

19112

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 18, 1966

Rep. HANLEY said Congressional action is needed because "New York went way beyond the intent of Congress." One of his amendments would require a person to be able to qualify for Federal public housing, under the yardstick of that law, in order to be eligible for medicaid; "Why employ a double standard?" he commented.

The second Hanley amendment would add a deductibility clause along the lines of that proposed by JAVITS.

Rep. HANLEY noted that concern is intense in the Syracuse area, and commended your association for its active role there.

Reflecting downstate opposition were the comments of Democrats OTIS G. PIKE (Riverhead, L.I.), LESTER L. WOLFF (Great Neck, L.I.), and ABRAHAM J. MULTER (Brooklyn) and HERBERT TENZER (Lawrence, L.I.).

Said Rep. PIKE: "The New York legislature went hog wild; it went ape. There was a lack of realization in the legislature as to what it was doing. The New York standards allow eligibility for those with money, and create dangers for those without money who are in real need.

"The amendments enacted later were good ones, but did not go far enough to return the implementation statute to a reasonable level. If it is determined that HEW does not have discretionary authority to act to curb the New York law, and I believe it is questionable whether HEW has this authority, then it is incumbent on Congress to amend the Federal law so as to offer guidelines to prevent the recurrence of such circumstances in the future."

Noting that he had serious questions regarding the income limit provisions of the New York law, Rep. WOLFF said that "changes in the Federal law might be indicated," inasmuch as the New York law obviously does not reflect the intent of Congress.

Rep. TENZER, although he wants to see what HEW does with respect to the New York law, also felt that Federal amendments should be enacted to establish guidelines to prevent future action "contrary to the original intent of Congress." The New York income standards defining "medically indigent are too high and should be revised."

"New York must amend its law further, or we must take steps to amend the Federal law," Rep. MULTER declared.

But downstater BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL (D., Elmhurst, L.I.) said that "I support the New York law as it is now."

Rep. SEYMOUR HALPERN (R., Forest Hills, L.I.) said "I like the New York law the way it is."

Rep. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM (D., Bronx) voiced the opinion that the New York problem has been "exaggerated."

Buffalo Rep. THADDEUS J. DULSKI (D.), supporting legislation along the lines of the amendments proposed by Sen. JAVITS and Rep. STRATTON, said action should be taken this session to provide needed adjustments to shore up the "too many open ends" left by Title XIX.

Rep. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK (D., Ellenville), whose voice was one of the earliest to be raised against the New York law, continued to emphasize the need for Federal action, cited as one supporting argument that "in one of my counties, 90 percent of the population would have been eligible for medicaid under the original New York law." Ways and Means Committee chairman Mills, he pointed out, must be looked to if action is to be initiated.

A senior Democrat, LEO W. O'BRIEN (Albany) expressed the view that the New York law, by "placing the eligibility levels unrealistically high, in effect creates a new class of exaggerated indigency. The political impact of the New York law is imponderable. The New York legislature rushed in legally under existing law without knowl-

edge or giving recognition to the ultimate cost impact. The cost could be astronomical. The cost must be defined, so we must set cost limits graded on a state-by-state basis.

"The New York law amounts to a handout for everybody in lieu of personal responsibility; its impact will be particularly adverse to private insurance plans," he said.

Republican HOWARD W. ROBISON (Oswego) concurred with this line of reasoning, and said that "Congress must review and clarify its intent under Title XIX, and also should review the need for writing some restrictive guidelines into Title XIX—perhaps setting some maximum income limitations and controls over 'resources' that the states would have to follow in determining their eligibility standards, and giving consideration, too, to the need for a 'deductible' clause in every state plan in order to prevent abuse thereunder and to encourage all persons who can do so to continue to carry their own basic health-insurance protection."

One other leading upstate Republican, who requested anonymity, said that he and most of his colleagues are "aghast at the implications of the New York law. Title XIX, as implemented in New York, reverses the normal approach of encouraging people to meet their own expenses to the extent possible. It will have an adverse impact on private insurance plans.

"There is no question that Congress must act, and the insurance industry and other affected businesses and professions should start a fire to overcome current inertia if they want action now."

AL GOLDSMITH.

WESTMORELAND MESSAGE: COURAGE ADDRESSED TO VICTORY

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in view of the outrageous spectacle which has been occurring almost daily this week on Capitol Hill, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the August 16 edition of the Nashville Banner which is a direct and far more representative expression of national public opinion than the handful of irresponsible so-called Communists and radical leftists which have disgraced themselves and attempted to disgrace our Nation.

The editorial is entitled "Westmoreland's Message: Courage Addressed to Victory." I commend it to the attention and thoughtful consideration of every Member of the House:

WESTMORELAND'S MESSAGE: COURAGE ADDRESSED TO VICTORY

Resolute Americanism is more than words. It's the conduct, the courage, the strength and skill—in short, the character—of a Nation. And nobody better personifies it than America's sons in uniform; the fighting team of which Gen. William C. Westmoreland was speaking in assurances given to President Johnson, and through him to the whole constituency, that these forces "will not be defeated by the Communists in Viet Nam."

The weekend consultations in Texas were in order. They provided him the opportunity not only to review with the Commander-in-Chief the progress of that war, but to express personally the conclusions therein reached; and to take back with him reciprocal assurances to his men that the nation stands with them. As the Chief Ex-

ecutive stated it, the message is that "their determination and courage in Viet Nam will be matched by a dedicated resolve and support here at home."

That spirit of unity entails provision of whatever it takes to win this war. It is precisely what The Banner repeatedly has said must mark the nation's total response, to wind up this conflict in victory in the shortest time possible. Military realism decrees it, unencumbered by policy-sniping shenanigans which stab our fighting men in the back and lead to Free World disaster via appeasement or defeat.

