

substantiated by the significant act of bond redemption almost 30 years ahead of schedule.

The WPPSS, consisting of 18 consumer-owned utility systems, 17 PUD's, and one municipality, in the State of Washington, is a municipal corporation authorized to build and operate facilities for the generation and transmission of power.

HANFORD PROJECT BONDS REDEEMED

(Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. McDONALD of Michigan) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues who were here in 1962 will recall the long and hotly contested legislative battle over authorization of the world's largest nuclear powerplant at Hanford, in my district, in the State of Washington.

Many had great faith in this project, known as Hanford No. 1, and there were those who felt that the project was technically unfeasible. Such doubts at the time were understandable, but the position of the Congress in sustaining this vital project has been proved, over and over again, to have been basically sound.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am more than delighted to be able to report to my colleagues that although Hanford No. 1 has been in commercial operation for only 1 year, the joint operating agency, Washington Public Power Supply System, is now redeeming approximately \$25 million worth of revenue bonds through the Banker's Trust Co. of New York, the supply system's bond fund trustee.

The significance of this news is that these bonds were originally scheduled for redemption in 1996, and this early redemption, nearly 30 years ahead of time, means there will be a 20-percent decrease in the project's long-term debt and a corresponding reduction in Hanford No. 1's power costs.

The announcement of this significant news, which once again more than justifies the faith of Congress in this project, was made by the outstanding managing director of the supply system, Owen W. Hurd.

The question before the Congress in 1962, was approval for the supply system to construct and operate an electric generating facility to use the excess steam being produced by the Atomic Energy Commission's new production reactor in the manufacture of plutonium at Hanford. Following congressional approval of this, the supply system raised the necessary risk capital to finance the project through the sale of a single issue \$122 million in revenue bonds, thus relieving the Congress of any need to appropriate construction funds.

Mr. Hurd, in announcing the early redemption of the \$25 million in outstanding bonds, has stated that a surplus of \$22,271,122 in construction funds has permitted this action. The excess resulted from outstanding management, as well as the fact that many large pieces of hardware were purchased below the engineer's estimates, among other factors.

Mr. Hurd has also reported that Hanford No. 1 has met every expectation claimed by its proponents during the long, hard-fought legislative battle, and that the 800,000-kilowatt steamplant has exceeded expectations and has performed beautifully. For example, recent tests conducted by engineers have shown that the two largest turbine generators in the world can produce approximately 4 percent more than their rated output. Mr. Hurd points out that this means the units can produce 62 megawatts more than the manufacturer's guaranteed performance.

The Hanford steamplant has been built without any expense to the taxpayer, and the Federal Government is making money from it because of the \$5 million per year paid to the Atomic Energy Commission by the supply system for steam from the reactor.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues who supported this project in 1962 are pleased to hear this good news and join with me in congratulating Mr. Hurd, the Washington Public Power Supply System, and all the others who have made the Hanford project such an outstanding success. Our faith is more than justified by this truly remarkable performance.

NE [Signature] CONGRESSMAN BURKE SEES DANGER IN SOVIET MILITARY BUILDUP IN MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. McDONALD of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the trouble spot for us appears to be Vietnam as we keep our sights focused on Southeast Asia. But, Mr. Speaker, today I want to alert you and my colleagues in the House to what may well be the real danger point for the world, and to call your attention to a military buildup that could well trigger World War III if it is not quickly checked. The danger point is the Middle East, for it appears to be here that the Soviet Union has focused its aims for expansion and is making inroads so swiftly and powerfully that it would be difficult for the average American to comprehend and imagine.

For some it is hard to believe that the Soviet Union, with all its talk about world peace, would risk another world war. Yet the situation in the Middle East is so explosive and involves so many factors as well as so many people and countries that this could well be the area which will feed the flames for the outburst of another horrible war, one which could well lead to World War III.

The Soviet Union is playing a dangerous game in this part of the world. While the Communists talk of wanting peace in Asia they are furnishing arms to the North Vietnamese and are also commencing a dangerous buildup of military strength in the Middle East.

I have been informed by what I believe are reliable sources that the Russians have moved as many as 25,000 military personnel and technicians into Syria, Egypt and Algeria. The Soviet Union has

been aiding the Arab forces with new modern weapons to supplant those the Arabs lost in the June 1967 war with Israel. Furthermore, it appears that trained Russian officers are now accompanying these weapons shipments and there are now six to eight Russian Army generals for the purpose of supervising the renewed area.

To further complicate matters, it appears that Algeria is now also getting involved with this Soviet program and is allowing the Russians to build a rocket complex at the port of Oran. If the information I have received is true, then you may be sure that this rocket complex will be strategically located by the Russians so that it would pose an ominous threat to the entranceway of the Gibraltar Strait from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean. In this event, the potentially explosive dictator Houari Boumedienne of Algeria together with the Soviet Union would be in a position to render our own U.S. Sixth Fleet almost impotent by bottling it up in the Mediterranean. Furthermore, one can plainly see how a rocket complex at the port of Oran would put the Russians in an excellent bargaining position for any future deliberations. With the Suez Canal under the control of Nasser and its use to us almost nil, the only other entry into the Mediterranean, that is, the Strait of Gibraltar, would be put in jeopardy since it would be directly in the line of Russian and Algerian rocket fire.

What is happening in the Middle East today is terrifying and should concern us all. The Soviet Union, which once had little or no outlet to the sea, could now conceivably become the master in any bargaining involving all of the strategic sea routes in the Middle East and in the Mediterranean.

It therefore appears that the Soviet Union is definitely playing for high stakes in this area and, contrary to what the Communists would like to have us believe, the issue far transcends the Arab-Israeli dispute. This appears to be only a smoke screen to cover the Soviet Union's real aim in the Middle East, which is the control of the vital sea routes and the promotion of the further decay of our Western world defenses.

I charge that these actions by the Soviet Union are a prelude to a direct aim by the Communists at the weak foundation of NATO which the Russians are hoping to further destroy. In my opinion, now that De Gaulle has provided an opening by neutralizing France, the Communists are aiming to wreck the entire structure of defense of the Western community.

In this regard I further feel that the administration may well be under-reacting in the Mediterranean because of a misguided belief that the Russians are less hostile and less dangerous than the North Vietnamese and the Red Chinese. As I see it, the truth of the matter is that the Soviet Union has not changed its desire for world conquest, not one bit! There is, in fact, much evidence to support the contention that the Soviet desire to conquer is stronger than ever.

The time has come for the United States, with our Western Allies, to make

a complete reassessment of our stance with regard to the Russians. The world should know the Russian objectives in the Middle East and in the Mediterranean are not conducive to peace, and that they are working through the Arab people and using the Arab people to gain their objectives by direct penetration. I think it is imperative now that we take a stronger stand in this regard and challenge the Russian aggressiveness. Tomorrow it may be too late. We must be wary and careful that we do not give aid to any nation that collaborates with the Soviet Union in that part of the world.

Furthermore, knowing the Russians, it would seem to me that we must definitely help Israel maintain a reasonable posture of defense in this area to counteract these hostile Russian movements. It was the swift and decisive action by the Israeli in that June war which saved our country from another Vietnam-type involvement and possibly the ignition of a world war.

The free world is not safe yet. All recent developments indicate that we must recognize today's dangers and prepare to stop them as they arise, or we may find ourselves in a new Munich, 1967 style.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging all my colleagues to join with me in insisting that our administration take immediate steps to inform the American people of what positive steps we will take so as to prevent a future horrible holocaust from erupting; for I believe that one could occur if we as a nation remain blind to the reality of hate that the Soviet Union is seeding in the Middle East as it appears from their present activities.

KANSANS MOURN DEATH OF EDUCATOR

(Mr. DOLE (at the request of Mr. McDONALD of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOLE Mr. Speaker, death recently has taken from Kansas an educator, State leader, gentleman, and friend.

He was William C. Kampschroeder, who was serving as Kansas' last elected State superintendent of public instruction. At the age of 64, "Kampy" as he was known to thousands of friends and colleagues, had amassed an impressive 40-year career in education and public affairs.

Citizens throughout the State mourn his death. The loss to all Kansans is appropriately summarized in editorials which I submit for insertion in the RECORD:

[From the Topeka Capital-Journal]
SCHOOLS LOSE A FRIEND

The schools of Kansas lost a friend in the death Wednesday of William C. Kampschroeder.

He had devoted his life to their betterment. His unselfish attitude was illustrated by the fact that he knew when he accepted appointment and later ran for the state superintendent's position it was a job with no future, but a vital one so long as it existed.

Kansans adopted a constitutional amendment in 1966 providing for abolishment of the office, creation of a new State Board of

Education and appointment of a state commissioner of education by the board.

Kampschroeder had looked forward to completing his term as superintendent and maintaining Kansas schools on a high basis, then retiring and traveling.

He took into the state superintendency a long career in education, both on the state and local levels. He had been assistant state superintendent and a department head in the State Dept. of Public Instruction. Previously he was a principal and superintendent in several Kansas school systems.

