alongside awaiting its turn. The workman is explaining to his friend that the small box contains an electronic data processing system and in the big box are, of course, the instruction manuals for the system.

MAGNITUDE OF PAPERWORK COSTS

To return to the serious side of our discussion this morning, the paperwork problem has been with us for a long time. As many of you know, back in 1810 the House of Representatives established a committee to determine what was happening to important old public records and to provide for the orderly preservation of them. The emphasis then was on preservation, and while the list of paperwork management problems has expanded considerably, records preservation is still extremely important. The trick, of course, is to preserve the right records and have reasonable accessibility to them. How many times have you set about to research a problem and found that a voluminous clutter of records is available to you, but that the one record which would give you the answer to what you really need to know is nowhere to be found.

I am sure much work was done on records management between 1810 and 1934 when the National Archives Act was passed which established the Office of the Archivist of the United States, but it was not until 1943, during World War II, that the Records Disposal Act was put on the books. In tracing this history briefly, we find that there was a shift in emphasis over the years from records preservation to records disposal.

Later, the Federal Records Act of 1950, put the Federal records manager in business, so to speak, and it was high time. Shortly thereafter, the Hoover Commission estimated the cost of the Federal Government's paperwork at $4 billion a year. I think this is a statistic we have been passing over all too quickly, so let me suggest we refresh ourselves about it for a minute. The Hoover Commission reported that the lion's share of the $4 billion, 70 percent or $2,800 million, goes for creating records. They estimated that 485,000 Federal Government employees, or about one-quarter of all Federal workers, were engaged in collecting, compiling, and analyzing reports of all kinds. Almost all of the remainder of the $4 billion was devoted to maintaining files and records. About 1 percent of the total, which still is a large sum—$30 million—was used for the records disposal program.

THE COST TO THE PUBLIC

Now, whether you accept the Hoover Commission's estimates or not, they are the best figures we have so far on the dimensions of our paper problem and, of course, they are now almost 10 years old. More recent information leads us to believe that today we are about holding our own; or, in other words, we are disposing of about as many papers each year as the Federal Government is creating. And, if, as they tell us, the Federal records created each year laid end-to-end would reach the moon 13 times, maybe we ought to turn this whole problem over to NASA. But I hate to think where we would be today if our records disposal program did not exist.

A good example of records disposal has come to my attention, and I am sure you will enjoy hearing about it. The example is cited in an editorial which appeared in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., on February 6, 1964, and is one of the few kudos I've seen for good records management work outside of the trade journals. The editorial is entitled "Bouquet for Census," and reads as follows:

"Someone ought to make up a bouquet and present it to the Census Bureau.

"Despite the rise of the microfilm method of record keeping, there are times when we wonder whether the population can keep its head above the rising flood of stored Government records.

"Now we are informed, by the Census Bureau, that 1960 questionnaires on population and housing have already been destroyed. There were 837 tons of them. As wastepaper they were packed into 1,200-pound bales. It took 20 freight cars and 17 trucks to move them out.

"But the main point is that this has been done, and less than 4 years after they were collected. A few more items like this will give us hope that we can hold back the flood."

The second observation I should like to make is that if the cost to the Federal Government is $4 billion to make, maintain, and dispose of its records each year, how much is it costing individual citizens, businesses, and manufacturing plants around the country to meet the paperwork requirements of the Federal, State, and local governments?

Let's look at the problem in somewhat more detail, and let's take first the situation in which the small businessman finds himself. How much are Government reports costing him, and how are they affecting him otherwise?

The example I am going to give you is actual and probably occurring more frequently than you and I would like to think. It comes to me from Congressman O'BRIEN, of New York, and describes the plight of a druggist back home in his district. The druggist has a small business and hires one or two employees to help him run it. After a full day at the store, ordinarily one would expect that the druggist could go home and relax, but not so. He must go home and do his bookkeeping, a significant amount of which is generated by Government report requirements. If this were the end of it, the situation would be bad enough, but I have not finished the example. The druggist finds it necessary to hire an accountant, who gets more money per hour than the druggist, to prepare his income tax return and other Government reports.

This is the very point I have made before. Government reports can play havoc with the small businessman and can go so far as to turn his profits into losses. There are serious side effects, too. These good, honest people get the idea that the Government is breathing down their necks and that the Federal Government in Washington is almost an enemy, because of this heavy burden of paperwork. These people want to obey the law, but it is becoming increasingly difficult for them because so much reporting is required. We simply cannot allow the causes of this type of feeling to go unchecked, nor do we intend to.

Next, let's review the paperwork experience of a private corporation. Some of you may remember that back in 1959 our subcommittee looked into this matter, using case histories of individual companies. I would like to read from our "Report on the Business Reporting Requirements of the Federal Government," citing the case history of a large manufacturing company in the Midwest:

"In 1 year, the company handled 173 different Federal forms ranging in frequency of filing from daily to annual, and involving the filing of 37,683 reports. The workload amounted to 48,285 hours. In addition, the company received a number of other Federal forms, presumably voluntary, which it did not respond to because it objected to the apparent duplication, felt that the data requested were confidential, or for other reasons. In this group were 33 different forms which would have involved 1,098 reports and an estimated workload of 424 hours.

Requests from State agencies which were complied with included 63 different forms, involving the filing of 1,145 reports at a cost of 3,266 hours. State requests which were not filed included 6 different forms which would have involved 32 reports and an estimated 61 hours.

Requests from cities, other local governments, and private groups (e.g., trade associations, chambers of commerce) which were honored included 36 different forms requiring 385 filings and 676 hours. Requests from similar sources to which response was not made included 27 different forms which would have involved 110 reports and an estimated cost of 234 hours.