General Westmoreland and his men are there to win. They were sent for that—and nothing less would have justified their mission and sacrifices to date.

With the candor of one who knows the score, he entertains no illusions of easy victory. He does not rest his conclusions on dime-a-dozen rumors, nor couch his report in guesswork. He deals in fact; and the fact is progress toward victory—with that objective attainable, given the full support which it is the right of these American sons to ask and expect.

He confirmed their qualities: "They are a credit to America and our society. Their mothers and their wives can be truly proud of their attitude, their courage, their understanding of the situation, their compassion, their integrity, and their endurance."

A soldier's soldier can appreciate those attributes on the firing-line—possessed, to a man, on the team he commands. They have not failed America on the front to which they were sent, and America must not fail them on the home front.

EIGHT TENNESSEE NATIONAL GUARDSMEN

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 7, 1966, a tragic accident claimed eight Tennessee National Guardsmen.

These men were members of Part Company A, 1st Bn(M), 117th Infantry of Greeneville, Tenn.

Mr. Speaker, these men were on military duty at the time of their death and were serving their Nation as are our men around the globe.

There is little that can be said to comfort their families and loved ones but I believe, and I am sure all will agree, they gave their lives for their country just as our men are giving their lives in Vietnam.

As recognition of and as a tribute to their sacrifice I would like to place the names of these Tennesseans in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Pfc. Jimmy L. Kenney, NG 25-345-073 (age 23). Wife, Dawn H. Kenney, 222 Lake Street, Greeneville, Tenn.

Pfc. Ronnie J. Cox, NG 25-345-089 (age 23). Father, J. C. Cox, 1414 North Main Street, Greeneville, Tenn.

Sp4c. Harold L. Smith, NG 25-345-054 (age 23). Wife, Gaynelle S. Smith, Route 4, Greeneville, Tenn.

Sp4c. Cody W. Erwin, NG 25-345-044 (age 25). Wife, Carol C. Erwin, Route 1, Mosheim, Tenn.

Sp4c. Harry E. Gass, NG 25-345-037 (age 26). Father, George B. Gass, Route 6, Greeneville, Tenn.

August 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19111

Cohen, in the face of critical questioning by ANDERSON, acknowledged that the cost of the Title XIX program will be higher than estimated, "regardless of the specific [reimbursement] principles adopted, because Congress wrote into Title XIX that the states must pay the same reasonable costs for hospital care as it provided under Title XVIII. And as you know, the states, on the whole, have been paying only a fraction of the reasonable costs. There is no question in my mind that whatever the estimates are for Title XVIII, the costs are appreciably going to increase, both Federal and state costs under Title XIX. I don't know the estimate, Senator, but I do agree that it will be appreciable."

WILLIAMS at that time unsuccessfully tried to elicit a firm estimate of the ten-year cost of Title XIX if it is implemented in its entirety by the 50 states.

WILLIAMS noted then that increased Federal costs under the eight state programs already approved at that time were estimated at \$250-\$260 million, as against the original HEW estimates of an extra \$238 million in the first fully operative year of the Title XIX program.

On this basis, he commented, "you have a multibillion-dollar error in your estimated cost of this proposal. And that concerns me."

Cohen agreed that, depending on the scope of the state programs, the Federal cost could exceed \$1 billion a year.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee, with a few exceptions who have not yet given careful study to the issue and therefore are unwilling to comment, are in general agreement that the New York law has spotlighted a serious problem that for the most part was overlooked during consideration of the omnibus social security bill, and that some action must be taken at the Federal level.

There is, however, some divergence of opinion as to the urgency of the problem; some feel action should be taken now, others would prefer to watch future developments at HEW, to give the matter more study, and perhaps wait until next year before reaching a decision on which direction to take.

Rep. CECIL R. KING (D., Calif.), second-ranking majority member and principal sponsor of Medicare, said the revelations of the New York law "caught us all by surprise," and therefore he has no firm opinions on just how the problem should be resolved. He emphasized, however, that this is a "matter of concern with which the Committee will have to deal."

This uncertainty as to the best approach was reflected by several other members of the Committee, who also conceded that they were unaware at the time of the potential implications raised by Title XIX.

Rep. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS (D., Mich.), terming the New York law "utterly unreasonable," said some action must be taken to set an income ceiling or comparable limiting standards, or to provide firm guidelines to be followed by HEW.

Several Democrats were sharply critical of the medical profession, placing responsibility for Title XIX on the doctors' organizations that were pressing for expansion of Kerr-Mills as an alternative to Medicare.

Other top Republicans on the Committee are in agreement with Rep. BYRNES that the issue must be tackled—sooner or later.

Second-ranking Republican THOMAS B. CURRIS (Mo.), who supported the so-called doctor-sponsored "eldercare" advanced as a substitute for Medicare, said that, under Title XIX, "eldercare has been expanded to everybody," and that there was "no realization" of its potentialities—largely because "HEW distorted cost estimates."

The New York law, CURRIS added, "is a fraud, but I don't see how HEW can disprove it." The problem which has arisen,

he commented, is largely a result of rejection by Congress of a "reasonable, rational needs test," and of injecting general revenue financing into the social security structure under Medicare.

Third-ranking Ways and Means Republican JAMES B. UTT (Calif.) suggested that Title XIX might be controlled by prohibiting Federal matching grants in excess of the average industrial wage of each state that submits a program. This approach, he said, would have the effect of lowering the income level in New York eligible for Federal money to the area of \$2600-\$2700.

The great majority of Senate Finance Committee members concur that something must be done, but they too offered varying shades of opinion regarding the urgency of immediate action.

Sen. ANDERSON, despite his expressed concern over the potentialities of Title XIX, is one of those who would prefer to await HEW action on the New York law, to "let things settle down and then, if necessary, do something next year."