Always devoted to the good of the community in which he lived, he was active in church, club and cultural activities.

His unexpected death, resulting indirectly from a traffic accident, cut short a career devoted to the advancement of Kansas education.

[From the Wichita Eagle-Beacon,
Nov. 10, 1967]

W. C. KAMPSCHROEDER

It was fitting that W. C. Kampschroeder was able to fulfill one of his fondest ambitions and become state superintendent of public instruction before that office faded into oblivion.

The office was important to him and he went after it vigorously even though his opponent Robert Saft was an old friend and colleague and despite the fact that rough and tough political campaigning was against his nature.

"Kampy," as he was known to his students, colleagues, and friends, had a habit of raising his eyebrows and looking you straight in the eye when he made a point in conversation. It gave one the impression that he was concentrating only on what he had to say and that he considered talking with you important.

Kampy was trim and healthy looking before his death here at 64. He had been much heavier in the days at Eureka when he was superintendent of school there.

He had taught at Savonburg and Richmond before moving to Eureka where he was superintendent for 14 years. Kampy had some visionary ideas about how Kansas education should progress, and he was happy with the thought that his tenure as state superintendent would be transitional.

But as a teacher he retained enough of the old fashioned ideas of discipline to maintain a reasonably tight ship, even during the trying war years.

He was not feared by the students, but he certainly was respected. On one occasion a group of students at Eureka High School scheduled a walkout which Kampy got wind of somehow. When a large group headed by some burly football players approached the front doors, Kampy was standing there, barring the way.

There was a brief standoff, and the students returned to class.

His students and all Kansans interested in education are going to miss Kampy.

PROTECTIONISM: A MEAT AX INSTEAD OF A DOCTOR'S SCALPEL

(Mr. WHALEN (at the request of Mr. McDONALD of Michigan) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the economic well-being of the Nation is being threatened by a revival of protectionist sentiment.

A dialogue of sorts has begun on this serious question. I hope it will continue long enough for all Members of Congress to comprehend fully the signifi-

cance of the import-quota measures that have been introduced during this session.

One of the most succinct commentaries on what is involved in this issue appeared over the weekend. Mr. Roscoe Drummond, the distinguished columnist, summarized the threat of the "new" protectionism by recalling some recent economic history.

Mr. Drummond observed that—

There may, indeed, be valid complaints by a few industries that trade agreements have operated inequitably in their cases. But needed relief ought to be made with the care of a doctor's scalpel, not with a politician's meat-ax.

As an economist, I concur with Mr. Drummond's evaluation, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge my colleagues to review his pungent commentary.

For that reason, I insert herewith Mr. Drummond's column which appeared in the editions of the Washington Post on Saturday, November 18, 1967:

NEW "SMOOT-HAWLEY TARIFF" COULD BRING REPEAT OF 1930'S

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Let me relate a revealing conversation which occurred on Capitol Hill the other day.

A distinguished American with long, successful experience in business who knows first-hand why expanding world trade is a boon to every nation, was talking with a United States Senator who with many others is seeking to ring American trade with high-protectionist import quotas.

This is what he gave the Senator to think about.

"Do you realize," he asked, "that in taking these first steps up the ladder of protectionist import quotas, you will be acting to destroy all that every Congress and both political parties have accomplished during the last 30 years to release world trade from artificial restrictions to the great benefit of the United States and every other country?"

"Do you realize," he asked, "that in moving away from freeing world trade and toward a barrier of import quotas for the United States you are proposing to return the Nation—and the world—to the ghastly economic mistake of the Smoot-Hawley tariff of the '20s?"

"Do you realize," he asked, "that in returning to the discarded and discredited policy of economic isolationism you will be inviting another economic depression in the United States like the horror of the 1930s?"

And what do you think the Senator's answer was?

"Yes, I know all that," he said, "but I can't help it."

He can't help it!

In 1930 President Herbert Hoover, with the gravest doubts and greatest reluctance, signed the Smoot-Hawley tariff atrocity instead of vetoing it. He said he couldn't help it—even after 3000 U.S. economists had unanimously appealed to him to veto it in order to save the United States and the world from the developing depression.

No one who knows how much the American consumer has been benefited, how many jobs have been created, how much wealth has been produced for the wage-earner by the leadership which the United States has given to the cause of freeing mutual trade, can take any comfort from the decision of the New Protectionists in Congress to hold back momentarily their import-quota proposals rather than try to push them through in the last hectic, over-crowded weeks of the present session.

They are not having second thoughts on what they are after. They simply expect to gather more steam for their enterprise by 1968 and to be in a better political position

November 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 15663

relief and to conduct a preliminary investigation of conditions in Vance.

Cdr Milligan himself described his method of conducting his preliminary investigation. He placed a note in the ships' Plan-of-the-Day "stating that he was available to any man who had anything to say pro or con about events in the ship since 22 December", the date of Lcdr Arnheiter's commencement in command. Under these circumstances, in which their Captain had been summarily relieved in amazing fashion, the crew of Vance was alive with rumors. Certainly Arnheiter had done something scandalous! Into Cdr Milligan's cabin came the ship's malcontents to unload their complaints. One would have expected those who respected Arnheiter to be stunned into silence. Amazingly, some brave souls came forward on his behalf. Cdr Milligan then sent a selection of statements to Capt Witter in Subic Bay, who by then had been designated to conduct an informal, one-man investigation.

Mr. Secretary, consider Cdr Milligan's position! He had perpetrated an unheard-of relief of a Commanding Officer in violation of Article 1404 of U.S. Navy Regulations which requires that charges and complaints against an officer be given him in writing, and in violation of Article C-7801 of the BuPers Manual, which provides safeguards against the preemptory action Milligan initiated. His conduct was so unmanly as to inspire instant contempt. And now he had to justify what he had brought about. Mr. Secretary, was Cdr Milligan competent to be an impartial investigator?

Now, Sir, consider the officers in Vance who had initiated the rumor and slander against the Captain. They had exceeded beyond their wildest expectations. The Captain was gone! But the show was not over. There would be an investigation. Having lied, exaggerated and misrepresented before, could they be expected now to be objective and truthful?

Then, Mr. Secretary, consider Capt Witter. With no prior knowledge of this situation he was suddenly caught as investigating officer of an action which two flag officers in his chain of command had already perpetrated. Mr. Secretary, could Capt Witter qualify as an impartial investigating officer?

There is more, Mr. Secretary. Consider now Rear Admirals Irvine and King, the two Flotilla Commanders who jointly authorized the relief. They had done so without a shred of substantiation. They had by-passed every one of the safeguards of the BuPers Manual. They had not enforced Navy Regulations Article 1404. Mr. Secretary, as convening authority of the investigation, Admiral King was its first reviewer. Was he competent to be objective?

Suffice it to say, Mr. Secretary, that when this fantastic fishing expedition to support an improper, cowardly, preemptory action against a Commanding Officer, which passed as an investigation, reached Rear Admiral Baumberger, he had the good sense and courage to twice recommend in effect that the whole mess be thrown out and that redress be made to Lcdr Arnheiter, if such was possible.

Again Mr. Secretary, I ask the question that your entire officer corps will soon ask. How is such a thing possible in the U.S. Navy?

Mr. Secretary, I offer a conclusion from this for your consideration—not as my own but because you should be forewarned that it will be embraced by all but the most charitable observer. It is that because the case was handled so badly by authorities in Subic Bay they had to justify their flawed and extra legal means by demolishing Lcdr Arnheiter. The end had to be constructed to ensure acceptance of what they had done.

It is an easy thing for rumor and falsehood, if uncontested, to destroy a reputa-

tion anywhere. In the Navy, our vulnerability is particular and peculiar. The fruits of many years of experience, and the sense of fairplay and manliness which are inherent in the character of an officer lie behind the safeguarding regulations which were violated in this case. Only the most patent, proven dereliction on the part of the accused could justify this treatment. Far from proving this dereliction, the evidence in the case now points clearly in the opposite direction.

If I may end on a personal note: Last March, in the absence of the evidence which is now available to construct a more complete view of this episode, I concluded there was no effective way to challenge the decisions reached in the case. I withdrew my support. I went further and took a stand against Mr. Arnheiter. To have withdrawn my support was prudent. But to turn against him was pusillanimous. I hope my statement today, in addition to presenting the case for Mr. Arnheiter, will also encourage others to re-examine views and positions they have previously taken.

Thank you for the opportunity of presenting this statement.

NE. Edwards
GREECE UNDER DICTATORSHIP:
ZORBA MUST RISE AGAIN

(Mr. EDWARDS of California (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I placed in the RECORD a brief and moving letter to the editor of the Washington Post, superbly written by Mr. Christopher Janus, prominent Chicago investment banker and president of the Greek Heritage Foundation. The letter dealt with the inherent tragedy of the Greek nation under a military dictatorship and hinted at the implications, moral and strategic, involved in the American reaction.