It is noted that the proportion of total workload attributable to Federal forms was much greater in the case of this company than has been observed in other cases. This company deals largely in agricultural products, and 61 percent of its Federal workload comprised work on the U.S. Department of Agriculture forms. In addition, the workload for the year included filing for the census of manufactures, which is conducted only once every 5 years. Hours chargeable to the census forms amounted to 26 percent of the total time spent on Federal forms.

It is probably true, however, that the larger the company the greater the relative impost of Federal filing requirements. Many Federal inquiries are limited to the larger enterprises, or require more detailed reporting from the larger ones. The workload tends to vary also according to the nature of the industry. Firms operating in an economic area in which the Federal Government has a strong regulatory interest, such as agriculture or railroads, or a strong procurement interest, such as aircraft and missiles, are likely to have heavier reporting burdens than firms in other areas.

Now in fairness to the Federal agencies, I should say that they are often criticized by persons who do not know all the facts. In our hearings last month on the 1963 Economic Censuses, one witness complained about a form used in the census of business for restaurants and cafes or as the Census Bureau calls them eating and drinking places. The census schedule asks for figures on sales of such things as clothing, shoes, hardware, and many other mechandise lines not usually associated with "eating and drinking places". Our witness who comes from New York, ridiculed this form and implied that this was typical of government bureaucracy at work.

Now in New York City, I'm sure that most eating and drinking places sell only food and beverages, but out in my district in Montana, eating and drinking places sell everything under the sun.

But some of these complaints are justified and our subcommittee plans to look into the businessman's cost for Federal reports in connection with hearings to be held in April and May. If we are unable to put a dollar value on these costs, I think we'll be able, at least, to state them in employee manhours. My impression now is that, on the average, the cost to the public for Federal reporting may be as high as 10 times the cost to the Government. And, I will predict to you now that before long we will require Federal agencies to submit a statement about the cost of a survey or form to the business community before the questionnaire can be placed in the mails. We may not like to do this, but in my opinion, we will be forced to do it.

PAPERWORK AND EDP

Now, I would like to turn to the subject of EDP and briefly discuss its effect upon the paperwork problem. I would liek to quote from my speech in the House on February 8, as regards EDP:

"The possibilities of paperwork reduction through or as a byproduct of electric data processing automation in the Government are enormous. Exploration of machine-to-machine reporting is only in its infancy, but a few applications reported by the agencies suggest what the future has in store. As

described in this report, an outstanding example of paperwork reduction through interagency data exchange is the Treasury Department's arrangement whereby the Division of Disbursements receives check issue information on magnetic tape from a number of cooperating agencies (Veterans' Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Internal Revenue Service, and others). Another example is the arrangement whereby the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (BOASI) receives Federal Insurance Compensation Act (FICA) earnings statements on magnetic tape; some 4 million earnings items are received quarterly, 3 million from the Armed Forces and 1 million from State agencies and private employers. A third, which may point the way to greater paperwork savings, is the Census Bureau's use of BOASI lists and employer identification numbers in the 1963 Censuses of Business and Manufactures."

In my speech, I went on to say that some of us are disappointed so far, in that EDP in some cases has actually increased the paperwork flow and I cited the 500 million forms now used by the Internal Revenue Service in the collection of income taxes. I may have been a little severe on the Internal Revenue Service in my remarks, and Mr. Caplin told me as much in a four-page single-spaced letter. But, I plan to pursue this matter further in our hearings. I have never understood why the financial and banking agencies are exempt from the Federal Reports Act of 1942, especially when they are among the worst offenders when it comes to the proliferation of paperwork.

Nor do I understand why it is necessary for the Treasury Department to retain income tax forms and other records for as long as 30 years. As a lawyer and former attorney general of my State, I can understand keeping records for a reasonable period of time, if only because of the delays in the courts and the statute of limitations, but what about the records storage costs involved in these systems. We will soon have 100 million persons filing income tax returns each year and the information retrieval problems must be enormous. In contrast, we have the example of the 1960 census schedules which have already been destroyed, as I described earlier.

Speaking of EDP, I wonder how many of you have actually stood in front of a high-speed printer. I don't mean the 1,200 lines per minute outputs of the printers now generally in use, but the new generation printers with speeds up to 3,000 lines per minute. These machines spew out paper at such a tremendous speed that if you do stand in front of them, you would literally be buried in paper in a matter of minutes. One of these machines could engulf this room in printed paper in no time at all.

How important it is, then, that the entire EDP system be intelligently managed and monitored; and how important it is that we bring the best management tools at our command to this new technology. These and other EDP matters are discussed in considerable detail in our subcommittee report on the "Use of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government," released last October.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

In my remarks this morning, I have had to highlight certain aspects of the paperwork problem. I have not discussed, for instance, information retrieval via EDP and the work of my colleague, Congressman PUCINSKI, is doing in this area, nor the study the Library of Congress has undertaken regarding the feasibility of automating some of its operations, your own correspondence management projects, and so on. I'm afraid this is one of our problems. We have so many paperwork projects, there is a real question as to whether we can do all of them justice and keep our eye on the ball at the same time.

Before closing, I want to say that the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics is going to continue to fight in this paperwork jungle. We are planning hearings in April and May. Throughout, we are hopeful that we will have your support and that you will use your excellent vantage point to lighten the Government paperwork burden on the citizens and businessmen of this country. I know that most of you have active programs in paperwork reduction, but if you don't, you certainly should. If you are in doubt as to how to proceed, you might contact the Interstate Commerce Commission, which, in my opinion, has done an outstanding job in this matter, and I praised them for it on the floor of the House.