ANDERSON also is concerned over the lack of definitive provisions for the funding of depreciation under both Medicare and Title XIX, under the general requirement that providers of medical care services are to be reimbursed for their "reasonable costs." He believes that the amounts providers get for depreciation should be funded, and if used for growth and development, should be disbursed in accordance with a definite and effective plan.

Another high-ranking Democrat, who did not wish to be quoted by name, voiced strong opinions that Title XIX "must be changed. It can destroy the entire program for the aged. We must modify the Federal statute; if the law permits what New York is doing, it could break the whole program."

Another Democratic member of the Committee, while supporting the "wait-and-see approach," said that "we must use common sense and keep income eligibility standards down to a reasonable level. If the states don't use common sense, the Federal Government must step in. The Federal law appears to be such that the New York formula will stand up. If New York revises its statute to bring the limits within reasonable bounds, we should leave it alone, but if it is shown to be unreasonable, then Congress must step in."

Similar views were voiced by Sen. HERMAN E. TALMADGE (D. Ga.), who said that "we never intended poverty levels to be as high as some of those being set by the states. New York State is the most flagrant example. If the states don't take corrective action, Congress must take legislative action."

Sen. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY (D., Minn.), one of the few who said the unlimited possibilities were recognizable at the time the law was passed, also favored a cautious attitude. He cited Minnesota's implementation program as one that is reasonable, but conceded that "we may have to impose some limits in light of the New York law."

Sen. PAUL H. DOUGLAS (D., Ill.) advanced no recommendations as to what action, if any, should be taken, but he outlined these views as to the origins of the issue:

"Title XIX grew out of 'eldercare.' It was the product of the American Medical Association. The income limits in the New York law are the product of Governor Rockefeller. If any abuses develop, they will be the fault of the AMA and Governor Rockefeller."

The Republican members of the Committee agree down the line with Sen. Williams that the problem will require some sort of action to curb the potentialities.

Second-ranking Republican FRANK CARLSON (Kansas) said he is concerned that "other states may take advantage" of the cost loopholes now that New York has shown

them the way. In fact, he noted, he has heard reports that Kansas is contemplating an upward revision of its anticipated benefit schedules.

Sen. CARL T. CURTIS (Nebr.) concurred that "if Title XIX is to be continued, some limits must be attached."

Sen. THRUSTON B. MORTON (Ky.), noting that "we didn't envision the scope of Title XIX," said that "this is a danger we must look into, one that could require amendments to the present law."

The overwhelming sentiment of the New York delegation is anti-Title XIX, anti-New York law, and pro-Federal action.

There is no indication that this sentiment is based to any extent on party lines, although some Republican members contend that Democratic opposition to the New York law has been accentuated by the desire to build up a major campaign issue against Governor Rockefeller.

The small minority groups that favors the status quo is for the most part concentrated in New York City and the outskirts, again without regard to party.

But one powerful key figure—Sen. ROBERT F. KENNEDY—is outspoken in his support of the New York law; his influence cannot be overlooked, even though it is balanced to a large extent by the stand of his Republican colleague, Sen. JACOB K. JAVRS, in support of Federal legislation.

Sen. KENNEDY is on record as favoring the amended New York law, noting that he endorsed the original statute and said earlier that he did not think it should be amended. There should be no Federal legislation, according to Sen. KENNEDY; if experience shows that further changes or cutbacks in the New York law might be advisable, this decision should be left up to the state authorities.

Sen. JAVRS, on the other hand, is taking an active role in seeking prompt Congressional action. He said last week that he intends to maintain pressure on Ways and Means Chairman MILLS, who had just returned from a primary campaign.

Sen. JAVRS said that, at the very least, favorable action on his proposed amendments to Title XIX are needed this session.

These amendments would: eliminate the prohibition against including a deductible feature with regard to hospital bills in a state plan; remove the Federal requirements that income eligibility standards be the same throughout the state, and permit the state to take into account differing costs in geographic regions; and would give the states more flexibility to distinguish between the needs of different classes of aid recipients by repealing the requirement that identical benefits must be made available to all persons who qualify for aid.

Proposals also have been introduced by Rep. SAMUEL S. STRATTON (D., Amsterdam), and by Rep. JAMES M. HANLEY (D., Syracuse).

Under one Stratton amendment, if the eligibility requirements of Title XIX and those of any state-financed program made possible by the Federal program cover more than 20 percent of the state population or persons whose family income is more than 90 percent of average family income the state plan would be disapproved. A second amendment would require a state to demonstrate that its program will not discourage private health and employee insurance programs.

Rep. STRATTON, along with a number of other New York members, stressed their serious concern over the potential adverse impact of the New York law on individual and group health insurance plans.

Rep. STRATTON was not optimistic as to the chances of Congressional action this year, although he feels that HEW will approve the New York law which, he said, has been improved costwise only "slightly" by the recent amendments. It is imperative, he added, that "we set limits."

A4380

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 18, 1966

He is expected to understand, be informed about, and make the wisest decision on upwards of 2,000 bills each session. He is expected to know everything about his own district, nearly everything about the more than 400 other districts in the United States, plus more than 100 countries on every continent of the globe.

"If he makes the right decision, takes the right action, chooses the right course, not a word appears in the newspapers—not a letter comes from home—offering approval, encouragement or gratitude. But, if his teen-age son get a parking ticket, if his wife has her picture made dancing at a Washington party, or if he happens to miss getting his picture made with a delegation from back home, publicity is immediate and his future is cast in doubt.

"Yes, the pay is good for all this—good, until you add up the bills. If he goes to lunch with a delegation of schoolchildren, the congressman is a piker unless he picks up the bill. If he goes to lunch with businessmen and lets them pick up the bill, he is a tool of the vested interests. If he drives an old model automobile, he is a discredit to the district; if he comes home in a new model, constituents wink knowingly at each other and say, See, what'd I tell you—a man doesn't stay honest long in politics.