Mr. Janus has now written a more extensive article on the Greek situation. It appeared in the November 12, 1967, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times. In my judgment, this is perhaps the best analysis of the Greek coup and its consequences to appear in the American press. His message, to businessmen who prefer to do business with "efficient" dictators, and to a U.S. public and Government not sufficiently aware of the destructive character of the junta, comes from a man who is an authority on modern Greece.

During World War II Christopher Janus helped organize Greek war relief and was chief of the Greek desk of the American division of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. After the Germans moved out, he served in Greece as chief of Balkan intelligence for UNRRA. Mr. Janus is publisher of the scholarly hard-cover quarterly, Greek Heritage, whose art work and articles by the world's greatest Greek scholars, has drawn wide critical acclaim. As President of the Greek Heritage Foundation, he annually leads an American pilgrimage to Athens for an intellectual symposium sponsored by the foundation. He is personally acquainted with the postwar leaders of Greece. The article is based on his observations during his latest trip, from which he recently returned.

I would like to make some additional

observations concerning the Greek junta and the short-term and long-term consequences of its continued stay in power.

First, the junta's claim that it moved to prevent a Communist takeover is not supported by competent observers. The New York Times, which had been critical of the Papandreou, father and son, nevertheless editorialized on the day after the coup that the coup was a mistake, that there was "no clear and present danger" of a Communist takeover, and that Greece had survived even the two bloody Communist insurrections of the late 1940's without resort to dictatorship. Our own U.S. State Department concedes that there was no danger of a Communist takeover.

Second, the junta claims that it is interested only in "cleansing" Greece and restoring democracy, not in power. But as Mr. Janus suggests, the colonels are interested in power. It is generally acknowledged in the United States and Greece, that a "big junta" group existed, made up of palace, high military officers, and some members of the establishment. The takeover device was to be the NATO-approved Prometheus plan, originally devised as a means to prevent a Communist takeover.

In early 1967 this plan was dusted off by the "big junta" to use in the event of a Papandreou-Center Union victory in the scheduled May 28 elections—that is, a victory by the non-Communist left and center. The colonels stole the plan, and in their own power play beat the "big junta" to the punch. It was a power grab later excused in anti-Communist terms. A supporter of the "big junta" has ruefully described it as "the wrong people pushing the right button at the wrong time."

Third, although the coup was made by the military, to effect a change, economic considerations, as Mr. Janus pointed out, are crucial. We should not be indifferent to the leverage we can exercise via our economic power.

Fourth, American apologists for the junta usually point to the preparation of a new constitution as justification for American condonement of the junta. The truth is that the new constitution has a large element of hoax in it. The junta did not seize power because of a passion for constitutional reform. Indeed, the "new constitution" is a football, naively looked upon by some Americans as a device, a mechanism to nudge the colonels back to democracy, and looked upon cynically by the junta as a stalling device. There has never been any clear showing that the old constitution was bad. Furthermore, what comes out is likely to be far worse.

When Americans hear of a new constitution being written, they may think of something like the Maryland or New York constitutional conventions. There is no comparison. The new Greek constitution will be the product of a situation that in my judgment is indefensible. The constitutional law experts, including some appointed against their will, are merely submitting individual drafts following the guidelines laid down by the junta. There is no evidence that they have ever met in a body, either publicly or privately. When the draft is submitted

H 15664

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 20, 1967

on December 15, the junta will have, by its own decree, 8 months to review and rewrite it. The Greek people, then, having had no voice in choosing the people drafting the constitution, will not be allowed to publicly debate it or criticize it in the censored press. It is a sad state of affairs.

Fifth, U.S. officials frequently condone the junta on the basis of military considerations, especially citing the fact that during the Israel-Arab war, Greece provided a haven for U.S. evacuees and a staging area for U.S. military forces. This sounds persuasive until the question is asked, "Would not every other postwar Greek government have done the same thing?" The answer is a resounding "Yes." Furthermore, to those who seem to look only to military considerations and ignore moral and political considerations, I say to you that the a democratic Greece will make for a healthier NATO ally than a Greece under a dictator's heel.

And now, under leave to extend my remarks, the excellent article by Mr. Janus follows:

A MESSAGE FROM GREECE
(By Christopher Janus)

George Papandreou had just been released from house arrest when I met him in Athens. And he quickly dispelled any notion that his freedom had been purchased by a promise of silence.

He had a message for the free world—which no longer includes Greece.

"Don't let up your pressure from abroad," he said. "No matter how much it hurts us here—no matter how much Greeks have to suffer—you must not let up the pressure."

The old man, former prime minister of Greece, was referring to the economic pressure that has been applied to his country since military leaders seized control of the government last April 21.

"We must get rid of the junta," he said. "And the constitution must be restored as soon as possible."

The urgency of his appeal was not overstated. There is reason to believe that a continuation of military rule could plunge Greece into a full-scale civil war.

A solution to the problem rests partly at least in the hands of businessmen outside of Greece—in America and other countries. And many of those men, unfortunately, have demonstrated a shocking disregard for the facts and morality of the Greek situation.

Greece is very efficient these days, and businessmen of course are in favor of efficiency. Just the same, I have been appalled to hear the military dictatorship supported by such prominent Americans as John Nuveen, first chief of the Marshall Plan in Greece; Spyros Skouras, president of 20th Century Fox, and Thomas Pappas, president of Esso-Pappas in Greece.

Pappas gave our group a luncheon in Athens, at the yacht club overlooking the harbor. He stood up and proposed a toast.

"You can get things done now," he said. "Believe me, Chris. I don't have to wait six months to get a contract signed. There is stability. There is order. There is no graft."

I could not drink that toast. Order and stability are no trick, after all, when you are holding a gun to someone's head.

The gun was easily justified, of course. The military had to take over to prevent a Communist coup masterminded by Andreas Papandreou, son of the onetime prime minister.

The Reds were plotting to seize control of Greece by armed force, if necessary. Or they had infiltrated the Center Union Party of

the left-wing Papandreou, and they were confident of winning power in the elections scheduled for May 28. Either way, they had to be stopped.

That was the theory. So everywhere I went in Greece I asked the same question.

Where was the evidence to substantiate that Communist plot?

"My boy," said Pappas, "there are carloads of evidence."

"Where?" I asked.

"Why do you care where it is?" he answered.

I put the question to the prime minister, Constantine Kollias.

"We have files and files of evidence," he said.

"Where?" I asked.

"For now," he said, "you'll have to take my word for it."

I asked everybody. But I never saw one piece of evidence.

Were there masses of troops on the Albanian border, ready to march in? Were there hundreds of Communists up in the mountains with grenades and guns, led by some Greek Castro?

Why in fact was the military takeover bloodless, as they boasted? Why wasn't there a shot fired?

Because there was nobody to shoot at. That's why.

As for Andreas Papandreou—who remains in prison—I have known him for 30 years. And he is not a Communist. He is a liberal, yes, but I think I would place him politically somewhere to the right of President John F. Kennedy. That opinion is shared, I might add, by every friend I have who knows Andy, including high-placed American officials.

For what it's worth, I also have my opinion of the military strongmen—of Col. George Papadopoulos and Brig. Stylianos Patakos. I have met both of them, and I do not believe for a moment that they sincerely feared a Communist plot.

The government indeed was weak and corrupt and not very efficient. They are sincere about that. From my knowledge of these men and their mentalities, however, I believe they are mainly interested in their own power.

They are power-hungry men—just as mad for power as any dictator. That is the essential fact about them, and I think their motive for taking over in Greece was just as simple as that.

Papadopoulos now is trying to maneuver King Constantine to appoint him a vice prime minister—a new title that would give him more authority and respectability, coming from the king.

That is the next move. But I do not think the king will go along with it.

The king looked awfully tired and haggard when I saw him at the palace. The last time I saw him there he was very relaxed and happy. He and the queen brought the baby out, and we talked about Mayor Daley. This time the king was serious and quiet and far more reserved than usual. He seemed to have aged a lot since April.

He has been traveling all over the country by helicopter, trying to meet as many of the people as possible. I don't think he knew in advance what the military were up to, and I believe the people are convinced that he is doing all he can to restore the constitution.

The junta, of course, has promised there will be a constitution to vote on early next year. But there is widespread pessimism about that, and the average Greek, in fact, just doesn't believe it.

A member of Parliament came to my hotel room in Athens. He was scared to death. He looked up and down the hall, and he wanted to turn on the radio, convinced as he was that the room must be bugged.

"I wouldn't be surprised," he said, "if these people stayed in for 10 years."

That's the feeling. What everybody is mainly afraid of, however, is the danger ahead of a civil war.

Said the member of Parliament:

"There is only one thing that could possibly unite all the parties and factions in Greece. And that one thing is the continuation in power of the military regime.

"Then there would be a Communist threat, because many people would want to unite with the Communists to overthrow the regime. And then after that we'd have to turn around and fight the Communists again. We'd be repeating the whole pattern of World War II."

That fear is expressed widely. And it points up the short-sightedness of the efficiency-minded businessmen.

I was surprised to find the businessman's viewpoint echoed by such a person as Gen. James Van Fleet, former United Nations commander in Korea.