Also, if any of you have any suggestions which should be included in our forthcoming hearings, please get in touch with me or the staff. It may come as a surprise to some of you that under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has jurisdiction in matters concerning the National Archives and this responsibility has been delegated to our subcommittee. So, your ideas and suggestions are doubly welcome.

One last word before I close. We don't associate paperwork with the struggle in Vietnam but if we're not doing too well over there, this report by Jim Lucas, of Scripps-Howard, might explain why:

"Men in the field often work for three commanders: the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV), the Military Advisory Assistance Group (MAAG), and the Military Assistance Command, Thailand (MACT). These are in addition to the 'Support Command,' the 'country team' headed by Ambassador Lodge. Fieldmen must report to all three commands. The paperwork is horrendous."

Lucas goes on to say that organization on the Vietnam side is equally confused. This report from Vietnam only bears out what we've been saying right along that poor organization and management breeds excessive paperwork. So don't let anyone tell you that paperwork is not important.

Thanks for asking me to come here this morning. I enjoyed being with you.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE RICHARD F. TAITANO

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1961, Richard F. Taitano, a native of Guam, became the Director of the Office of the Territories in the Department of the Interior. It was the first time that a native of one of the territories had been placed in the command post over the destinies of the islands in the Atlantic and the Pacific over which flies the Stars and Stripes. Mr. Taitano is retiring to become Deputy High Commissioner of the trust territories after an outstanding record of accomplishment. It is said of him by those closest in position to judge that in 3 years he has accomplished more, especially in the field of education and health, than has been accomplished in the preceding half century.

Here are the islands under the jurisdiction of the Director of the Office of the Territories: Virgin Islands in the Atlantic, Palmyra, and Canton near Hawaii, Guam and American Samoa in the Far Pacific, and over 2,000 islands that comprise the Trust Territories of the Pacific.

When Mr. Taitano was summoned from Guam by President Kennedy and Secretary Udall to take over the Trust Territories of the Pacific, although under American care and guardianship, were perhaps the most desolate and neglected areas in the world. Few of the islanders spoke English. There were six native languages and the language spoken on one little island might be quite different from that spoken on another island. There were no doctors, no medicine.

That was 3 years ago. Now there are 75 schools and by next year the number will be 400. Several hundred teachers have been brought from the United States, more are being recruited. The children of these faraway islands are responding splendidly and already are handling English with ease and delight.

Progress also has been made in improving health conditions.

Three years ago there was one small school in American Samoa. Today there are school accommodations and qualified teachers for every child on the island.

What Director Taitano accomplished, the miracles he worked, would not have been possible, of course, without the interest and the help of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], chairman of the subcommittee that handles the appropriations for the territories.

Congressman KIRWAN spent days on some of the desolate and neglected islands observing painfully and uncomfortably at first hand, came to the conclusion that all this constituted a national disgrace and came back to Washington to do something about it. As chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio has consistently and faithfully been the friend and champion of the Virgin Islands, Guam and our other unincorporated territories.

Credit also is due the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the members of his committee who work together on a bipartisan nature for the advancement of the interest of our unincorporated and trust territories.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak the sentiment of all my colleagues in extending to Mr. Taitano our warm congratulations on the outstandingly good job he has done in a post of the greatest importance and our every good wish for a future of expanding accomplishment and contentment. He and his charming wife, Magdalena and their children, Miss Taling and Master Richard, Junior, will be missed by the many friends they made during their 3 years in Washington.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING PERSECUTION BY THE SOVIET UNION OF PERSONS BECAUSE OF THEIR RELIGION

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a speech by the president of B'nai B'rith.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest and most heartfelt concern not only for the Jewish people in the Soviet Union but for all mankind throughout the world that I have introduced a resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion.

I hope that this resolution, which is similar to Senate Resolution 204, introduced in the Senate by the Honorable ABRAHAM RIBICOFF and cosponsored by 63 fellow Senators, will receive equally representative backing in the House.

The terrifying situation of Jewish persecution in the Soviet Union has reached such intensity and alarming proportions that leaders of 24 major national Jewish organizations in the United States have gathered together in Washington these past 2 days to conduct a conference on Soviet Jewry.

I would like to bring to your attention by including in my remarks the opening address of the chairman of the conference, Label A. Katz, president of the B'nai B'rith, whose articulate thoughts and whose presentation of alarming facts on the treatment of the Jews in the U.S.S.R. must be heeded by every human being who cares for his fellowman.

I hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will take action on this resolution, so that somehow our voices may be heard by the Soviet leaders and will help to put an end to the insidious cultural and religious genocide that is being perpetrated on the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

ADDRESS BY LABEL A. KATZ TO THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY

I call to order the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry.

This is an assembly of historic dimensions. It is an assembly predicated on Jewish unity—unity of mind and of purpose.

We, the representatives of 24 organizations, are gathered to bear witness and to protest.

We do so with that most formidable of witnesses and most potent of protesters: our collective conscience as a free people.

We are here to speak that conscience.

We are here to proclaim moral indignation that makes the free spirit shudder when another man's spirit is enslaved.

We are here for a singular purpose. It is without political overtones. It is removed from cold war problems.

We are here to speak for a community of Jews in the Soviet Union that is trapped in silence; it cannot speak for itself.

We are here to articulate its plight; to appeal, in its behalf, for reason and civilized decency; to mobilize, in its support, those for whom freedom of thought and conscience is an ideal to be cherished—and therefore to be shared.

And with the Passover festival still fresh in our souls, we are here in obedience to the commitment of the Haggadah:

"B'chol do'er vo'do'er chiyov oh'dom lee'ros ess ahtz'mo key'loo hoo yo'tzo mi'mitzryim.

"In every generation, one ought to regard himself as though he had personally come out of Egypt."