"The life of the congressman or congresswoman—the life of the senator or the representative—is one of the most demanding and least appreciated in our system and society. If the perquisites and privileges of the offices are many, if the satisfaction of having served the nation is great, the fact remains that for the individual who gives himself in this manner, the life is a lonely life, an harassed life, a thankless life—and a life which often leads the most able men to decide that some other occupation is what they prefer for their families.

"I discuss this here today for one reason. On more occasions than I like to remember, I have sat in audiences such as this listening to speakers tell what is wrong in Washington, what is wrong with Congress, and urging that we write our representative and tell him how the cow ate the cabbage. But I believe that there comes a time when a nation such as ours needs to be reminded—and very much needs to remember—that respect for public office and public officers is essential to the continuing success of our system.

Apart from political parties, apart from political philosophies, apart from "conservatism" or "liberalism," from divisions of "labor" or "business," the attitudes we have long indulged toward public officeholders in this country may be luxuries a mature nation cannot afford.

"If, as I am sure we do, want and expect a society which respects law and order, then we of the business community—we who try to be leaders of our community—ought to realize that it is very important what attitude we reflect toward those who make our laws and try to assure us an orderly, fair, progressive and secure society.

"I do not suggest that Congress would be better if it were filled with businessmen; I know few businessmen—myself included—who could stand the pace, much less do the work as well. We could not, if we tried, make the job of our congressmen soft, but I do suggest we could—and should—do all that we can to make it easier: to share with our representatives more constructive suggestions and fewer caustic slurs; to help them find answers in defense of our way of life instead of threatening their political lives.

"On the caliber and character and competence of our Congress—and the men and women who compose it—rest the answers for us to the age-old choices of mankind. In this world, those jobs will never be soft and

those responsibilities never easy. So, I would conclude by repeating the sage advice of old Champ Clark who once said:

"A man must learn to be a representative or senator, just as he must learn to be a farmer, carpenter, blacksmith, merchant, engineer, lawyer, doctor, preacher, teacher or anything else . . . The best plan for a constituency to pursue is to select a man of good sense, good habits, and perfect integrity, young enough to learn, and re-elect him so long as he retains his faculties and is faithful to his trust."

The Negro in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 18, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a well-deserved accolade for the Negro in Vietnam appeared in an editorial in the Peoria Journal Star on Monday, August 15, 1966. I have unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the RECORD:

THE NEGRO IN VIETNAM

(By C. L. Dancy)

THE DEEDS THEY'RE DOING

There are about 40,000 Negro fighters in Viet Nam, and that is more Negro youth than has been involved in all the troubles from Watts a year ago to those that have made news across the country this summer.

They are not only there doing the job, but the proportion is above average in outfits like the 101st Airborne which is made up of specially qualified volunteers.

It is also clear that whether one talks to officers or private soldiers, whether it is someone commanding some Negroes or operating under a Negro's command, and whether that soldier comes from Illinois or Mississippi—the judgment is the same:

The Negro soldier in Viet Nam is doing an outstanding job.

As some say, "They try harder!"

The number of incidents of record are too numerous to count of Negroes risking their lives to save white comrades, and of white soldiers risking their lives to save Negro comrades.

In the integrated armed forces, these young men know each other, and the fact of race has taken its appropriate place in their relationships—unimportant. It has little or nothing to do with any of the important things in either their jobs or their relationships.

It is part of the total picture that doesn't make much news, because race is not a part of the thing. Everyone is operating as a man not as a Negro or a Caucasian—as an American soldier or as an American Marine.

We have an obligation to take notice that the Negro like any other segment of the population of this country has many "representatives," and we act in both ignorance and in the wrong when we pick of a "bad representative" and choose to view a whole people in that image.

We believe that the soldier who speaks with his actions in treating wounded under fire or in leading white squad members into combat with the enemy speaks louder than the street-corner hell-raiser who makes charges that we should "get out of Viet Nam" or that "Negroes should refuse to fight there."

The simple fact is, also, that there are more Negroes in Vietnam putting their lives on the line for this country and its potentials for them—mostly serving in highly professional volunteer outfits like the paratroopers and Marines—than there are members of SNCC or the Muslims, for example, opposing the war and the Negro role in it!

"And it is certainly easier to shout for SNCC than to face Viet Cong ambushes in the jungles of Viet Nam!

That choice, made by so many thousands of Negro Americans, must be part of the reckoning for those who are trying to cast the Negro populace en masse into some narrow and unflattering classification.

THE LESSON THEY'RE LEARNING

The performance of Negro fighting men in Viet Nam, which is recognized as being exceptional, is a clue as to what can happen in this country to the great benefit of all concerned.

If the Negro soldier and Marine, upon the discovery that he has an equal status and an equal chance in an integrated armed forces, responds to that situation generally by "trying harder," the same thing can happen in "civilian" America.

Indeed, it is rather typical of minority groups.

Throughout our history, such groups have made the "transition" to "American" society, and in the course of the transition period, especially, have contributed an exceptional number of outstanding people in many fields of endeavor.

They "tried harder."

When Negroes in this country realize the gaps that have been made in the old-time barriers, are no longer distracted by the remnants and rubble of such barriers that remain, and go after the opportunities as they exist and as they expand, we shall see an immense gain.

We shall also see the remnants of those old barriers swept away in the new surge of accomplishments.

For when folks find that they can compete, that "having been disadvantaged" is not a permanent disability unless they treat it as such, and go after the skills involved in this competition—we'll really be on our way.

Nor will there be any lack of effort by other Americans in clearing away the debris of the past to make that road ever more clear of obstacles—except those hurdles every man must face and conquer along the way, regardless of race.