Van Fleet was very enthusiastic about the junta.

"This is really all right," he assured me. "Greece has been saved from becoming another Vietnam."

Quite the contrary, it could well be argued. A prolongation of the junta's rule easily could create another Vietnam.

There isn't much organized resistance yet. There is some in Crete, and a few bombs went off in Piraeus harbor while I was in Athens. But something like 400 officers have been dismissed from the army, and they could form the nucleus for a concerted resistance movement.

Resistance to the junta certainly will increase if there is any significant deterioration of Greece's economy. And, in fact, continuation of junta rule is likely to produce a serious recession.

Tourism has been off 60 per cent. More than \$100,000,000 in international loans and credits have been cancelled or postponed, and the other members of the Common Market are talking now about economic sanctions against Greece. The United States has cut some military aid and has postponed action on future aid.

Shipping is the No. 1 industry in Greece. Now there are indications that Stavros Niarchos and Aristotle Onassis have cut down their shipbuilding, waiting to see what happens.

My own firm, Bache & Co., has postponed action on a \$10,000,000 long-term loan we were arranging for the Public Power & Light Corp. of Greece. And I recently had a call from Stanley Thea, executive vice president of Ruder & Finn—the firm that has handled the Greek government's public relations in this country.

He said they are dropping the account—which is \$60,000 a year—because they can't stomach a dictator.

Relatives in this country and in England normally send more than \$50,000,000 a year to their families in Greece, and there has been a sharp reduction now in those remittances. There also has been a 20 per cent drop in bank deposits in Greece, for the same reason. People are afraid that the drachma might be devaluated. So they are taking their money out of the banks—sending it to Switzerland and America—and that means there is much less working capital in Greece.

Greece live in mortal fear of devaluation, remembering how it was during World War II, when they were papering their walls with drachmas—when I paid, I remember, 5,000,000 drachmas for a newspaper. So this is very close to them, and they watch. The drachma hasn't been devaluated since 1947. But the suspension of credits has the government in trouble, and it eventually could result in devaluation. Then the roof really would fall in.

This is the sort of pressure George Papan-dreu was talking about. Short of civil war, it represents perhaps the only practical way to dislodge the junta and restore a constitutional monarchy.

Greece up until now has been really prosperous, and I think the Greeks have gotten a little fat. They have suffered so much in the past—they are so fed up with war and misery and unhappiness—that you can't blame them if they have wanted to enjoy their recent prosperity.

A general complacency developed that made the military coup possible in the first place, and continued prosperity will might make a dictatorship at least tolerable.

Freedom and liberty are pretty abstract ideas, after all. But empty stomachs are something else again.

The military leaders understand that. They know that a sagging economy will lead almost certainly to civil war. And that is why continued economic pressure from abroad is the best and probably the only strategy that can force the junta to relinquish its power voluntarily realizing that it just can't win.

The junta's sensitivity to world opinion is reflected in the release of the elder Papan-dreu. And I am happy to report that I found him looking well.

He told me that he received good treatment while he was confined, and he said he had refused exile.

"I will never leave Greece," he said.

He said the junta had suggested he might leave, and he was offered a permit to do so. That he refused. He said he also was asked to sign a statement promising he would not take part in politics or agitate for a restoration of the constitution. That, too, he refused.

He was optimistic about the future.

"Don't worry too much," he said. "This cannot last forever. We are Greeks. If we survived the German occupation, we can survive this. But you must keep up the pressure."

Similar optimism was expressed to me by the Patriarch Athenagoras, leader of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

"Patience," he said. "Patience, my son. The church has survived for thousands of years. It will survive this."

I asked him if God is dead in Greece. The Patriarch smiled and said:

"God is not dead in Greece. He is just bored with some of our priests."

I'm optimistic myself. And what I'm betting on more than anything else is the individual Greek. He values his individuality above all else—by temperament, by character and by tradition.

You might knock Zorba down. But you cannot keep him down. He will get up again, somehow, and do his dance again.

He will not live under a dictatorship for very long.

SGT. CHARLES B. MORRIS AWARD-MEDAL OF HONOR

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

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week, November 16, one of my constituents, S. Sgt. Charles B. Morris, of Galax, Va., was presented the Congressional Medal of Honor by President Johnson at a ceremony at the White House attended by a number of Members of Congress, including among others Senators BYRD and SPRONG of Virginia and the following Members of the House of Representatives from our Commonwealth: Congressmen DOWNING, SATTERFIELD, POFF, MARSH, SCOTT, WAMPLER, and myself.

I was particularly proud to witness this tribute by a nation through its President to one of the outstanding heroes to emerge from the war in Vietnam. On hand for the occasion were Maj. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the commanding general of our troops in Vietnam, and Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor, as well as Sergeant Morris' wife, young son, and parents, and other guests.

Sergeant Morris' feat in battle, his bravery and dogged persistence in the face of death after he had been thrice wounded, all stretching over a period of 8 hours, comprises a style of heroism that ranks with the major incidents of individual bravery, some of them almost legendary in character, which have come down to us out of the American past. For that reason, it gives me much pride to insert in the RECORD the remarks of the President at the time of the presentation, the citation, and the remarks of General Westmoreland, all of which are as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE CEREMONY AWARDING THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO S. SGT. CHARLES B. MORRIS, U.S. ARMY

Sergeant and Mrs. Morris, and Doug, Secretary Resor, General Johnson, General Westmoreland, distinguished members of Congress from Virginia, and other Representatives here, distinguished guests, One of America's greatest war correspondents wrote about courage—intimately and well.

He called the decorations for bravery "pinnacles of triumph" in a man's life, "that will stand out until the day he dies."

Ernie Pyle spoke for all wars—for all those moments when men must reach down into their deepest reserves of courage. He celebrated those times when men risk life for a principle—or risk life for a comrade—or risk their lives for their country.

On whatever field, on whatever day—war is an agony of spirit and flesh and mind.

After thousands of years of civilization, the saddest of human failures is this—the precious wealth of man's courage must still be spent on the battlefield.

But all the wisdom of the earth has not yet found a way to preserve freedom without defending it.

Staff Sergeant Charles Morris is one of those who defended freedom on the battlefield. He fought with dogged courage through long hours of hell. He fought far above and far beyond the call of any duty.

Just a few days ago, I returned from a journey of 33 hours and 6,000 miles, where I met thousands of Sergeant Morris' comrades.

I stood with American sailors on the deck of a mighty carrier, the Enterprise, at sea in the Pacific Ocean. I stood with our airmen under skies that were filled with American power, many of them who had just finished their 100 missions in Vietnam. I saluted the infantry, the Queen of the Battles, at Fort Benning, and Marines at El Toro and Camp Pendleton. And I ended up at Yorktown with the gallant men of the Coast Guard.

Some of the men that I saw were there just beginning their training for combat.

Some of the men I saw had just returned from combat. They wore its badges—and many of them wore it wounds.

I saw other badges, too. I saw the white carnations that were worn by wives of the missing men.

I saw the loneliness on the faces of waiting families, and little boys and girls.

I felt so humble to be among these men and women. But I also felt a towering pride—pride in them—pride in this nation.

I realized that some good day, war was going to be only a shadowed memory.

We will labor, with all of our passion and

all the strength God gives us, to quicken the coming of that day.

But until it does come, our lives, our safety and our hope of freedom's survival are in the hands of all those like Sergeant Morris, all of those who serve—here and in Vietnam.

Sergeant Charles Morris was there when America needed him.

And I am so glad that his Commander, General Westmoreland, could be here today to observe this ceremony concerning one of his very own soldiers.

Once before, I stood with General Westmoreland at a ceremony for Sergeant Morris when he enjoyed one of his "Pinnacles of triumph." It was at Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam, just a little bit more than a year ago. Upon General Westmoreland's suggestion I awarded Sergeant Morris the Distinguished Service Cross.

Today, I am so proud to stand with him here in the East Room of the White House on a hero's very high summit—the Medal of Honor.

Sergeant Morris, I don't know anything more or anything better that I could say to you than all the American people for whom I am supposed to speak are grateful to you and appreciative that the Good Lord has given you to us and has brought you back. May God bless you.

Secretary Resor will now read the citation.

The citation as read by Secretary Resor follows:

While on a search and destroy mission in the Republic of Vietnam on 29 June 1966, Sergeant Morris was a leader of the point squad of a platoon of Company A, 2nd Battalion, 503rd Infantry. Seeing indications of the enemy's presence in the area, Sergeant Morris deployed his squad and continued forward alone to make a reconnaissance. He unknowingly crawled within 20 meters of an enemy machine gun, whereupon the gunner fired, wounding him in the chest. Sergeant Morris instantly returned the fire and killed the gunner. Continuing to crawl within a few feet of the gun, he hurled a grenade and killed the remainder of the enemy crew. Although in pain and bleeding profusely, Sergeant Morris continued his reconnaissance.

