give increasing heed to the prevention and abolition of war. In this nuclear age peace is no longer merely a visionary ideal, it has become an urgent and practical necessity," and "Effective disarmament means universal disarmament—an open world, with no secret armies, no secret weapons, and, in effect, no military secrets. Responsible statesmen do not risk the security of their countries for hopes which may prove illusory or promises that are worthless."

There were not many responsible statesmen on this issue in 1956. Those of us who remember that speech of October 15, can also remember the hue and cry that went up around the country—accusing Stevenson of being everything from an ivory-towered idealist to a Benedict Arnold.

But look at the situation only 10 years later. Once Stevenson brought the issue out for all to see—once frank and open discussion was encouraged by communication media around the world—once the responsible statesmen had a forum from which to discuss the issue, they have been able to convince their constituencies of the validity of nuclear arms control. Today, only 10 years since that speech, all but 15 nations of this earth have made a partial commitment to this concept by affixing their names to the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Agreement.

Of the 15<sup>1</sup> who have not signed—8<sup>2</sup> are not members of the U.N.—and they are all of limited significance save for 3—the same 3 who are the principal protagonists in South Vietnam—the Peoples Republic of China, North Vietnam, and France.

It must be kept foremost in our thinking on the subject that though 116 nations have taken this limited step towards a rejection of force in the settlement of international disputes—their primary motivation for taking such a step must have been survival. Their continued commitment to this agreement and commitment for further steps toward the objective of total disarmament must of necessity be predicated on the same motivation—but to secure such commitments there must be credibility that they will not only survive as humans but as nations.

During the transition period, which may well take several decades, that they will not be consumed by a war of national liberation.

#### COMMITMENT BY EISENHOWER

One can, and most have, argued the validity of the actions and commitments of the Eisenhower administration to the country of South Vietnam. Our original "dog in the manger" attitude re the Geneva Accords on French Indochina, the subsequent failure to hold elections, de Gaulle's "execution" of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in a fit of personal pique—as a spoil sport. Former Senator William Knowland's personal commitment to Chiang Kai-shek that helped drive Red China to bandit status. All of these things have been and should be debated, for hopefully we will learn from our past blunders. But during this debate we must be careful not to delude ourselves into believing that we can turn back the clock—we must recognize the realities of today.

Most of these acts happened prior to October 1956, when Stevenson opened the eyes of mankind, and all of them happened prior to the limited nuclear test ban agreement.

#### FORCE MUST BE REJECTED

Today the vital issue facing us is: how do we build on that limited agreement? How do we keep faith that force as a resolution of international disputes must be rejected and that those who so reject force need not fear for survival—either from nuclear pollution or wars of national liberation?

Surely we are not credible if we now turn our back in South Vietnam and allow the country to be consumed by terrorist invaders. As former President Eisenhower recently said, this would be giving "sanctuary to those responsible for sending guerrilla forces and supplies into South Vietnam in the effort to impose their will on the government and people of that country."

Retreat could well precipitate a repeat performance in Thailand, Korea, Indonesia, and possibly the Philippines—not to mention at least a half dozen countries in Africa and a similar number in South America.

<sup>1</sup> Nonsignatories of limited nuclear test ban: Albania, Andora,\* Bhutan, Cambodia, Congo, Cuba, France, Guinea, Lichtenstein,\* Monaco,\* Oman and Masquat,\* Saudi Arabia, Peoples Republic of China,\* North Korea,\* North Vietnam.\*

<sup>2</sup> Countries marked with asterisks above are not members of the United Nations.

April 26, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2255

There is undoubtedly a role to be played by Federal grants-in-aid. But assuming, as we do here, that the Federal Government should finance a larger share of total governmental expenditures, there is much to be said for taking a close look at the alternative ways in which it might achieve this end.

One such alternative is Federal assumption of functions that are now in the hands of State and local authorities. But in the face of wide diversity of local needs and tastes across the country, there are probably very few functions or subfunctions that are appealing or appropriate candidates for this treatment. Those that are involve services with very large "spillover" effects—services that do not readily benefit the taxpayers of any one State. This will frequently explain why some services are not provided at all, or are provided inadequately. It undoubtedly goes far to explain the failure of the States to take appropriate action to prevent the pollution of the Great Lakes or the Ohio River, for example. In cases of this kind, there may be no reasonable way to get a job done that everyone seems to agree should be done except by having the Federal Government do it.