My assignment of the moment, as prelude to the eminent voices we will hear this evening, is to examine briefly the problem of the Soviet Jew in its historic perspective.

The core of that problem can be found in a current Russian joke that asks: "Why is the sputnik Jewish?"

And it answers: "Because it wanders around the earth and has no place to stop."

As with all grim humor, the jest is compounded of bitter truth. The Soviet Jew—who wants to remain a Jew—has no place to go and no place to stay.

His is a dilemma foisted upon him by the conformities of a closed society, and by his unwillingness to fit neatly into orthodox preconceptions laid out by Soviet ideology.

The Soviet Jew is a creature of Soviet law—and a victim of Soviet dogma.

He is, in the promise of Soviet law, upheld as a full and equal citizen of his motherland. In terms of his right to be Jewish, there is nothing wrong with the Soviet constitution—except that the ruling authorities choose to forsake it.

But in the practice of Soviet dogma, the Jew is cast as an alienated element in Soviet society—this because his Jewishness has not freely and conveniently faded away, as Soviet dogma predicted it would.

So the Soviet Jew finds himself between the colliding forces of Soviet law and Soviet dogma. A collision shatters: this one has fragmentized his Jewish community, crushed his Jewish culture, splintered his Jewish existence.

Despite all this, the destructiveness has failed to achieve its ultimate: it has not yet been able to kill off his Jewish consciousness.

Each of the two forces has made of Soviet Jewry a unique component, unlike any other, of Soviet society.

The law has invested Soviet Jewry with a dichotomous status. It has recognized Soviet Jewry as a religious community, with a legal right to practice Judaism as it chooses. And it has established Soviet Jewry as a major Soviet nationality, with a legal right—in fact, if you consider basic Soviet theory you would almost call it an obligation—to maintain a national culture and language.

The dogma, with its perspective of a Jewish community disappearing through assimilation, has singled out Soviet Jewry for disabilities and oppressions that contradict, not only the law, but the dogma as it is interpreted and practiced for every other major Soviet nationality.

Unlike any other Soviet nationality, the Jews are dispersed, without a province or land area of their own. The experiment of Birobidjan, ineptly conceived and haphazardly implemented, was doomed from its start.

Unlike any other Soviet nationality, the Jews are denied the national institutions—the schools, the books, the newspapers, the theaters—of their Yiddish culture.

Unlike any other Soviet nationality, the Jews are without a structure or program—or even an identifying address.

There is today in all of the Soviet Union only one "Jewish address"—that of the harassed synagogue. And what remains of the synagogue is little more than a caricature of the old East European shul that had been the lively stronghold of piety, scholarship, and communal life.

The suppression of Judaism in the Soviet Union is the suppression of all religions. But Soviet practice decrees that for Judaism it be more so.

Unlike the Russian Orthodox Church—which has a privileged status—the Baptists, the Buddhists and others, each of which is able, in some fashion, to conduct an organized establishment, to produce Bibles and prayer books, to manufacture or import religious articles, and to maintain some forms of contact with their denomination outside the U.S.S.R.—unlike these, the practice of Judaism is quarantined—insulated from its every means of sustenance.

I recently came across a handsome and revealing volume that tells about the Russian Orthodox Church. It was published several years ago by the Moscow patriarchate. Its 230 pages, nicely illustrated with scores of photographs, report on the church's multitude of religious activities, its extensive educational program of training seminarians, and its formal contacts with Christian churches outside the U.S.S.R.

There is no such volume for Judaism in the Soviet Union—there could not be. The number of synagogues in the Soviet Union has dwindled to 97. There were 450 in 1956. Each of the 97 is kept apart—unaffiliated with and unrelated to any other synagogue.

The struggles of Judaism under Soviet dogma are summed up in this poignant incident of a visitor who met an old man at worship in one of the few remaining synagogues. The visitor's questions were really rhetorical.

"Do you need siddurim—prayer books?"

The old man answered with a shrug.

"Have you enough talesim—prayer shawls?"

Another shrug.

"Do any of the children learn Hebrew?"

A third shrug.

"Can we help you in any way?"

The old man stared back. "My friend," he finally whispered, "you have asked four kashes—four questions. This is not the time for such a dialog. Four kashes are for Pesach—and Pesach in the Soviet Union is a long way off."

We are this evening following in the tradition of those who aroused the conscience of this Nation against the persecution of Russian Jews during the days of the czar. The restrictions, the quotas, the pogroms, the pale of settlement—these were the indignities that an earlier American Jewish community protested about to the highest councils of our Government.

Yet such is the character of Jewish persistence that in the very midst of the oppressions and pogroms there flourished a rich and variegated Yiddishkeit—a throbbing, vibrant culture that grew abundantly. And that culture was transported by those who fled to escape the barriers—to America, to England, to Palestine.

If Yiddishkeit bloomed in the dark shadows of these barriers, how much stronger a culture would it become when the political fetters were unchained? This was one of the false promises of the Russian revolution.

The Jews were certainly a nation when the Soviet era began. There were 3½ million Jews in Russian territory alone—another 1½ million if you include the present borders of the U.S.S.R. Soviet Jewry had its own idioms—Yiddish and Hebrew; it had a vigorous press, communal institutions, hundreds of synagogues and schools, and a popular national culture.

In the formative days of the U.S.S.R., Soviet leadership encouraged these developments. It did so while simultaneously seeking to suffocate the Jewish religion and the political philosophies of Jewish peoplehood, since these were anathema to an atheistic and closed society. But a proletarianized Yiddishkeit was evident wherever there were Jews in the Soviet Union.