Returning to the platoon area, he reported the results of his reconnaissance to the platoon leader. As he spoke, the platoon came under heavy fire. Refusing medical attention for himself, he deployed his men in better firing positions confronting the entrenched enemy to his front. Then for eight hours the platoon engaged the numerically superior enemy force. Withdrawal was impossible without abandoning many wounded and dead.

Finding the platoon medic dead, Sergeant Morris administered first aid to himself, and was returning to treat the wounded members of his squad with the medic's first aid kit when he was again wounded. Knocked down and stunned, he regained consciousness and continued to treat the wounded, reposition his men, and inspire and encourage their efforts. Wounded again when an enemy grenade shattered his left hand, nonetheless he personally took up the fight and armed and threw several grenades which killed a number of enemy soldiers.

Seeing that an enemy machine gun had maneuvered behind his platoon and was delivering fire upon his men, Sergeant Morris and another man crawled toward the gun to knock it out. His comrade was killed and Sergeant Morris sustained another wound, but firing his rifle with one hand, he silenced the enemy machine gun. Returning to the platoon, he courageously exposed himself to the devastating enemy fire to drag the wounded to a protected area, and with utter disregard for personal safety and the pain he suffered, he continued to lead and direct the efforts of his men until relief arrived.

H15666

Upon termination of the battle, important documents were found among the enemy dead revealing a planned ambush of a Republic of Vietnam battalion. Use of this information prevented the ambush and saved many lives. Sergeant Morris' conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty were instrumental in the successful defeat of the enemy, saved many lives, and were in the highest traditions of the United States Army.

After the reading of the citation, the President introduced General Westmoreland, who made the following statement:

REMARKS OF GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND AT THE CEREMONY AWARDING THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO S. SGT. CHARLES B. MORRIS, U.S. ARMY

Mr. President, I thank you for this honor. It so happens that I know Sergeant Morris. We are not only fellow soldiers, but we are friends. I saw him at Cam Ranh Bay when he was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross by our Commander in Chief.

I saw him in the hospital. I saw him several times in the hospital. The indomitable spirit that he displayed on the battlefield when he earned this, our Nation's highest award, he displayed in the hospital ever time I saw him—self-confidence, proud to be a soldier, proud to serve his country in their fight against Communism, proud to be an American.

I recall, Mr. President, when you honored us by coming to Cam Ranh Bay to see the troops on the battlefield in South Vietnam. I told you while trooping along that never in all history had a Commander in Chief commanded finer troops than are now commanded by President Johnson around the world, but particularly—in accordance with my personal knowledge—on the battlefield in South Vietnam.

This American fighting man is represented today by Sergeant Morris.

I am proud to be here to participate in this ceremony and to have the opportunity to see this man justly awarded and to be able to personally congratulate him.

DANGERS OF NEGATIVE INCOME TAX PROPOSALS

(Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, recently my colleague, Congressman ROY TAYLOR, in addressing the student body of Montreat-Anderson College, Montreat, N.C., pointed out the dangers of the negative income tax proposals. Congressman TAYLOR emphasized that these proposals would freeze their beneficiaries into a perpetual state of dependency, rather than to help them out of it. I recommend that attached excerpts from Congressman TAYLOR's address for the consideration of my colleagues and the American people.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROY A. TAYLOR BEFORE MONTREAT-ANDERSON COLLEGE STUDENT BODY, NOVEMBER 10, 1967

Another change affecting our nation is the population shift from rural areas to the cities. In the decade from 1950 to 1960, 11 million people moved to urban centers so that today 71% of our citizens live on 1% of the land.

Years ago there appeared a verse which might be called the theme song of the fight to the city. We sang, "How are we going to keep them down on the farm after they've seen Paris?" Today millions of Amer-

icans have, you might say, seen Paris, the glitter and pace of the city, but we are seeing its problems too.

Years ago the federal government launched a program of public housing in cities, wherein some low income families found housing at reduced rates in publicly-owned facilities.

In recent years a rent subsidy program has been advocated and has been put into operation on a small scale. Under this program low income families rent privately-owned apartments in any approved location and the federal government pays a portion of the monthly rent. I have voted against the rent subsidy program because it discourages private home ownership, which is needed in every community, and it also discourages individual initiative and thrift.

A more far-reaching proposal and one that you asked me to discuss is the negative income tax to guarantee an annual income. Various suggestions have been made to guarantee to each family a certain level of income through the federal personal income tax machinery. Under these proposals families and individuals with insufficient income would receive a federal cash subsidy according to the number of persons in the family and the amount of income deficiency, regardless of the reason for their poverty. Instead of paying an income tax, the low income person or family would receive the difference between the actual income and a minimum standard of need for families of different sizes.

What are the arguments for this radical proposal? The proponents contend that the negative income tax is directed specifically at the problem of poverty regardless of the cause, that present programs are set up for specific categories: old age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to disabled persons, and aid to the blind, and that a person must fit into one of these categories and prove need and inability to solve his own financial problems before receiving welfare help. These proponents contend that only about one-third of the poor families in the nation receive help because they either do not meet the means test or they were uninformed of their eligibility for aid or they were frightened by the stigma attached to welfare or they did not fit into the prescribed categories, or in some cases, were too proud to ask for help. It is expected that the negative income tax would replace the wide variety of programs now used to aid the poor and perhaps replace social security for these people.

I believe in charity toward the unfortunate, the handicapped and helpless, but I am unalterably opposed to these negative income tax proposals. Such would benefit the lazy and shiftless as much as the deserving. It would enable them to live on someone else's labors. It would guarantee to each citizen an income whether he is willing to work or not, thereby taking away the incentive for the unemployed to find work . . . it would encourage those who work today for low wages to work only part-time or to quit.

From the individual's viewpoint the receipt of a guaranteed income paid by other citizens would destroy individual dignity, weaken the capacity for growth and self-sufficiency and would perpetuate poverty as a way of life. Of course, from the point of view of a person who does not want to work, it would enable him to enjoy his poverty.

From the country's point of view it would cause severe manpower shortages, especially in low paying menial jobs. It would produce an idle class of citizens and this idleness of itself would create new social problems. Idle hands and minds are still the devil's workshop.

Summarizing, I oppose the guaranteed income proposal because it penalizes indus-

trous citizens and encourages dishonesty, it gives people who are able to work money which they were unwilling to earn. It encourages laziness, discourages self-reliance, and is a prescription for paralysis.

Recently, an Office of Economic Opportunity grant was approved for study and research by the University of Wisconsin Institute for Research concerning the negative income tax proposal. I oppose even making a grant for this study because it would use public funds to carve a path in the wrong direction.

Education and training are the most effective ways for opening the door between poverty and a decent standard of living. Giving cash doles perpetuates the plight of the poor. The checkbook approach is not the solution to the war on poverty and on city ghettos. The most fruitful results will come from programs of manpower training. Too many of our citizens remain poor because they do not possess the learning and the job skills needed to fit into an industrial society.

A few months ago it was my privilege to speak at the graduation exercises of the Asheville-Buncombe Technical Institute which had offered some training, upgrading skills, to about 10,000 people during the year 1967. Institutions such as this show what can be accomplished. Years ago I was impressed by the statement that "if you give a man a fish, you feed him for a day, but if you teach him how to fish, you feed him for life."

POVERTY PROGRAM

(Mr. HUNGATE (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some of my colleagues may believe that duly elected officials will now exercise some direct control over the poverty program, I wish to call to their attention the following article: [From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1967]

AUTONOMY SEEN HERE FOR UPO

Wiley A. Branton, executive director of the United Planning Organization, said yesterday he doubts the city government will take over UPO even if it does get the chance.

Branton said his guess was based on conversations he has had with Mayor Walter E. Washington and a majority of the City Council over the last few weeks.

The Mayor declined to discuss the matter, since Congress has not taken final action yet on the antipoverty bill.

A section added to the bill in the House would give the Nation's city halls the option of taking over local community-action programs—the largest part of the war on poverty.

The city hall section was designed to win conservative support in the House. There was no such language in the Senate bill, and the issue now has gone to conference. The city hall stipulation probably will stay in the bill in some form.

UPO has been independent up to now, and at times has feuded with the District Building.

Branton, who took over UPO last month, said he hopes that the antipoverty agency can start working more closely with the city government, and thinks there will be a great deal more cooperation now. But he does not think UPO should become a regular city agency, he said.

Under the House bill, the Mayor could either absorb the community-action program or let UPO keep running it.

Even indirect responsibility for the antipoverty program could prove a problem for the Mayor.

But overall, we are making progress. We are satisfied with that progress. Our allies are pleased with that progress. Every country that I know in that area that is familiar with what is happening thinks it is absolutely essential that Uncle Sam keep his word and stay there until we can find an honorable peace.

If they have any doubts about it, Mr. Ho Chi Minh—who reads our papers and who listens to our radio, who looks at our television—if he has any doubts about it, I want to disillusion him this morning.

We keep our commitments. Our people are going to support the men who are there. The men there are going to bring us an honorable peace.

Mr. Reynolds.

Question. Mr. President, Hanoi may be interpreting current public opinion polls to indicate that you will be replaced next year. How should this affect the campaign in this country?