THE RESULT WE EXPECT

There is an another result which will surely flow from the experience of Negroes fighting side by side with other Americans in Viet Nam, and doing such a good job of it.

Thousands upon thousands of them will be coming back, and the lessons they've learned about life itself in the jungle struggle will send great numbers of them back into our schools and colleges as it has G.I.'s since 1940.

Thousands will come back with the confidence, and the discipline and drive and determination to carve out a place for themselves at home. They will compete at home as they have in the armed services.

Their records of performance as American soldiers and as leaders will help them win extra opportunities just as a record of performance assists any other person in getting better opportunities for himself.

They will lead the way.

And it is hard to see how those who have found themselves in an integrated activity in war are going to have much sympathy for other Negroes who support segregationist doctrines whether such segregationists call themselves "nationalist" or "Muslim" or whatever.

August 18, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- APPENDIX

A4379

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Evening Star,
Aug. 10, 1966]

CONGRESSMEN APPLAUDED BY OEHLERT

Former Orlandoan Benjamin H. Oehlert Jr. Wednesday called for a better understanding on the part of the public of the enormous job our representatives in Congress are doing for us.

Speaking before the Rotary Club of Orlando, the former Minute Maid Co. executive who is now senior vice president of the Coca Cola Company in Atlanta, Ga., said:

"I suppose most of us here today are employed, although the matter of how gainfully may depend on whether we are talking to our bankers or to our wives. But let me assure you it is no different in Atlanta than in Orlando; outgo still rises to match income.

"Even though you are happily employed at present, you probably will be interested in this position as described in a 'Help Wanted' advertisement:

"Wanted: men or women, U.S. citizens, over age 25, for employment in Washington. No prior experience necessary. Five day week, six to eight months each year, hours 12 noon to 4 p.m. Job attendance not mandatory. Fringe benefits include unlimited vacation, travel in U.S. or abroad expenses paid, free medical care, free haircuts, private dining rooms, luxurious office suites equipped with paid staffs, free telephone and telegraph service, low license plate numbers. Starting salary \$30,000, plus expense allowances for office. Two-year contract. Can be basis for lifetime career. Selections made on basis recommendations from friends and neighbors."

"Now, of course, no such ad has appeared—and no such jobs exist. But—and this is the reason I speak as I do—across this land of ours, all too many Americans believe that some such job description fairly and fully summarizes the duties and emoluments of those who serve us all in the Congress of the United States.

"Throughout our history, as a nation, generations of Americans have harbored and nurtured the attitude that, as someone once expressed it, 'politics is the last refuge of the incompetent.' Whether we are businessmen, professionals, farmers, workingmen, or whatever, we take satisfaction—a very perverse satisfaction—from believing that our own occupations are hard and demanding while the jobs of public servants are soft and easy. This is peculiarly and particularly true of our attitudes toward Congress—especially the House of Representatives.

"Many years ago, the great American humorist, Mark Twain, expressed this attitude—not too humorously—when he addressed his readers, saying: 'Suppose you were an idiot. And suppose you were a member of Congress. But I repeat myself.' The members of Congress, if not the institution of Congress itself, have been—and all too many places, still are—looked upon as fair targets for our ridicule, disrespect, even sometimes contempt.

"I am here today—as one private citizen, speaking only for myself—to say that this attitude is dangerous, that the impression on which it rests is cruelly false, and that the day is past when responsible Americans can indulge themselves such a sentiment toward public service at any level, particularly the level of the Congress of the United States.

"Certainly, I have no call—and no cause—to speak as a self-appointed defender of men and women in elective office. The very fact they are there is evidence that they can defend themselves quite well. But I do believe—as a businessman—that we of the business community have a responsibility for raising the level of public understanding and respect for the demands these times are making upon our public servants.

"Thomas Jefferson said once that, 'When a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property.' And I agree with that. But I might make this observation. In any community, if someone throws stones at the public property of school windows—or if paint is splashed on the public property of buildings or signs—or even if the public property of litter baskets in our parks are destroyed, then you can count on a great public outcry demanding that an end be put to such outrages. Or, perhaps, I should say that you could have counted on it until recently!

"Yet, very often the same outraged people will themselves engage in the worst sort of vandalizing of the public property of those who serve us in public position—thinking nothing of throwing stones, figuratively, at Congressmen or Senators, splashing them over with tar buckets, destroying the individual and destroying respect for the offices and the profession as well. I do not suggest that members of the Congress should be immune against criticism or complaint at all—but, gentlemen, I do suggest that we should treat them with as much respect, at least, as litter baskets in our public parks and roadsides.

"Several years ago, Dr. Ernest Griffith published a book I would commend to you all on 'Congress: Its Contemporary Role.' I think it profits us to reflect upon some of this able scholar's observations.

"The Congress of the United States," he writes, "is the world's best hope of representative government. In its halls decisions are made which may make or break not only our own nation but also the whole free world. These decisions are major weapons in the struggle not only for democratic survival but for its advance."

Then, Dr. Griffith writes on, to say:

"The fact that we are by all odds the most powerful of the units of the free world, without which the remainder could scarcely survive, attaches to our Congress today a dignity and a responsibility at the same time inspiring and terrible, a responsibility unmatched in all its earlier history. It is responding well to the challenge."

"For myself, I would have to say—from close and objective observation—that I fully agree both with that description of the role of Congress today and with that final assessment of its response.

"The role that history has thrust upon the American people—and the responsibility we, in turn, have delegated to our representatives—makes the job of service in Congress anything but easy and the jobs there everything but soft.