Another means of providing financial assistance to the States that has frequently been advocated involves Federal relinquishment of tax sources and their use by the States. The tax on local telephone service has been a favorite candidate for this role. With its repeal by the Federal Government as of the beginning of this year, it will be interesting to see how much of the one-half billion dollars of its yield will in fact be taken up by the States. As a discriminatory tax on consumption and a tax on business costs, there is little to commend it; our overall tax system will not be improved if it should be replaced by comparable State taxes. Other candidates are similarly unpromising and, generally, less likely to yield significant revenues. Moreover, like the tax on local telephone service, they would mostly help those States that are least in need of assistance.

A third alternative is the allowance of a credit against Federal income taxes for State or local taxes paid. This device would help only the taxpayer immediately and directly, but, it is argued, it would enable the States to impose additional taxes in the amount of the credits allowed without adding to the net tax liabilities of taxpayers. Because the amount of sales tax paid by any one taxpayer is extremely difficult to ascertain, and because of the likelihood that renters as well as owners bear property taxes, the only attractive prospect for the credit is in the income tax. But 16 States do not impose general individual income taxes, and some of them are constitutionally prohibited from doing so. In addition, the tax credit device would aid the richest States most and the poorest States least—and, in this sense at least, would appear to entail an inefficient use of Federal funds. Furthermore, there seems to be nothing to be gained through an approach under which the States impose taxes so that they may, in turn, be "forgiven" by the Federal Government.

This brings us to the most recently advocated form of Federal financial assistance to the States—the so-called Heller plan, named for Walter W. Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. One of its most attractive features is its basic simplicity. The Federal Government would distribute to the States each year an amount equal to a specified percentage of the Federal individual income tax base—taxable income reported by all individuals. One variant of the plan would simply divide the total distributable sum among the States according to population. At current levels of taxable income, 2 percent would provide \$5 billion, or approximately \$25 per capita.

Some would attach no strings whatsoever to State use of the funds, while others would require that they be spent on a rather wide range of functions or that they not be spent for such generously aided ones as highways.

The plan has several major pluses. Unlike conditional grants-in-aid, its budget-distorting influence would either be offsetting or nonexistent. The amount to be distributed would grow at least as rapidly as the economy as a whole, and probably considerably faster. Thus it would provide a source of revenue that is more likely to keep pace with rising expenditures than existing sources. And a minimum (perhaps equal to the prior year's amount) could be built in to insure against cyclical downswings. The equal per capita form of this unconditional Federal grant would have some equalizing influence among the States because, for example, \$25 is a larger proportion of per capita income in Alabama or Mississippi, say, than it is in Connecticut or Delaware.

At several points one may take issue with the Heller plan as thus far presented. But it is a flexible plan which can be modified easily to meet most objections. Clearly, for example, if \$5 billion per year (growing at about 6 to 7 percent annually) is thought inadequate, the 2 percent figure can readily be raised to 3, or 4, or any other percent that is consistent with the fiscal position of the Federal Government, its objectives of economic growth and stability, and the needs of State-local governments. Similarly, it would involve only a modest increase in complexity to provide a built-in penalty against those States putting forth relatively little fiscal effort and to provide more interstate equalization of fiscal capacity than would be achieved through equal per capita grants.

Fiscal effort could be taken into account by multiplying the basic per capita figure by the ratio of State-local tax collections in each State as a percentage of income received in the State to the same percentage for the United States as a whole. A State which responded to the receipt of Federal subsidy by cutting its taxes would be penalized by having that subsidy reduced. Similarly, fiscal capacity, as measured by income received in the State, could be built into the formula.

With the suggested modifications, the Heller plan appears to meet the objections that are raised against the alternatives. Under present circumstances, it has far more appeal than a further reduction in Federal taxes, or it may be coupled with a smaller reduction than would otherwise be warranted; it would be likely to meet needs more urgently requiring attention than those that might be met through an equivalent increase in Federal expenditures; and it does not suffer from the disadvantages of expansion of the already unwieldy structure of conditional grants-in-aid.

It is no secret that a Presidential task force headed by Joseph Pechman of the Brookings Institution reported favorably on an undisclosed version of the Heller plan last year and that its report has not been released to the public. Obviously, the plan was not viewed favorably by key Presidential advisers. One can only speculate on the essence of their objections.