In 1920, for example, there were 96 Yiddish or Hebrew newspapers and periodicals. Today, not a single Jewish daily newspaper. There is one bimonthly magazine—begun 3 years ago largely in response to protests from outside the Soviet Union.

I was in Moscow the day the first copy of Sovietish Heimland came off the press. I was delighted to se a Yiddish vort in print—and said so to Aaron Vergelis, its editor. Yet Vergelis spent most of the time of our visit insisting that Jewish mothers did not

want their children kept separate in Yiddish schools or familiarizing themselves with the Yiddish language. This pose of a Yiddish poet and editor rejecting any future for the language to which he contributes his talents was its own classic form of irony.

In the midthirties, there were 17 permanent Jewish theaters in the U.S.S.R. Today there is none.

As late as 1938, there were 800 Jewish primary and secondary schools in White Russia and the Ukraine alone. Today there is no such school anywhere in the U.S.S.R.

There were millions of copies of Yiddish books coming off the presses; hundreds of courts in Jewish districts that insisted upon Yiddish as the official court language. The Soviet Communist Party, the government, the military, the diplomatic corps—all of the institutions of the state—were open to Jews. Soviet posters shouted of a new dawn of justice and equality for all the nationalities—the Jews too.

It was a short-lived promise. By the late 1930's it had already begun to fade. The megalomania of Stalin crushed it completely. In 1948, with a single brutal sweep, Stalin toppled every institution of Jewish cultural and intellectual life. He did so with a show of force, with his famous trumped-up charges—the Doctors' Plot, the secret purges of the Jewish intelligentsia—and with a reign of terror that lasted until his death in 1953.

There remains forever in Soviet history the infamous day of August 12, 1952—the day when 26 of the leading Soviet Yiddish writers and intellectuals were summarily executed. These were not Zionists. They were not religious Jews. Most of them were practicing Communists. They were purged because they were the leading exponents of Yiddishkeit—which Stalin intended to purge with them. Soviet Jews still speak of that era as the "shvartze yohrin—the black years."

Mr. Khrushchev and his de-Stalinization policy have exposed the corrupt and fraudulent nature of that era. But while denouncing Stalin, they have said little of Stalin's anti-Semitism, and have done nothing to remove it, or to restore cultural and nationality rights to Soviet Jewry.

The standardized Soviet response to this is that Soviet Jews are not interested in maintaining a Jewish cultural life. But even Soviet leaders have difficulty with this evasive and weary cliche; first, because the facts disprove it; second, because it leads them into a mess of dialectical contradictions.

It is they who have decreed a Jewish nationality in the Soviet Union. It is they who have decreed that the Soviet Jew be identified as a Jew on his internal passport.

It is they who single out the Soviet Jew for exclusion from positions of special trust in the government and in the economy.

It is they who indulge in the curious rationalization that the Soviet Jew can best enjoy equality in the Soviet Union by being treated unequally among other Soviet nationalities.

It is they who have thrust the Soviet Jew into a consummate contradiction, on the one hand requiring him to maintain his identity as a Jew, and, on the other, forcibly pushing him toward assimilation.

It is they who have created a senseless, neither-nor world for the Soviet Jew, which says to him: "You are a Jew—but you can't be Jewish."

The Soviet dogma that commands the disappearance of Jewish consciousness is denied by history and by current events. It is worth recalling that 80 years ago a Russian high commission, a liberal and, by the standards of the times, enlightened body that sought to reduce the intensity of Russian anti-Semitism, spent 5 years studying what it called the Jewish problem. It finally concluded that only through assimilation could the problem be solved.

But the Jews of czarist Russia did not disappear through any such assimilation. And the Jews of Soviet Russia are not willing to bury their traditions or inter their heritage.

Jewish consciousness has a survivalist quality. There is an ironic aftermatch to the depotism of Stalin's black years. Observers of the Soviet scene say that nothing in the postwar years did more to heighten Jewish consciousness among Soviet Jews—particularly among the untaught, Jewishly illiterate youth—than the tyrant's efforts to achieve just the opposite.

We are called to order this evening to strengthen that survivalist spirit—to help the Soviet Jew preserve and make meaningful his Jewish consciousness.

We do not seek special privilege or status for our Soviet brother—but the equality of status that is guaranteed him by Soviet law.

We do not challenge Mr. Khrushchev's view of a world of good goulash and ballet. We simply propose that good goulash tastes better and ballet is more inspiring when the human spirit is free and untrammeled.

We are here to appeal for the restoration of an inalienable human right that cannot be challenged in any civilized society. It is the right of the Jew to be Jewish; the right of the Jew to be, not someone else—but to be himself.

AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called the attention of the House to the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry which was held in Washington on April 5–6. Sponsored by 24 Jewish organizations and attended by more than 500 people, the conference was called to protest the Soviet Union's discrimination against its citizens of the Jewish faith. At the conclusion of the conference yesterday the delegates adopted an 18-point resolution which I include at this point in the RECORD:

The American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry protests the denial to Soviet Jews of the basic institutions and facilities granted to other religions and nationality groups within the Soviet Union. Considerations of humanity and justice require the Soviet Government:

1. To declare its policy of eradicating anti-Semitism by a vigorous educational effort conducted by government and party.

2. To permit the free functioning of synagogues and private prayer meetings.

3. To remove hindrances to the observance of sacred rites such as religious burial and circumcision.

4. To make possible the production and distribution of phylacteries, prayer shawls, mezzuzoth, religious calendars, and other religious articles.

5. To restore all rights and facilities for the production and distribution of matzoh and kosher food.

6. To make available facilities to publish Hebrew Bibles, prayerbooks, and other religious texts in the necessary quantities.