"I could—and you who know me so well realize how much I would enjoy it—discourse well into the afternoon on the various choices and decisions Congress has made. As much as any of you, I am confident—or think I am confident—that if I were there, I would sometimes choose otherwise, decide otherwise than the members of Congress do. But I never forget the counsel a good 100 percent conservative Republican once gave our country; it was President William Howard Taft who said:

"Nothing is more deceitful than the statements that what we need in politics is the business man. Politics are a business—at least they are a field in which experience tells for usefulness and effectiveness—and a man who has devoted his entire life to the successful establishment of a business is generally not the man who will be useful to the public in the administration of public business."

"I am not here to argue philosophy. As businessmen, I imagine that you would agree with what was once said to a French king. Back in the reign of Louis XIV, a delegation of businessmen from Bordeaux called on him and they were asked by the sovereign what should be done by the government to help

them out—in other words, what would be best for business. The delegation answered in words that still apply, 'Sire, let us alone.'

"In our high-pressure, hyperthyroid society today, most of us would like to be let alone—not merely let alone by government but by all the weight and pressures of responsibilities we feel every waking moment. However, much that we ask—or would like to ask—for ourselves, it is not something we grant to our congressmen.

"In Washington—if you would, as some of you do, come to know your congressmen and senators and the jobs they perform—you become aware of the fact that the one dominant characteristic of those so-called soft, easy jobs is that the incumbents are never 'let alone.'

"You and I wake up in the morning, pick up our newspapers, turn over to the financial pages to see how the market did, turn to the sports pages to see if the Braves are still in Atlanta, check the weather so we will have something to talk about all day—and then casually look over the news of the world and nation, complacent in the confidence that we could run the show better if anyone asked us to do so.

"For the member of Congress, the morning doesn't start that way. Quite possibly, his working day started long before breakfast with a telephone call from some not exactly sober citizen back home—about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning—saying 'Congressman, me and some of the boys are out here at the country club, and we have just figured out what you ought to make the President do on Viet Nam.' If, an hour later, he tells his callers that he really needs to get some sleep, they will immediately become indignant—'We didn't send you to Washington to sleep on the job.'

"Then, about 6 o'clock, the telephone rings again: 'Congressman, bet you can't guess who this is? It's me, Charley from Orlando. Molly and I are in town for some sight-seeing—and I know there won't be a chance to visit with you after you get to the office. So, I thought we would just come on by now with the kids and have coffee with you because I remember your letter where you said if we were ever in Washington, be sure to drop in to see you.'

"On and on, throughout the day, the congressman—wherever he may be from—seldom enjoys a moment when he is, truly, 'let alone.' His day begins early and it never really ends. If he is hurrying to a committee meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning, rushing to a luncheon after answering a quorum call in the House, or sprinting back to the floor to cast a vote, there is likely to be a constituent tugging at his coat sleeve—or a delegation of visiting schoolboys and girls, or a representative of one interest group or another who wants to say a word. For all those who are physically present, hundreds more are demanding his time through letters, postcards and telephone calls, many of these messages following the pattern of 'Dear Sir: You cur. You will never get my vote again.'

"Brooding over all of it is the necessity and the expense of being in two places at once. He must maintain a home at home and some abode in Washington. He must somehow find the time—and the money—to travel back and forth frequently, for he has two never-ending jobs: one is to do the back-breaking work in Washington, and the other is to be home enough so that he doesn't lose touch.

"The days are gone when—as was true only a few years ago—the House Foreign Affairs Committee could spend a week debating whether to approve a \$20,000 appropriation for the U.S. to participate in an international poultry fair. Today—whatever his committee assignment—the congressman must decide, as best he can, on programs involving billions of dollars and hundreds of millions of people for decades to come.

August 18, 1966

private lines showing where its orders will come from.

Something like this is very likely to happen in fact, unless the agency gets what it needs most—some kind of purposeful shipping policy having the solid support of the White House. Failure of Mr. Johnson to make any headway in this direction has created a prolonged hiatus in this field. The bruising experiences suffered by former MA Administrator Nicholas Johnson last year doubtless had something to do with the delay. But the hiatus persists and for the time being it looks as though the MA will simply have to live with it.

One Hundred and Twenty-two Billion in Aid—And the Results for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 18, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine has called to my attention an especially noteworthy article on our gold drainage and the lack of interest or help from those countries who have grown rich with our financial assistance.

This enlightening review appeared in the August 15, 1966, issue of U.S. News & World Report:

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-TWO BILLION IN AID—AND THE RESULTS FOR THE UNITED STATES

A question many ask: If the dollar is in trouble, and the U.S. gold is draining away, why does this country keep pouring dollar aid abroad? Many countries have grown strong on aid that has weakened U.S. Yet 97 nations are still on the aid list.

American taxpayers since World War II have poured out 122 billions of their dollars to aid other countries of the world. That is, the total to July 1 of this year. By next July 1, the total will be 128 billions or more.

Aid from Americans has gone, over the years, to more than 100 countries . . . the largest sums have gone to the nations of Western Europe and to India, Korea, Turkey, Nationalist China and Japan. Not included in the aid totals are the huge costs, tens of billions, borne by Americans to support U.S. troops in Western Europe since World War II.

Today the United States is in financial trouble. Its gold supply is down 8.4 billion dollars from 10 years ago and still is declining.

America's gifts and loans have so filled the world with dollars that claims on remaining American gold are up to astronomical totals. Even India is suggesting that maybe it will be necessary to revalue the dollar downward.

While the generosity of Americans in aiding most of the other nations of the world has made their own country financially weak, several of the nations aided have become rich and financially powerful—often at the expense of and with the help of the U.S.

France today, after getting 9.4 billions in U.S. aid since World War II, and while still owing about 6.7 billions on World War I debts, now looks down its nose at the U.S. dollar.