Perhaps it was because of reluctance on the part of Washington bureaucrats, to see Federal funds distributed to the States whose spending they (the bureaucrats) would not supervise. Perhaps it was because influential Washingtonians outside of the Government object to their loss of influence vis-a-vis their counterparts in the State capitals. Some may be reluctant to make more Federal funds available at this time to State officials and legislative bodies whose behavior on civil rights issues has been objectionable.

Others are concerned about the possibility that the larger cities would be shortchanged by the States. Whatever the facts of the

matter may be, it seems clear that the Heller plan has yet to be examined on its intrinsic merits.

### The Civil Rights of Many Washington Merchants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to insert in the Record a letter I received recently from a constituent of mine which contains some very interesting observations he has made as to how the Attorney General might protect the civil rights of many Washington merchants who are presently being intimidated and threatened with reprisals if they do not agree to support a specific type of home rule legislation. The letter shows that actions taken by the Department of Justice in other areas of the country on the basis of Federal statutes could be applied with equal vigor in protecting these merchants.

The letter follows in full:

ARLINGTON, VA.,

April 2, 1965.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,  
Attorney General of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On February 22 I wrote you concerning the activities of the Free D.C. movement as announced in the press, and pointed out that these activities constituted an open conspiracy to deprive Washington merchants of the enjoyment of their civil rights. I suggested that the Department of Justice take action similar to that which it has taken in regard to activities of Southern whites interfering with the civil rights of Negroes.

On March 16 I received a reply signed by an assistant to Assistant Attorney John Dear and stating that the information I have furnished "does not disclose the violation of a Federal criminal statute," and that therefore the Justice Department "has no authority to take any action in the matter."

I have before me the Supreme Court decisions of March 28 in the Price and Guest cases, and these decisions show that the Department of Justice has been using a Reconstruction statute (18 U.S.C. 241) to bring to justice southern whites conspiring to interfere with the civil rights of Negroes. It seems to me that the same statute is applicable to the openly confessed concerted action of the leaders of the Free D.C. movement to intimidate Washington merchants and interfere with the enjoyment of their civil rights.

The opinions of the Supreme Court in these cases hold that section 241 is applicable to conspiracies by private individuals not connected with conspiracies by public officials to interfere with the enjoyment of civil rights. They also hold that the rights involved include all rights protected by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, not merely those rights which are conferred by or "flow from" the Federal Government. Finally they hold that conspiracies by private persons to interfere in the enjoyment of civil rights can be prosecuted "whether or not motivated by racial discrimination."

April 26, 1966

A257

And what of Europe? De Gaulle now has NATO in convulsive death throes as a result of his failure to sign the test ban agreement and his determination to have an "independent nuclear capability." Wouldn't our retreat from South Vietnam force West Germany to reconsider her commitment to disarmament? Wouldn't she question our commitment to her defense—and probably decide that she too needed "independent nuclear capability"?

And what of Russia? Is she capable of "eating crow"? That is what China would make her do. China would announce to the world that she was right and Russia was wrong—the United States was in fact a "paper tiger." To save face, would Russia have to move on Berlin?

The United States has many unique aspects—but one of them is not demagoguery. Each country has its Robert Welches of the right and its Robert Scheers of the left. Our capitulation in South Vietnam would bring them to the fore in each country of this earth and they could well force many world leaders to retreat from the limited progress we have made toward disarmament. These leaders would have to come closer to their emotionally charged constituents or run the very probable chance of being so far out in front that they are being "chased."

As distasteful as our involvement in South Vietnam is to all Americans—when the realities of today are recognized—it seems obvious that of the options available to us now—capitulation and withdrawal, retreat to enclaves, uncontrolled escalation, or continuation of our policy of measured response—only the latter one serves what should be our primary foreign policy objective—disarmament.

## The Need for a New Federalism

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article on the present Federal-State-local government relationships, by a former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Robert Taft, Jr. This article appeared in the April 1966 issue of *Washington World*:

#### THE NEED FOR A NEW FEDERALISM

(By Robert Taft, Jr.)

Rich uncle's handouts to the children rarely help to build a happy family. This remains true even when the child has grown to adulthood and responsibility. Can the increasingly direct role of Central Government in the community life and local governments of America expect any better result? This is what the debate over the "New Federalism" is all about. The answer points up a basic difference between the thinking of the Republican and Democratic parties.