7. To permit the organization of a nationwide federation of synagogues.

8. To sanction the association of such a federation with organizations of coreligionists abroad.

9. To permit Jews to make religious pilgrimages to the holy places in Israel.

10. To make it possible to allow all qualified applicants to attend the Moscow Yeshivah, to provide facilities for the establishment of additional Yeshivot as needed, and to enable rabbinical students to study at seminaries abroad.

11. To provide schools and other facilities for the study of Yiddish and Hebrew, and of Jewish history, literature, and culture.

12. To permit Jewish writers, artists, and other intellectuals to create their own institutions for the encouragement of Jewish cultural and artistic life.

13. To reestablish a Yiddish publishing house and to publish books in Yiddish by classical and contemporary Jewish writers.

14. To reestablish Yiddish state theaters in major centers of Jewish population and to publish Yiddish-language newspapers with national circulation.

15. To eliminate discrimination against Jews in all areas of Soviet public life.

16. To end all propaganda campaigns which use anti-Semitic stereotypes, implied or overt.

17. To halt the discriminatory application of maximum penalties, including the death sentence, against Jews for alleged economic crimes.

18. To make possible on humanitarian grounds Soviet Jews who are members of families separated as a result of the Nazi holocaust to be reunited with their relatives abroad.

We appeal for a redress of these and other wrongs and sufferings; for the elimination of discrimination and for the full restoration of Jewish rights in the U.S.S.R.

In addition to the resolution, the conference issued a general statement appealing to the Soviet Government to grant equality to the Jewish community in accordance with the Soviet constitution and law. That appeal follows:

AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY, APRIL 6, 1964

We, as representatives of the major national American Jewish organizations, have met for the past 2 days in solemn assembly in Washington, D.C., to express with one voice our deep concern with and our determination to protest the plight of our Jewish brethren in the Soviet Union.

Soviet Jewry constitutes the second largest Jewish community in the world and is the last remnant of the once great East European Jewish community. This remnant exists largely because of the heroic resistance of the Soviet Union to the Nazi hordes which destroyed the great majority of European Jewry.

The approximately 3 million Jews of the U.S.S.R. have a special claim on the conscience of all who are zealous of securing human rights, and, more particularly, on the conscience of all Jewry. Soviet Jews are the heirs of a tradition that stretches unbroken over 1,000 years of Jewish history in Eastern Europe, a tradition which produced an enduring heritage of scholarship, piety and ethical idealism. They are the kin of the millions who went forth from Russia to other countries, bringing with them the social idealism of their tradition enhancing the cultures of their new lands.

With the lessening of repression and persecution so widely acclaimed following the death of Stalin, it was hoped that the Soviet Jews would share in the new atmosphere of relaxation of tensions. Now, however, with anguish and indignation we witness Soviet Jewry being denied its natural right of group existence. It is fragmented from within and kept isolated from without. Though formally recognized as a nationality and as a religious group, the Soviet Jewish community is deprived of those rights granted to other nationalities and other major religious bodies in the U.S.S.R. A process of attrition forces Soviet Jews to live only a most attenuated Jewish life and threatens to crush their spirit and sever their ties with the Jewish people.

Soviet Jewish youth, traumatized by the Nazi holocaust and by Stalin's anti-Semitic excesses are now seeking to reestablish their links with Jewish life. But they are denied even the most meager opportunity to learn, enhance and transmit their Jewish heritage.

The whole of Jewish culture, and Yiddish artistic and literary expression in particular, once so flourishing in the U.S.S.R., are now represented by the merest tokens. The bonds of Soviet Jewry with their tradition are being destroyed by increasing restrictions against fundamental and sacred Jewish practices. Synagogues are closed down; the public production and distribution of matzoth and of other essential religious articles are banned. Soviet Jews are cut off from contact with their brethren at home and abroad. Jewish opportunities in higher education and in certain fields of employment are being limited.

Simultaneously, a campaign of vilification of the Jewish past and present is conducted in the press and other official publications. Judaism and Jewish history are falsified. Anti-Semitic stereotypes are exploited to portray the synagogue as a breeding ground of economic and social crimes.

We are appalled at the discriminatory application of maximum penalties, including the death sentence, against Jews for alleged economic crimes and that they are singled out in the press in a calculated attempt to exacerbate public anti-Semetism.

We are moved by the plight of thousands of Soviet Jews whose families were shattered or separated by the Nazi devastation and who are prevented from rejoining their remaining kin in the United States, Israel, and other countries.

We appeal to the Soviet Government to redress these wrongs, to restore the rights of Jews and of the Jewish community and to grant the equality with other religious and nationality groups as required by Soviet constitution and law.

We make this appeal within the framework of our ardent desire to see an end to the cold war and lessen and hopefully eradicate the existing international tensions. Our aim is to mobilize public opinion into a moral force which will save Soviet Jewry from spiritual annihilation.

We who are assembled here are bound by the moral imperative of our history, which demands that we speak out on the fate of our brothers in the Soviet Union. We pray that our voice will be heard and heeded.

Mr. Speaker, by bringing to the American public the facts concerning religious discrimination in the Soviet Union, the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry has demonstrated the importance of vigorous action by the U.S. Government. The sponsors are to be commended for convening this important meeting.

The denial of fundamental rights in the Soviet Union must not go unheeded. I urge the Department of State to protest to the Soviet Government and to press the issue in the United Nations.

WILDERNESS HEARINGS SCHEDULED

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is good news that our chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has brought to us. I appreciate the action he has taken in scheduling these necessary further hearings here in Washington, D.C., on the various wilderness bills that are before our committee. The chairman's arrangements give further hopes that we shall soon have some effective agreement in our efforts to preserve wilderness, and in my own behalf, as well as in behalf of many others who have long been interested in establishing a sound national wilderness policy, I thank him. I am confident that the way can now be cleared for committee and House action that can be satisfactory for all of us.