Gold held by the outside world in the past 10 years alone has risen by 13 billion dollars, to 27.3 billion. Claims of foreigners on gold held by the U.S. have increased from 13.8 billion 10 years ago to 28.2 billion now.

FROM THE RICH, A LESSON

The outside world is loaded with 55.5 billion dollars in gold and U.S. dollars that can be turned into gold.

Yet nations grown rich are showing anything but enthusiasm for coming to the aid of the United States, now in trouble. Some members of Congress are suggesting that there may be a lesson in all this for Americans to learn. They notice that nations which today are the richest—after being broke in 1945—show little interest in returning the generosity that is being shown to them by the United States.

France, for example, follows a policy of consistently drawing on the U.S. gold supply, month after month. And France is the chief stumbling block to attempts of other European nations and of the U.S. to reform and strengthen the world's monetary system, which now relies heavily on the American dollar and the British pound.

BUT AID GOES ON

The Administration, however, continues to ask Congress to authorize money for foreign aid year after year. The request this year: 3.4 billion dollars for aid to 97 countries. In the fiscal year ended last June 30, aid was extended to 98 countries.

Included in the aid package is 336 million dollars for various European defense programs in an area where most nations now are financially strong.

Questions are beginning to be asked in Congress whether aid programs are doing as much good for other countries as they are weakening the financial strength of the United States.

U.S. Troops From Vietnam Praise Hawaii as an R. & R. Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 18, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from Hawaii, I am often asked the meaning of the word "aloha." I would therefore like to share with my colleagues a newspaper story which tells about the happy discovery of the meaning of aloha by the first group of U.S. servicemen from Vietnam who chose to go to Hawaii for rest and recuperation.

This first contingent of 165 men was permitted to select Hawaii under the recent directive which made Hawaii an "R. & R." center to augment other centers, such as Tokyo and Hong Kong.

The touching and heartwarming stories of the fighting men's 5 days in Hawaii are, to use a cliché, good for the soul. As one who requested that Hawaii be designated a rest and recuperation center, I am pleased that these battle-weary men discovered the true meaning of our aloha spirit during their stay in Hawaii.

I should like, at this point, to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the news story which was written by Reporter Joe Arakaki. The article appeared in the August 9, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

THEY'LL TELL THEIR BUDDIES—R. & R. MEN PRAISE STAY

(By Joe Arakaki)

"We'll tell our buddies back in Viet Nam, they're crazy if they don't come here," said

Specialist 4th Class James C. Cadman, 23, of Rockton, Illinois.

Technical Sergeant John A. Evans of Cartersville, Georgia, said, "The most wonderful five days I have ever had."

"This has been a million dollar R. & R. for me," said Warrant Officer Gary D. Eddy of Black River Falls, Wisconsin.

Major Robert A. Ross of Monterey, California, added, "I think Hawaii is the most desirable R. & R. place in the world."

These were the typical reactions of servicemen returning to Viet Nam last night after spending a five-day rest and recreation leave in Hawaii.

The first contingent of 165 Viet Nam based servicemen arrived here last Wednesday and another group of 165 men is due here tomorrow morning.

More than 250 persons, including wives, children and friends spent the last few hours with the servicemen last night at Fort DeRussy.

Shortly after 10:30 p.m., the men boarded buses for Hickam Air Field, where a military charter plane left for Viet Nam at midnight. Before they left the men filled out questionnaires asking them for comments on their Hawaii leave.

Colonel Frank Dower of Special Services, U.S. Army Hawaii, said, "Their reactions were generally very favorable."

The men were quite enthusiastic about the fine treatment they received here, he said. Dower said they all praised the red carpet treatment they received at the night clubs.

The servicemen, many of them visiting Hawaii for the first time, went sightseeing, night clubbing, swimming and shopping.

The wives of about 40 servicemen came from the Mainland to join their husbands. To assist others, whose wives or parents were unable to meet them here, Hawaiian Telephone Company installed eight special long distance lines at Fort DeRussy.

Two company employees—Mrs. Beatrice Loo and Mrs. Margaret Palmerton—were kept busy last night helping them arrange long distance calls to the Mainland.

They also assisted the servicemen in locating local friends, arranging tours and finding hotels during their stay here.

Other comments from the servicemen:

Cadman said, "This is a perfect place to relax coming from Viet Nam. I hope they make Hawaii a permanent R. & R. area."

He said, "Everywhere we went, we got the red carpet treatment."

Evans added, "The people have been most cordial, friendly and receptive."

"I have been all over the world, but I don't think I have come across more friendly people than those here in Hawaii."

His wife came from the Mainland to join him here.

"We had our belated honeymoon in Hawaii," he said.

Married in 1951, he said, they could not afford such a honeymoon before.

Evans said, "This city has been wonderful to us . . . you bet we're going to sell Hawaii to the men back in Viet Nam."

"I told my wife when she gets back home to start saving so that we can bring the entire family to Hawaii for another vacation in about two years," he said.

They have three children, two boys and a girl.

Ross said, "I didn't expect any special favors or hand-outs."

But, he added, "It really felt good to see signs saying R. & R. card holders welcomed."

Mrs. Ross joined her husband here. She came from Monterey.

Ross said, "People in Hawaii seem more concerned about what's going on in Viet Nam than most people in the other states."

Private First Class Emilio R. Perez, 21, of New York City, said he and his two buddies went everywhere and and just about did everything.

A4388

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 18, 1966

"Don Ho has a fabulous show," he said. "I enjoyed everything about his show."

Specialist 4th Class Edward W. Gates, 22, of Middletown, Connecticut, said, "Hawaii has been like a home away from home. Everybody treated us as though we were one of their boys."

He said the R. and R. cards came in real handy.

"We got reduced prices and in many instances, there was no charge at all," he said.

Master Sergeant Larry Inouye of Wahiawa, Oahu, said he wished he had more time to spend with his wife and three children.