The PRESIDENT. I don't know how it will affect the campaign in this country. Whatever interpretation Hanoi might make that would lead them to believe that Uncle Sam—whoever may be President—is going to pull out and it will be easier for them to make an inside deal with another President, then they will make a serious misjudgment.

Mr. Rather.

Question. Are you going to run next year? The PRESIDENT. I will cross that bridge when I get to it, as I have told you so many times, Mr. Rather.

Question. Mr. President, there are increasing statements from Capitol Hill that say your tax bill is dead for this Session of Congress. Is there any plan on the part of your Administration to try and revive this before Congress leaves; and, secondly, if not, what plans might you have next year to avert this inflationary trend that we are told will be coming?

The PRESIDENT. We want very much to have a tax bill just as quickly as we can get it. We think the sound, prudent, fiscal policy requires it. We are going to do everything that the President and the Administration can do to get that tax bill.

I would be less than frank if I didn't tell you that I have no indication whatever that Mr. Mills or Mr. Byrnes or the Ways and Means Committee is likely to report a tax bill before they adjourn.

I feel that one of our failures in the Administration has been our inability to convince the Congress of the wisdom of fiscal responsibility and the necessity of passing a tax bill not only for the effect it will have on the inflationary developments, but the effect it will have on the huge deficit that we are running.

I think one of the great mistakes that the Congress will make is that Mr. Ford and Mr. Mills have taken this position that they cannot have any tax bill now. They will live to regret the day when they made that decision. Because it is a dangerous decision. It is an unwise decision.

I think that the people of America—none of whom want to pay taxes—any pollster can walk out and say: "Do you want to pay more tax?" Of course you will say, "No, I don't want to pay tax."

But if you ask him if he wants inflation; do you want prices to increase five or six percent; do you want a deficit of \$30 or \$35 billion; do you want to spend \$35 billion more than you are taking in? I think the average citizen would say: "No."

Here at the height of our prosperity when our Gross National Product is going to run at \$850 billion, when we look at the precedents of what we have done in past wars—in Korea when President Truman asked for a tax increase, people supported it.

This request has been before the Congress since last January. They have finished most of the appropriations bills. I read the story this morning. It looks like out of \$145 billion

they will roughly cut a billion dollars in expenditures.

But they will cut several billion from revenues because of inaction, because people don't like to stand up and do the unpopular thing of assuming responsibility that men in public life are required to do sometime.

I know it doesn't add to your polls and your popularity to say we have to have additional taxes to fight this war abroad and fight the problems in our cities at home. But we can do it with the Gross National Product we have. We should do it, and I think when the American people and the Congress get the full story they will do it.

We have failed up to now to be able to convince them. But we are going to continue to try in every way that is proper.

Miss Means.

Question. Senator McCarthy has said he is considering opposing you in the Presidential primaries because he believes it would be a healthy thing to debate Vietnam in the primaries, for the party and for the country, too. Do you agree with him? What effect do you think this would have on your own candidacy?

The PRESIDENT. I don't know how I am going to be, after all this opposition develops, so far as my state of health is concerned. But I am very healthy today. I don't know whether this criticism has contributed to my good health or not.

I don't know what Senator McCarthy is going to do. I am not sure that he knows what he plans to do. We had better just wait and see, until there is something definite there, and meet it when it is necessary.

Miss Hanschman?

Question. Why do you think there is so much confusion, frustration, and difference of opinion in this country about the war in Vietnam?

The PRESIDENT. There has always been confusion, frustration, and difference of opinion when there is a war going on.

There was in the Revolutionary War when only about a third of the people thought that was a wise move. A third of them opposed it, and a third were on the sideline.

That was true when all of New England came down to secede in Madison's administration in the War of 1812, and stopped in Baltimore. They didn't quite make it because Andrew Jackson's results in New Orleans came in.

They were having a party there that night. The next morning they came and told the President they wanted to congratulate him—that they thought he was right all along, although they had come from Boston to Baltimore in a secessionist move.

That was true in the Mexican War when the Congress overwhelmingly voted to go in and later passed a resolution that had grave doubts about it. Some of the most bitter speeches were made. They were so bitter they couldn't be published. They had to hold up publication of them for 100 years.

I don't have to remind you of what happened in the Civil War. People were here in the White House begging Lincoln to concede and work out a deal with the Confederacy when word came to him of his victories. They told him that Pennsylvania was gone; that Illinois had no chance.

Those pressures come to a President.

You know what President Roosevelt went through, and President Wilson in World War I. He had some Senators from certain areas then that gave him very serious problems until victory was assured.

Now, when you look back upon it, there are very few people who would think that Wilson, Roosevelt, or Truman were in error.

We are going to have this criticism. We are going to have these differences.

No one likes war. All people love peace. But you can't have freedom, Miss Hanschman, without defending it.

Question. Mr. President, the foreign aid authorization has been cut back nearly a

third from what you requested. What is the impact of this economy?

The PRESIDENT. At a time when the richest nation in the world is enjoying more prosperity than it has ever had before, when we carefully tailor our requests to the very minimum that we think is essential—the lowest request that we have had in years—and then Congress cuts it 33½ percent, I think it is a mistake. It is a serious mistake.

When you consider that \$1 billion that we are attempting to save there, out of the \$850 billion that we will produce, we ought to reconsider that decision. What we are doing with that money not only can give great help to underdeveloped nations; but that, in itself, can prevent the things that cause war where you are required to spend billions to win it.

I would rather have a little preventive medicine. Every dollar that we spend in our foreign assistance, trying to help poor people help themselves, is money well spent.

I don't think we overdid it. I don't think we went too far. But I think the Congress has, in the reductions it has made.

Again, it is popular to go back home and say, "Look what I did for you. I cut out all these foreign expenditures."

But when the trouble develops—the people who are starving, the people who are ignorant, illiterate, with disease—and wars spring up and we have to go in, we will spend much more than we would if we had taken an ounce of prevention.

Mr. Morgan?

Question. Mr. President, some people on the air and in print accuse you of trying to label all criticism of your Vietnam policy as unpatriotic. Could you tell us whether you have guidelines in which you are enabled to separate conscientious dissent from irresponsible dissension?

The PRESIDENT. No. I haven't called anyone unpatriotic. I haven't said anything that would indicate that.

The wicked flee when no one pursueth, sometimes.

I do think that some people are irresponsible, make untrue statements, and ought to be cautious and careful when they are dealing with the problem involving their men at the front.

There is a great deal of difference, as I said a moment ago, between criticism, indifference, and responsible dissent—all of which we insist on and all of which we protect—and storm-trooper bullying, throwing yourself down in the road, smashing windows, rowdiness, and every time a person attempts to speak to try to drown him out.

We believe very strongly in preserving the right to differ in this country, and the right to dissent. If I have done a good job of anything since I have been President, it is to insure that there are plenty of dissenters.

There is not a person in this press corps that can't write what he wants to write. Most of them do write what they want to. I say "want" advisedly. I want to protect that. Our Congress wants to protect it.

But if I, by chance, should say, "I am not sure you saw all the cables on this and you are exactly right; let me explain the other side of it," I would hope that you wouldn't say I am lambasting my critics, or that I am assailing someone.

What I am trying to do is to preserve my right to give the other side. I don't think one side ought to dominate the whole picture.

So what I would say is, let's realize that we are in the midst of a war. Let's realize that there are 500,000 of our boys out there who are risking their lives to win that war. Let's ask ourselves what it is we can do to help.

If you think you can make a contribution and help them by expressing your opinion and dissenting, then do it.

But then if the Secretary of State starts to explain his viewpoint, don't send out instructions all over the country and say, "When he starts to talk and says 'Mr. Chair-

man, stamp your feet. When he comes to the end of a sentence, all of you do this, and at the third sentence, all of you boo."

I am amazed that the press in this country, who insist on the right to live by the First Amendment, and to be protected by it, doesn't insist that these storm-trooper tactics live by the First Amendment, too, and that they be wiped out.

I think the time has come when it would be good for all of us to take a new, fresh look at dissent.

We welcome responsible dissent. But there is a great deal of difference between responsible dissent and some of the things that are taking place in this country which I consider to be extremely dangerous to our national interest, and I consider not very helpful to the men who are fighting the war for us.

Everyone must make that judgment for himself.

I have never said anyone was unpatriotic. I don't question these people's motives. I do question their judgment.

I can't say that this dissent has contributed much to any victories we have had.

I can't say that these various proposals that range from a Senator to a County Commissioner to a Mayor of a city have really changed General Westmoreland's plan much, or Ambassador Bunker's approach. The papers are filled with it every day.

So I think you have to consider it for what you think it is worth and make your own judgment.

That is the theory of the First Amendment. We don't stop the publication of any papers. We don't fine anyone for something they say. We just appeal to them to remember that they don't have the privilege at the moment of being out there fighting.

Please count to ten before you say something that hurts instead of helps.

We know that most people's intentions are good. We don't question their motives. We have never said they are unpatriotic, although they say some pretty ugly things about us.