We have just had delivered to us three volumes of printed hearings held, in mid-January of this year, in Olympia, Wash.; Denver, Colo.; and Las Vegas, Nev. In accordance with arrangements made by our committee chairman, our esteemed colleague from Colorado, these field hearings were conducted by the gentleman from Nevada, WALTER BARING, as chairman of our Subcommittee on Public Lands. It was my privilege as a member of this subcommittee to participate in the Denver and Las Vegas hearings and to appreciate the fair, orderly, and expeditious way in which these hearings were conducted by our colleague from Nevada. I can say to you today it is good to anticipate the continuation of such hearings here in Washington.

The record of the January field hearings and the testimony at the forthcoming hearings here in Washington, I am confident, will give our subcommittee and committee a good basis for considering the various bills now facing the House—and sending a sound measure to the floor.

In addition to the Senate Wilderness Act passed and sent to us on April 9, 1963, a year ago this Thursday, and various House bills similar to it that were introduced in the earlier days of this Congress, we have some more recently introduced revisions designed to meet objections and facilitate effective agreement. Among these latter is one of my own offered in a spirit of cooperation in which, I am glad to assure this House and our committee chairman, I shall be glad to join in considering all the proposals now before us. In such a spirit I am sure we can deal constructively and effectively with the various proposals and see sound wilderness legislation enacted in this Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that I welcome the opportunity to work further with Chairman ASPINALL on this legislation, and I appreciate his willingness to work with us. I am glad the hearing dates have been set. I am optimistic that we can soon bring to a good conclusion the long efforts in this field of conservation to see established by Congress as a national policy and a program to make it effective.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD at page 6698 thereof of the proceedings of yesterday. The sentence which begins on the third line of the first column reads as follows:

From this background it is not logical to assume that the Secretary will dump wheat just like he did feed grains.

The sentence should read:

From this background is it not logical to assume that the Secretary will dump wheat just like he did feed grains.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

THE LATE GENERAL DOUGLAS ARTHUR MACARTHUR

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

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the death of one of America's greatest generals, the gallant and heroic Gen. Douglas Arthur MacArthur, has ended an era. General MacArthur combined the rare qualities of military genius, a flare for statesmanship, and political insight. Those of us who have lived through this era always will remember vividly his courage and bravery, often leading his troops under fire, his vivid rhetoric, his grand manner, and his decisive leadership. It was my privilege to have known him and to have had the benefit of his concise thinking and insight during the Philippine war claims controversy. Perhaps his words upon retirement were not so prophetic, for the memory of this "old soldier" will never fade away.

The entire country will remember him as the youngest and most brilliant World War I generals and the renowned leader of the allied forces in the Pacific during World War II. Called back from retirement, he assumed the command of the Southwest Pacific operations during World War II, leading the allies from Australia to the Philippines and ultimately to Japan. Following the surrender of Japan, General MacArthur became the first foreigner to rule that country and commanded unprecedented respect and admiration from the Japanese people. As United Nations commander in the Korean conflict, his determination and strategy caught the enemy off guard, routing the North Korean army from Seoul.

His promise, "I shall return," when his troops were routed from the Philippines, will be as true to posterity as they were then. For General MacArthur will return—in the annals of history as one of America's most brilliant soldiers, statesmen, and patriots.

UNEMPLOYMENT—PROFILE OF THE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of our unemployment problem appears in the March 1964 issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey. After pointing out the various type of unemployment, the article asserts that there is an important need for more information that now exists on the relative

importance of the different kinds of unemployment.

It is also important to tighten up our loose definition of unemployment if we are to understand the causes of the problem and the cures that are required. Marked shifts in the labor force also require greater attention than they have been given, particularly the remarkable growth in the number of women, particularly older women, coming into the labor market. About 65 percent of the increase in total employment in the United States between 1957 and 1963 came in the number of women employed.

Another factor of increasing importance is rapidly advancing technology that is boosting the need for persons with high skills and pushing down demand for persons with little or no training. The article points to the need to modernize vocational educational programs as well as to orient the Nation's educational machinery to producing the kinds of talent at the required rate.

In conclusion, the Survey makes clear that trying to bulldoze unemployment down to some predetermined size with sheer force of increased demand—as the administration is trying to do—might require a push so massive that inflation would be sure to rise in its wake.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD as this point.

UNEMPLOYMENT—PROFILE OF THE PROBLEM

During the coming period of watchful waiting to see the effects of tax reduction on the broad economy, one of the leading questions in observers' minds will be: can expansion of total demand through the tax cut bring down to an acceptable level an unemployment rate that almost all agree has been too high too long?

In the political realm, at least, the case for tax cutting has taken excessive unemployment as its point of departure—and also as its basis for contending that a mighty fiscal shove to the economy will not rekindle the fires of inflation, but rather will find unused resources of manpower ready and able to meet the new demand to be created.

Put in its statistically bleakest terms, the unemployment problem as cited by the administration in support of tax reduction and other programs, has the following dimensions:

By available yardsticks, 1 of every 18 people willing to work is unable to find work.

A net addition of some 1.4 million people, on the average, is expected to swell the labor force each year between 1964 and 1975.

Automation is alleged to be eliminating 550 jobs every day in the year.

The unemployment rate has settled at progressively higher levels after each of the three recessions since the Korean war.