"It's good to get away from Viet Nam and completely relax here," he said.

Staff Sergeant Rizal Esteban of Kohala, Big Island, went home to spend four days with his wife and two children.

"It's been just wonderful," he said.

Sergeant Robert G. Fuller of Louisburg, North Carolina, said, "I enjoyed my stay here 100 percent. I got no complaints."

His wife and five children live in Schofield Barracks.

Mrs. Fuller said, "I was so thrilled when I heard my husband was coming here."

"Hawaii should be made a permanent R. & R. area," she said.

Specialist 5th Class Richard M. Bernas and his wife also spent a belated honeymoon here. She came from New York to join her husband.

One serviceman said, "Please convey our appreciation to all of the people of Hawaii for their generosity and hospitality."

"Now, we know the true meaning of the aloha spirit."

Profiles in Buckpassing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 18, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the grassroots press across the country is very carefully reanalyzing this administration. I place in the RECORD a most practical commentary which appeared in the Calumet Index on August 7:

PROFILES IN BUCKPASSING

Discretion may be the better part of valor but is it unreasonable to hope that the President of the United States would display a little less "discretion" and a lot more valor when faced with an issue which we have been told he believes is extremely important to the welfare of the country?

President Johnson has fooled no one in his "timidity" to face up squarely to the unions when his cherished "guideposts" for wage-price stability are challenged. Yet we are surprised at the number who accept this vacillation as smart and sophisticated politics. In our apparent naivete we call it suicide.

Anyone, whether he be the president of his country, the foreman of his shop or a school teacher, who thinks he can be effective and respected and at the same time be so obviously anxious to win a popularity contest, is about to be trampled.

In this confrontation, congress has displayed even less backbone in making their convictions known regarding the machinists strike against the airlines. But this comes as no surprise—Congress, except for increasingly rare individual cases, sold its soul down the river of expediency long ago.

Between the President's frantic anxiety to save face and not offend any potential voter—and the Vice President's talking out of both sides of his mouth as to how he

would or would not lead a rebellion, congress had better get with it and the voters had better get to the polls with both eyes open in November.

If there is no more courage, foresight, or judgment at the top level of our government in dealing with Viet Nam than there has been in dealing with this domestic issue, there is real cause for concern.

Useless Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 18, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the present House Un-American Activities Committee hearings demonstrate once again the unconstitutionality and inherent intemperance of that committee.

If the committee were really concerned about the legislation which it is considering, it could question members of the Justice Department, the Defense Department, and the State Department to determine whether such legislation is needed.

Instead, the committee has indulged in subpoenaing witnesses for the purpose of exposure for exposure's sake.

Once again the committee has made a mockery of the legislative process. Once again it has illustrated that it serves no legislative purpose.

As the New York Times pointed out in its lead editorial on Wednesday, August 17:

There is little reason to suppose that any information developed in these hearings could form the basis of a constitutionally viable piece of legislation.

Insofar as demonstrations interfere with the movement of troops or war materials—

The Times went on—

they can be handled under existing law. No blanket new legislation is needed to deal with reason or sabotage.

The New York Times editorial, "Useless Hearings," follows:

USELESS HEARINGS

The opening of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings on left-wing aid to the Vietcong proved as disorderly and unproductive as the work of this committee usually is. There is little reason to suppose that any information developed in these hearings could form the basis of a constitutionally viable piece of legislation.

The free-speech guarantees of the First Amendment offer wide protection for radical, inflammatory and antiwar talk—and no one who understands the essence of a free society would have it otherwise. Insofar as demonstrations interfere with the movement of troops or war materials, they can be handled under existing law. No blanket new legislation is needed to deal with treason or sabotage.

Despite our belief that neither the hearings—nor the committee—serve any useful purpose, we are glad that the three-judge Court of Appeals vacated a lower court order enjoining the committee from conducting its inquiry. Federal Judge Howard Corcoran may well have been within his legal powers in issuing the original restraint. As Representative CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida reminded his incensed colleagues in the House yester-

day, each branch of government is under the rule of law and the courts are the final interpreters of the law.

But the injunction would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to enforce; and it placed the court in an unnecessarily awkward position in its relationship to Congress. The solution to the excesses of the Un-American Activities Committee must come from Congress, where the problem has its origins. The members of the House can expect an interminable round of futile and embarrassing controversies so long as they permit this committee to roam about with an inherently vague and unworkable mandate.

Max Steiner Heads Successful Chicago Educational Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 18, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, the Chicago Daily News carried an article about the astoundingly successful Goodman Summer Theater program which has been initiated by the board of education and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Partial funds for this program, which exposed 70,000 underprivileged children in Chicago to culture in the form of the theater, were provided through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which I supported in the Congress last year.

My good friend, Max Steiner, who is a noted philanthropist and distinguished civic leader, played a tremendous role in making this program possible by volunteering to underwrite the whole project if Federal funds were not available.

Mr. Steiner is a member of Mayor Daley's Committee for Cultural and Economic Development and served as chairman of the Goodman Summer Theater program. His efforts in promoting better human relations and improving understanding among all the people of our city, regardless of nationality, race, or religion, are well known to my fellow Chicagoans.

In addition, Max Steiner is a well known Chicago industrialist whose plant, the Clifford Peterson Tool Co., is located in the Seventh Illinois Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

This particular summer program, which Max Steiner headed, is a fine example of what can be accomplished when citizens, giving freely of their time, their effort, and their knowledge, join their government in working for a common objective.

The success of this project could not have been achieved by the government alone. Neither can the plight of the disadvantaged and the problems of the underprivileged be solved by the government alone. However, when private citizens like Max Steiner join the government's efforts, successes such as the Chicago Goodman Summer Theater program can easily be achieved.