People who live in glass houses shouldn't be too anxious to throw stones.

Question. Mr. President, is your aim in Vietnam to win the war or to seek a compromised, negotiated solution?

The PRESIDENT. I think our aims in Vietnam have been very clear from the beginning. They are consistent with the SEATO Treaty, with the Atlantic Charter, and with the many statements that we have made to the Congress in connection with the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. The Secretary of State has made this clear dozens and dozens of times—and I made it enough that I thought even all the preachers in the country had heard about it.

That is, namely, to protect the security of the United States. We think the security of the United States is definitely tied in with the security of Southeast Asia.

Secondly, to resist aggression. When we are a party to a treaty that says we will do it, then we carry it out.

I think if you saw a little child in this room who was trying to waddle across the floor and some big bully came along and grabbed it by the hair and started stomping it, I think you would do something about it.

I think that we thought we made a mistake when we saw Hitler moving across the landscape of Europe. The concessions that were made by the men carrying umbrellas at that time—I think in retrospect we thought that was a mistake.

So as a consequence, in 1954 under the leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, we had a SEATO Treaty.

It was debated, it was considered and it was gone into thoroughly by the Senate. The men who presented that Treaty then said, "This is dangerous. The time may come when we may have to put up or shut up."

But we ought to serve notice in Asia now as we refused to serve notice in Europe a few years ago that we will resist aggression—that we will stand against someone who seeks to gobble up little countries, if those little countries, if those little countries call upon us for our help.

I didn't vote for that Treaty. I was in the hospital. Senator Kennedy didn't vote for it—the late President—he was in the hospital. Senator Dirksen didn't vote for it. But 82 Senators did vote for it. They knew what was in that Treaty.

The time came when we had to decide whether we meant what we said when we said our security was tied in to their security and that we would stand in unison in the face of danger.

We are doing that. We are doing it against whomever combines out there to promote aggression. We are going to do whatever we think is necessary to protect the security of South Vietnam—and let those people determine for themselves what kind of a government they have.

We think they are moving along very quickly in that direction to developing a democratic procedure.

Third, we are going to do whatever it is necessary to do to see that the aggressor does not succeed.

Those are our purposes. Those are our goals. We are going to get a lot of advice to do this or to do that. We are going to consider it all. But for years West Point (and the other Service Academies) has been turning out the best military men produced anywhere in the world.

For years we have had in our foreign service trained and specialized people. We have in 110 capitals today the best trained we can select.

Under Constitutional arrangements the President must look to his Secretary of State, to his foreign policy, to his ambassadors, to the cables and views that they express, to his leaders like the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to General Westmoreland and others—and carefully consider everything they say and then do what he thinks is right.

That is not always going to please a county commissioner, nor a mayor, nor a member of a legislature. It never has in any war we have ever been in been a favorite of the Senate.

The leaders on the military committees and the leaders in the other posts have frequently opposed it.

Champ Clark, the Speaker of the House, opposed the draft in Woodrow Wilson's Administration. The Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—with the exception of Senator Vandenberg—almost invariably has found a great deal wrong with the Executive in the field of foreign policy.

There is a division there. There is some frustration there.

Those men express it and they have a right to. They have a duty to do it.

But it is also the President's duty to look and see what substance they have presented, how much they thought it out, what information they have, how much knowledge they have received from General Westmoreland or Ambassador Bunker, whoever it is; how familiar they are with what is going on; and whether you really think you ought to follow their judgment or follow the judgment of the other people.

I do that every day. Some days I have to say to our people: "Let us try this plan that Senator X has suggested." And we do.

We are doing that with the United Nations resolution. We have tried several times to get the United Nations to play a part in trying to bring peace in Vietnam.

The Senate thinks that this is the way to do it. More than 50 of them have signed a resolution.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee had a big day yesterday. They reported two resolutions in one day.

I have my views. I have my views about really what those resolutions will achieve. But I also have an obligation to seriously and carefully consider the judgments of the other Branch of the Government. And we are going to do it.

Even though we may have some doubts about what will be accomplished, that they think may be accomplished, if it is a close question we will bend to try to meet their views because we think that is important.

We have already tried the United Nations before, but we may try it again because they have hopes and they believe that this is the answer. We will do everything that we can to make it the answer.

I don't want to hurt its chances by giving any predictions at this moment.

We will consider the views that everyone suggests.

The Press. Thank you, Mr. President.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, have we dispensed with the pending business at the present time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is under control. There is no amendment pending. Senators are speaking on the bill. Who yields time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be accorded such time as he requires, the time not to be charged to either side.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I rise to ask a question.

Can the distinguished chairman of the committee inform us whether or not there will be any more votes tonight?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There will be no more rollcall votes tonight and I do not believe there will be any more votes tonight.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is recognized.

NE file

GREECE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the military clique that rules Greece by reason of having seized power by force has commented on some remarks I made recently about our U.S. aid program to Greece. The comments came from a newspaper in Athens, but the fact that the story is reproduced and circulated by the Greek Embassy makes it pretty clear that the paper spoke for the Government. I ask unanimous consent to have the press release from the Greek Embassy inserted at the close of these remarks as exhibit 1.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, most of the exceptions taken to my views in opposition to further military aid to Greece takes the form of recalling the heroic efforts of the Greek Army in World War II, first against Italy and then against Germany. What does that have to do with Greece, or the Greek Government, or the Greek Army in 1967? Absolutely nothing. It is nothing but a diversion from the plain truth which I expressed in my remarks of October 9 in which I pointed out that Greece to-

day is incapable of maintaining a military effort except through the military and financial support she would expect from the United States in case of war.

As to the Greek Government, and its army, during the period of the Truman Doctrine, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as exhibit 2 a letter from the New York Times of today, describing the imprisonment by the junta of a leading general who led the Greek Army against the Communist guerrillas, and commanded the Greek contingent in Korea. The letter is headed: "The Plight of General Koumanakos," and tells of his confinement and subsequent breakdown in a Greek jail as a result of the action of these tyrants that we are pouring American money in to maintain in a military dictatorship in a land that was once known as free Greece.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the faction of militarists running Greece today has little in common with the leaders of Greece who led its resistance to occupation, and its postwar resistance to Communism.

Yet, the point of my statement remains unanswered. Greece could not maintain a war effort today against anyone out of her own resources. If she could, she would not be seeking free American military equipment in time of peace. If she cannot equip her army in time of peace, how could she equip it in time of war? Where would the tanks come from, or the airplanes, the artillery, the supplies, even the money to pay her soldiers in wartime, if they did not come from the United States?

What I have said about our aid program to Greece has been aimed at American policymakers, not at Greece. The Pentagon sees Greece as one of its territorial bases against the Soviet Union, and its southern approaches. It is an important listening post for U.S. military and intelligence services, and it furnishes thousands of troops to the southern NATO command.

But do her manpower and geography make it worthwhile to keep Greece on the payroll, so to speak, when her government is an illegitimate collection of militarists who prosper from the Communist bugaboo and use it as a pretext for strangling liberty in their own country?

I say that to keep such a government afloat with U.S. arms and aid of any kind does more harm than good to American interests. We started 20 years ago with the Truman doctrine to keep Greece from Communist control. I supported the Truman doctrine then. In fact, I was the first man in the Senate, following President Truman's speech to the joint session of Congress, who was in complete support of President Truman, and I was the only Member of the Senate who gave him that support the day he made the speech. Others waited; I did not.

Mr. President, Greece at the time of the Truman doctrine is not Greece of today. Greece at the time of the Truman doctrine was a constitutional government, not having been taken over by a group of military dictators that threw

out the constitution and threw out their constitutional government.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon will never support tyranny so long as I sit in the Senate of the United States. Tyranny today reigns in Greece. This is what I want to say to the Greek Ambassador here in Washington, D.C.: "I shall welcome this opportunity to take you on. So far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, your shocking performance already makes you persona non grata. So far as I am concerned, because of the course of action you followed, I do not think you are fit to run an Embassy in Washington, D.C."

This is language which even a Greek Ambassador representing a military dictatorship can understand.

Mr. President, I said that I supported the Truman doctrine then. I supported the Truman doctrine then because I believed it was possible for a limited amount of U.S. assistance for a limited period to accomplish the goal of keeping Greece free of communism.

We are seeing now that the theory as practiced by the Greek junta is a fraud. According to them, they never will be free from the threat of internal communism and American arms and aid will have to be eternal. We already have spent \$3½ billion in this cause, and the economic gains from it have been largely dissipated by the junta itself.

Like the child who killed his parents and then pleaded for mercy on the ground that he was an orphan, this government in Greece has destroyed much of its economic and political base and now pleads for more help from the United States on the ground that it will be jeopardized if it does not get more assistance.