While acknowledging that tax reduction is no panacea for unemployment, and that other measures are required as well, the administration obviously is pinning high hopes on fiscal stimulus. Treasury Secretary Dillon stated the official position in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee in late January:

"Tax reduction, with its stimulating effects reaching into every corner of the economy, must be the centerpiece of any effective attack on unemployment and poverty, for the more specific remedies for these problems can be fully effective only in a more buoyant economic environment—an environment in which a trained man can find employment for his skills and in which there are strong incentives for upgrading workers and overcoming barriers of race and color."

Actually, there is little room to doubt that powerful fiscal stimulus will, in fact, have powerful impact on the labor market. The Revenue Act of 1964, which already is pouring new purchasing power into the economy at the rate of $800 million a month, will give a hearty lift to hiring. At the same time, however, it is important to recognize the limitations, as well as the potential, of fiscal policy in dealing with the unemployment problem. The problem, as it exists in the United States in early 1964, is a good deal more complicated than the simple statistics of an employment total or an unemployment rate suggest. An increase in the former need not mean a corresponding decrease in the latter.

TAKING THE MEASURE

To explain this paradox requires a searching look at the causes, dimensions, and measurement of unemployment in the United States today. It also requires an examination of the very vocabulary of unemployment. In basic concept, anyone of age 14 or older who wants a job (full time or part time) and can't find one is unemployed. In broad outline, analysts recognize four distinct kinds of reason why the jobseeker may fail to find work:

He may be employed in an industry—construction is an example—where activity varies sharply depending on the time of year. This is what economists call seasonal unemployment.

He may be between jobs, having been laid off or fired or having quit voluntarily and not yet having found new employment. This form is called frictional unemployment, and it exists in all free economies—even where, as in some Western European countries, job openings number several times the available workers.

He may not qualify for the jobs that are available in his community; he may have overpriced his skills in relation to what employers are willing to pay; he may be unwilling to surrender established union seniority and pension rights by moving to another line of work; or he may run into the invisible barrier of discrimination on account of race or other reason. These are varieties of structural unemployment. Retraining and relocation programs such as the Labor Department is conducting in various parts of the country are part of the attack on this general type.

Finally, employers generally may not be hiring as many people as are looking for jobs because the demand for goods and services does not warrant doing so—either because of recession or because of a too-slow rate of overall growth. It's the latter condition that administration fiscal policies aim to attack.

For public policy to attack unemployment most effectively and efficiently, more information than now exists is needed on the relative importance of different kinds of unemployment in the total. In some respects, the methods used to count the jobless tend to obscure, rather than clarify, the distinctions. The official measure of unemployment is based on a monthly survey of 35,000 households, selected to reflect the lives and habits of the whole Nation. In making the survey, the interviewers' task is to find out who in each family is working, who is not, and whether anyone 14 or over who are are not working are looking for work. The latter question is the key, for an affirmative answer classifies the person concerned as "unemployed."

For February 1964 the results of the survey—blown up to full population size—showed that 68 million people were at work during the survey week and 4.5 million were looking for work. This yielded a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate (the unemployed as a percentage of the civilian labor force, which includes those working plus those looking for work) of 5.4 percent, which is right in the narrow band where unemployment has been stuck since early 1962.

In late 1961, in response to charges that the unemployment figures were being manipulated for political purposes, President Kennedy appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Prof. Robert A. Gordon of the University of California to evaluate the statistical approach being used. The Gordon committee gave both the Bureau of Labor Statistics (which computes the unemployment data) and the Census Bureau (which makes the actual survey) high marks for good will and good faith. Beyond that, it concluded that, although the unemployment statistics are not perfect and probably can never be, they are adequate as guides for public policy.

DEMAND VERSUS STRUCTURE

While the Gordon committee summarily disposed of questions about the integrity of the unemployment figures, their efficacy as a policy guide is still the subject of lively debate. In large part, critics center their fire on the looseness of the definition of unemployment and on the fact that the census interviewers do not even attempt to measure two crucial variables of unemployment: The individual's degree of attachment to the labor force, meaning the urgency of his need for a job and the seriousness with which he is looking for one; and the extent of the individual's qualifications for the type of employment he says he wants.

Because there is no appraisal of attachment to the labor force, a suburban housewife casually looking for part-time work gets the same weight in the overall unemployment rate as a married man with five children to support. Even among the 1.9 million who, in an average 1963 week, collected unemployment compensation by certifying that they were seeking work, there may have been some not actively in search. State laws governing compensation tend to be loose both in wording and in enforcement. Thus the labor-force concept is an extremely fluid one.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics does not publish regular figures on gross flows into an out of the force; however, according to the Gordon report, during 1960 and 1961 an average of more than 3 million persons entered the force every month. In the same period, however, the net growth in the labor force was less than 100,000 a month. For every 3 million people coming into the labor market, this would indicate, at least 2.9 million were dropping out—because of personal predilection, pregnancy, disability, death, discouragement at inability to find a job, or any number of other reasons.

The composition of the unemployed group also is constantly shifting. The average level of unemployment for 1963 has been officially set at 4.2 million. During the year, however, more than 15 million people were classified as out of work at one time or another. Even among the "hard core" long-term unemployed—those without work 15 weeks or longer—turnover is at the rate of 25 percent a month.

As a measure of the qualifications of the unemployed, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has only what the unemployed person says he is able to do. Officials of BLS recognize that there is a natural human tendency to rate somewhat highly one's skills, but they have no way of discounting this factor. As one BLS economist has put it: "If a man says he is a carpenter, that's what we put down; we have no way to find out whether he's just a hammer-and-saw man."

These considerations have an important bearing on analysis of the unemployment problem, on decisions as to how big it is and what should be done about it. The President's Council of Economic Advisers is fully committed to the proposition that the bulk of the unemployment problem may be traced to a failure of "total expenditures in the economy * * * to generate an adequate