The future of our governmental framework, which has been based traditionally upon the States, hangs in the balance. In the end, the decision seems unlikely to be resolved by reestablishment of complete State hegemony over its local governmental offspring. More likely, and predicted by some, is the decline of the State to a vestigial organ. But with ingenuity and intelligence we may work out other solutions.

Our society, built as it is upon our Federal structure, stands to change with it. Why should we be concerned with the change? A review of the beginnings and development

of American federalism may help provide an answer.

The root of the word, "Federal" can help dispel misconceptions about its present implications. It stems from "fides," the Latin word for faith, and thus defining a compact between States which retain their internal independence. In America, its corruption began early with the "Federalist Party" as one favoring stronger Central Government, as contrasted to the compact approach of the Articles of Confederation. Its corruption took another big step in the Civil War, with the forces of the Union being known as "The Federals." Today to most of us, "Federal" when applied to Government, is all but synonymous with "Central" or "National." Perhaps we are conditioned most vividly to what it means when we face this "Federal" income tax month each year.

In its origin, our Government was Federal in the true sense of binding together by the Constitution colonies of diverse history, interests, and aspirations, yet reserving to each and its people the nondelegated powers. More than the historical and geographical considerations were involved. A chief motivation of the Federation was to build and guarantee a system of Government under which there would be built-in safeguards for individual rights and freedoms. This was done through limiting the power of national government by clearly prescribing its scope of authority and thus assuring that it would be responsive to the desires of those governed. The separation of powers was one means adopted. But equally important was the retention and definition of a truly federal system, with the separate tiers of National, State, and local government. Thus, at each level, the people, through an elective process guaranteed as a "republican form of government," could demand responsiveness and call to account.

Today, the concept thus established is constantly tested by greater strains. Revolutionary change in population, communication, transportation, and technology have all combined to require a broader role of Government. This is true both as to services and as to laws to regulate increasingly complex relationships of people. Confusion, or lack of concern, as to the wisest allocation of new responsibilities of Government has sometimes resulted in chance decisions as to the appropriate level for new programs. More often, availability of financial resources and political realities have made the decision. Our increased role in world affairs, availability of Federal revenues from the income tax, unlimited borrowing power, the rigidity of State constitutions, malapportioned State legislatures, and the more direct and effective communication of the Chief Executive and national officials with the electorate have all combined to channel much of governmental growth to the Central Government.

#### DIRECT ACTION

For many problems, direct central action has been inevitable and logical. For instance, interstate commerce and communications, an agriculture program, veterans affairs, antitrust legislation, national labor relations, and social security could hardly have been dealt with effectively otherwise.

In a number of other areas, such as workmen's compensation and higher education, the States have taken responsibility and have acted. In others, such as public education, local and State units combined to strive to meet expanding needs and provide services. In other fields, the pattern that has developed has been one of national initiation and policy determination implemented through the States down to the local level of final impact. Typical of this approach have been the unemployment compensation program, national health programs like Kerr-Mills, the categorical welfare programs such as aid to dependent children and aid for the aged, the

interstate highway program, and manpower development and training, to name a few. In those the degree of Federal financing and control of standards has varied. But this "grant-in-aid" approach has at least observed the original framework of the Federal system and kept some order in the National-State-local relationship. By doing so, it retained at least some control and participation by the State through its executive and elected officials. But let's admit that, even so, the tendency of the grant-in-aid system has been to drift toward increased financing, standard setting and control from the national level, accompanied by a shedding of responsibility at the State level. This is the tendency of the proposal we see in unemployment compensation, for instance, H.R. 8282, presently pending in Congress, would move toward depriving the States of the right to set qualifications for eligibility. It would all but do away with the merit-rating-for-employers concept that has been a key to the success and financial stability of many State systems.

An approach to check this trend for a field such as education and welfare has recently been suggested by a Republican task force. The task force suggestion has been endorsed in principle by the Republican Coordinating Committee. It proposes to limit further expansion of the specific grant-in-aid concept and institute new functional grants for general fields of expenditure. Defining the function only in general terms, the proposal suggests also broader grants from the national budget to the States, using an equalization formulation and prohibiting use of the funds only in programs discriminating on account of race. Admittedly, present spending attitudes, immediate military requirements and other economic factors may raise feasibility questions as to the proposals at this time, but a national budgetary priority for such grants, after national security, might be established. On the whole, it seems more likely to be feasible and considered favorably than the alternatives of turning back revenue sources to the States, or further State tax credits against Federal taxes. Even the Johnson administration appeared to so feel with regard to the Heller-Peckman proposal until opposition mobilized from Mr. Meany of the AFL-CIO and other centralistic forces. No more has been heard since.