The American taxpayers have been whipsawed long enough by this argument. We have heard it from many other countries before Greece. We will go on hearing it, as long as we cater to it. Greece is a place to put a stop to it.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service, Nov. 14, 1967]

ATHENS COMMENTS SENATOR MORSE'S ATTACK ON GREEK ARMY

The influential Athens daily "Eleftheros Kosmos" in three leading articles which appeared in its October 30, 31 and November 1 issues, commented on the recent statements of U.S. Senator Wayne Morse alleging that the United States is in Greece only because Greece disposes of several hundred thousand troops for NATO, that it is wrong "to give the impression that the Greek army could sustain any military action", that if the U.S. files on the subject are examined, one can see "what our military experts say about the lack of military efficiency of the Greek army" and that the Greek army "has no economic foundation whatsoever, other than the U.S. treasury and U.S. weapons and supplies".

Underlining the irresponsibility and shabbiness of these allegations, the Athens paper reminds the Senator of Greece's unique contribution and sacrifice during the last World War, resulting in universal praise of the Greek army by allied statesmen of the time headed by Winston Churchill.

The paper stresses that Greece has since devoted an impressive slice of its annual budget to military expenditures and levels the accusation that the U.S. Senator ignores the official reports of NATO leaders on the

high qualitative level of the Greek armed forces.

The paper is scandalized at the shortness of memory or bad faith exhibited in passing over the fact that the Greek army fought and won a communist guerrilla war in the late 1940's, in the direct interest of the entire free world, as it secured NATO and U.S. defenses in the Eastern Mediterranean area.

Concluding, the Athens paper expresses consternation at the exhibition of "such a complete lack of contact with reality" by a member of the U.S. Senate.

EXHIBIT 2

FLIGHT OF GENERAL KOUMANAKOS

To the Editor:

Your Nov. 6 news report from Athens about the political prisoners of the Greek Government fails to mention one prominent member of the Maroussi group, Gen. George E. Koumanakos. This omission may be explained by the fact that since Oct. 21 he is no longer with the group.

After five months at the suburban Athens prison you mention in your article, General Koumanakos was suddenly transferred to the infamous Averof prison, where he was placed in isolation in a 5x7-foot cell, without heat, light or furniture other than an iron bed and a chamber pot. Three days later he was found unconscious, and since then has been lying an invalid in the prison hospital, among thirty or forty common law criminals. A heart attack has been tentatively diagnosed, but the likelihood is that the man has suffered a mental breakdown.

ARMY RECORD

Like Andreas Papandreou, General Koumanakos is accused of conspiring against the men who conspired—and succeeded—to overthrow Greece's constitutional Government when they were still at the stage of conspiracy. But unlike Papandreou, General Koumanakos was never implicated publicly in this or any other accusation. Unlike Papandreou, General Koumanakos has never been accused of leftist sympathies.

His record as an officer who was promoted for bravery during the Greek civil war and again while serving as a commander of the Greek expeditionary force that fought the Communists in Korea leaves no doubt about his loyalty to ideals for which our own country fought and is still fighting on the battlefield and in the diplomatic front.

General Koumanakos' heroism, education and integrity have brought to him many Greek and foreign distinctions, including the United States Legion of Merit, Silver Star and a number of favorable citations from President Eisenhower and Gens. James A. Van Fleet, Maxwell D. Taylor, W. E. Dunkelberg, E. W. Ridding and others. His bond with this country has been further forged by several years of studies in the United States and a daughter who proudly—albeit bitterly—carries American citizenship.

My intention in writing is not to engage in a political argument, even though it is obvious to me too that the argument exists and reflects badly on all of us who so far have treated it lightly. If only my letter could cause the Greek Government to restore General Koumanakos' elementary human—not civil—rights, and thus alleviate his suffering, I, along with his family and friends, would be satisfied.

PETER HARTOCOLLIS, M.D.

THE MENNINGER FOUNDATION, TOPEKA, KANS., November 11, 1967.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO INCREASE SALARIES OF TEACHERS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the salaries of public school

teachers in the District of Columbia. As a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I am firmly committed to the proposition that the District of Columbia public school system should be a model system in our Nation.

The teachers' pay bill I am introducing today will bring teachers' pay more in line with what schoolteachers across the Nation should be receiving. Schoolteachers' salaries in this country have not kept pace with the salaries being offered in private industry and government.

Outstanding young men and women attending our colleges and universities, who are so desperately needed to teach in the field of education and especially to teach underprivileged children in our large cities, are not going into the teaching profession but are seeking more financial security in professions and occupations offering remuneration. In my judgment, this trend must be curtailed. The bill which I am introducing today is but a small step in that direction.

I am in complete agreement with Commissioner Walter Washington when he recently stated:

It is clear that no single factor establishes a school system's competitive position; it is also clear that salary is not the primary attractor of staff, though it is one of the important factors. In short, the staffing problem cannot be solved only with salaries, but it cannot be solved without a salary advantage. A superior salary schedule is the only major competitive factor which the District Schools can turn to their advantage quickly. Buildings take years to plan and build. Reputations may be lost rapidly and may take years to rebuild. 'Challenge' as an attractor is the opportunity to participate in a program of significance, and programs take time to develop and initiate. Compared with these factors, highly competitive salaries can be established quickly.

Urban teaching demands the most capable and dedicated teachers. Every child should have the benefit of an educational program designed to suit his capacities and to develop him to the limit of his potentialities. Ultimately, education serves all of our purposes, but the one it serves most directly is equality of opportunity. I believe that education is the high road of this opportunity, the great avenue that all must travel to succeed. It is essential that the District have the best teachers for this job.

Of 20 cities with a population of over 500,000 the District of Columbia teachers'

salaries for teachers with the bachelor of arts degree rank 15th for beginning salaries to sixth place for maximum salaries. My bill would put the District of Columbia schoolteachers in this category first, in both minimum and maximum salaries, in cities over 500,000 in population.

Public school teachers with a master of arts degree in the District of Columbia presently rank 13th for beginning salaries and sixth among the 20 cities with populations over 500,000. My bill would put the teachers in this category in first place with the schoolteachers of New York City as far as beginning salaries are concerned, and in first place as far as maximum salaries are concerned.

I would like to note, however, that salary levels for the 1968-69 school year in Detroit will range from \$7,500 to \$11,200 for those teachers with a bachelor's degree, and \$8,000 to \$11,700 for those teachers with a master's degree. New York City schoolteachers recently ratified a contract with the New York City Board of Education which will provide on March 1, 1969, a minimum salary of \$6,750 and a maximum salary for teachers with a bachelor's degree of \$11,150.

Mr. President, I see no justification for paying public school teachers in the District of Columbia less than the local transit company pays its bus drivers. I know of no reason why public school teachers in the District of Columbia should earn less than the plumbers, policemen, firemen, construction laborers, truck drivers, plumbers' helpers, and people in other occupations. I am not saying that people in the occupations which I cited are overpaid. What I am saying is that public school teachers in the District of Columbia are grossly underpaid and that the pay bill which I propose will help correct that situation.

Mr. President, we have file clerks in the Senate who are paid far more than our public school teachers. I am not saying that these file clerks are overpaid, but I think the work performed by public school teachers is at least equally as important as the filing of papers.

I am not very much impressed, Mr. President, by arguments that my bill would have starting and maximum sal-

aries above that of adjacent jurisdictions to the city of Washington. The problems facing the public school teachers in the District of Columbia, or any other large urban area, are much more acute than many of the school problems in suburban areas. If we are to attract school teachers to the District of Columbia, we must be willing to pay top salaries because working conditions in the District of Columbia public school system certainly would not attract teachers and administrators. Public school facilities in the District of Columbia are not a model for the Nation. Many of the physical plants are inadequate and archaic. I hope that this situation can be corrected within the near future.

I am very hopeful that hearings can be held on my teachers' pay bill in order that teachers' pay legislation may be considered in the Senate before Congress adjourns this year. I shall do whatever I can to assist in the passage of this bill as well as the police and firemen's pay bill, presently being considered by the Senate District Committee.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2679) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2679

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1967."

Sec. 2. The District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (D.C. Code, Sec. 31-1501 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 (D.C. Code, Sec. 31-1501) is amended by striking the salary schedules contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Salary class and group	Service step													Longevity step	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	X	Y
Class 1..... Superintendent.	\$34,000														
Class 2..... Deputy superintendent.	27,000														
Class 3..... Assistant superintendent. President, teachers college.	19,320	\$19,780	\$20,240	\$20,700	\$21,160	\$21,620	\$22,080	\$22,540	\$23,000						
Class 4..... Director, curriculum. Dean, teachers college. Executive assistant to superintendent.	16,400	16,800	17,200	17,600	18,000	18,400	18,800	19,200	19,600						
Class 5:															
Group A, bachelor's degree.....	15,260	15,640	16,020	16,400	16,780	17,160	17,540	17,920	18,300						
Group B, master's degree.....	15,960	16,340	16,720	17,100	17,480	17,860	18,240	18,620	19,000						
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	16,310	16,690	17,070	17,450	17,830	18,210	18,590	18,970	19,350						
Group D, doctor's degree.....	16,660	17,040	17,420	17,800	18,180	18,560	18,940	19,320	19,700						
Chief examiner.															
Director, food services.															
Director, industrial adult education.															
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.															