#### A NEW PARTNERSHIP?

But the most serious recent threats to the federal system do not lie in the areas already discussed. Rather, they are implanted and spreading in the concept of what HUBERT HUMPHREY and others have called the New Federalism. As described, it is to be a new partnership of the National Government with local subdivisions of government, the cities, the counties, the school districts, and other local authorities. Omitted entirely from the picture would be the State government. Often the elected body in the city or county or school district may likewise be bypassed by a contractual financing arrangement between Washington and an appointed or ad hoc group of one kind or another. The exotic cell in such arrangements is the independence, through a source of national funds, created in the local unit so financed. It is no longer required to turn to its parent government or community for required support. Nor need it continue to merit support in the local electorate. It is an independent and going piece of machinery that answers only to the source of its funds. Let's look at a few specific examples.

The poverty program is a classic one. Agreeing as we all do with making more meaningful the American principle of equality of opportunity, we must still recognize that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity has life-or-death control over every facet of the poverty program. He may contract, or refuse to contract, for the serv-

ies with any governmental or private non-profit group he desires. The contractor could be any type of organization other than a political party. It could be a labor union. It could be a local school board. It could be a newly formed private organization set up only for that purpose. The Governor (with a meaningless veto that can be vetoed by the OEO Director), the State legislature, the city council, the school board, the county commissioners, and the established local health and welfare councils have little or no say. Though they may be consulted in some cases, they need not be. For instance, organizations such as settlement houses supported by Community Chest and local government grants in the past have thus been subject to local assessment of validity of program. Now, they find their funds coming mostly from Washington. Naturally they will now dance to the tune that is played there. Confusion, competition, and duplication can mushroom under such circumstances. And the recourse of the citizen affected if he is not satisfied with the performance shifts also from his own locality or State to the Nation's Capital. The only way he can be felt is by his vote for President or for the Congress.

Other fields, such as transportation and housing, have very similar considerations. Local building codes, zoning restrictions, and city planning must meet the tests set by the various national authorities or be excluded from participation in the distribution of Federal funds. Often there is no recourse from a denial of such funds.

The new medicare bill, however much we may have felt there was a need for such help, puts almost unrestricted authority in HEW to determine the criteria for hospitals and nursing homes to qualify to receive payments under the program. How far these regulations will go at the outset remains to be determined, but very conceivably they could extend to professional qualifications of staff, kinds of medications prescribed, as well as the facilities provided. Again, the recourse for those who disagree will not be at the level of the community, the local government, or even the State capital.

In education, while the acceptance of the broad Federal aid program is up to the district, the National Commissioner has been reserved the right to establish criteria. At the outset these may be acceptable to local school authorities. But it is difficult to picture a school board with one-third or more of its budget coming from this source dropping participation in the future because of disagreement with a new or expanded requirement from the Commissioner. Again, if there is disagreement, the recourse, if any, lies only in Washington.

The citizen may think that this is a matter of indifference as far as he, John Doe, is concerned. He has enough problems of his own. Many have given up on the idea that government can be efficient, economical, and run by people who are truly concerned with the kind of conditions under which he and his children live and will live in the future. He has reason, Heaven knows, to feel this way. It is true that to increase the effectiveness of officeholders running your business after you elect them to a position where they have the power to do so, you should be able to expect them to do a good job. The local community or State can stay master of the situation by retaining the power to be able to check up on elected officers and unseat them if they do not do a good job or tend to go in the wrong direction. But who among us can fire a commissioner on education appointed by the President of the United States? Who among us can tell a commissioner of education, obscurely sitting behind a desk in Washington, that we do or do not want our children to learn about sex in the schoolroom, for instance, or dancing, or to allow fraternities and sororities to form there? We can tell our school boards today. But should economic dependence of our

schools turn from the community to Washington, our voice will be weakened, as the only weapon a citizen has against abuse through big money, whether it is in business, union, or government, is his ability to be able to oust the critter who is causing the trouble, or strengthen the officials whose positions he trusts and approves of. When the money comes not directly from us, but indirectly through our taxes paid to the central government, it is that government and not we who will make such decisions.

#### REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE

And the real difficulty with all of these developments insofar as the Federal system is concerned is that State and local responsibility and concern evaporates when the financial support and control move elsewhere. The Secretaries of HEW and HUD become the co-mayors of Main Street, U.S.A. The level of local responsibility drops, interest wanes, and the caliber of local officials deteriorates. It could be that from the point of view of efficiency and dispatch of public programs in our multiple communities, communications, and computer techniques are now so developed that the State and local governments could become surpluseage. This is highly doubtful. But even were it so, we have to take stock that such a change would have effects upon our society that would be revolutionary and unfavorable. We may be ready to accept them, but again, it's very doubtful.

As noted at the outset the Federal system was adopted at least in part to provide a check, or a series of checks, upon the power of government. The purpose of these checks was to build and promote individual liberty and equality of opportunity. Our past success toward these goals we sought is testified to by the growth and strength of our Nation. We have, through our private enterprise system, encouraged and protected by government, mobilized the energy, imagination, and capability of our people as individuals better than any other nation in the world. Checks upon abuse of government power have been a significant factor in this success. Should we abandon them now, particularly with the increased scope of government at all levels, we risk losing the wellspring of American progress, our free society. Centralized control and the rigid hand of national bureaucracy can stifle initiative and demoralize the Nation. We have been moving in that dangerous direction in many fields. We must turn from it and seek a new approach that will strengthen, not weaken, State and local governments. They must be made responsive to new problems. They must have available the means of financing those programs of government that can best be handled at their respective levels. Where, as must be true in many cases, they work in partnership with national government, we should insist upon safeguards that prevent Washington's domination and provide the recourse of a day in court for the offended. There is a desperate need for such a "new federalism." It should be in the tradition of our Federal Union, designed to give the people a louder and clearer voice in their government at all levels. It should promote, not infringe upon, human liberty.

### Horton Recognizes National Library Week

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK HORTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week, April 17-23, we celebrated National Library Week, a nationwide operation de-

signed to encourage reading and the use of libraries. The observance was in its 9th year of sponsorship by the American Library Association and the National Book Committee, two distinguished non-profit organizations.

One of the most important areas of library growth is in our Nation's public schools. The support given a schoolchild by a school library and an enthusiastic librarian is vital, especially for children from a deprived background—a fact recognized by Congress in the passage last year of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I am proud to say that the city of Rochester, N.Y., with a population of over 300,000, has a library and a librarian in each of its secondary schools—and 3 of these schools have 2 librarians apiece. Although there are no librarians or librarians in the 45 elementary schools, every classroom has its collection of books whose total value comes to \$3 a child—and an increase has been requested for next year.

Next year, moreover, there will be libraries, and librarians to go with them, in four elementary schools—three of them supported by title I funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

While I am discussing library services in Rochester, I might add that the city is noted for its contributions to the fields of library science and services. The Eastman Kodak Co. particularly has added greatly to the field of documentation by developing microreproduction systems, and the Xerox Corp. is actively exploring the field of teaching machines which can have great bearing on the future of school libraries.

As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, however, I have had occasion to contrast the school library situation here in Washington with that in my home area. Much has been done; much remains. The contrast is strongest in the allocation of money for library books: This Capital City of well over 800,000 can provide only 50 cents worth of books for every elementary child, and \$1 worth on the junior and senior high school level. The city has sought to double both these allocations in fiscal 1967. Combined with funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, granting of this request would put the schools within hailing distance of those in Rochester—and all would still fall short of the ALA standards of an investment of \$4 to \$6 per student in library books.

Not only books but people count—trained, friendly librarians to show a child how to unlock the storerooms of knowledge. Although Washington's secondary schools now have one or more librarians apiece, about 50 of our elementary schools still have no central library facilities and no professional or voluntary library personnel. Their library books are dispersed, for want of staff, among the classrooms or packed away in storage.

For fiscal 1967 the city proposes to add 21 more elementary school librarians to the 43 now employed. This will still leave over half the elementary schools without librarians. These are primarily the smaller, older schools in the central area, so crowded with children that they