HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

For their sake I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth.—John 17: 19.

Eternal God, our Father, who hast guided us in ages past and who art our hope for years to come, in Thee do we put our trust for today. We recall once again our Nation's day of remembrance when we call to mind those who have given their lives for our country. For the ministry of memory, for the heritage of sacrificial deeds and for the hallowed thoughts which go through our mind as we think of those who gave themselves for freedom—we pause in gratitude before Thee.

Inspired by their devotion and challenged by their dedication may we now give ourselves afresh to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people may not perish from the earth. In the name of Him who died that men might live, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 29, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that May 29, 1967, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1587. An act for the relief of Richard L. Bass;

H.R. 1646. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley; and

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present on Thursday, May 25, during the vote on S. 1432 which amends the Universal Military Training and Service Act because of my daughter's graduation from high school. Had I been present, I would have answered "yea" to roll No. 108, which was taken on the passage of this legislation. I would like the RECORD to show my position on S. 1432.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached a point in the Middle East crisis in which time is an important factor. I know that President Johnson has been seeking to mobilize the maritime powers and other stabilizing forces in the world to bring diplomatic pressure on Egpyt to reopen the Gulf of Aqaba. I heartily approve of this Presidential endeavor, but I think it is unwise, Mr. Speaker, to let too much time elapse in the quest for diplomatic solutions.

We are dealing in the Middle East with countries that take procrastination for weakness. We have all noticed how Egypt's Nasser has become progressively more emboldened as the days have passed without action either from Israel or the Western Powers. Now we note in the morning papers that Russia is sending a fleet of warships through the Dardanelles as a show of its own strength in the Mediterranean.

I fear it will be a mistake, Mr. Speaker, if our country does not act with dispatch to back the rights of the only democratic, peaceful, Western-oriented state in the Middle East. Israel's principles are our own—not the least of which is the freedom of navigation in international waters. Further delay, I am convinced, will simply increase the chances of a major war. I call upon the President to consider quick and decisive action to uphold justice in the Middle East.

I would like to quote from this morning's New York Times column by James Reston in which he quotes the former British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd:

> The proper course is for the United States and Britain . . . to declare boldly that they will assert the right of free passage of their ships into the Gulf of Aqaba, whatever their destination and whatever their cargo. If that right is disputed, military force will be used to sustain it. I believe a clear declaration of that sort is the best way to keep the peace.

THE THIRD-CLASS MAIL LOBBY

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, all Members received in their mail a large yellow card which attacked my bill to raise third-class postage rates, H.R. 99. This card very correctly quotes a statement I made on the televised "Town Meeting" program in Columbus, Ohio:

> I speak for millions of Americans who are irritated, indignant, and incensed. They are really fed up by all this junk mail that comes into their mail boxes every day.

The card also very correctly quotes the chief lobbyist for the third-class mailers, Harry Maginnis, as stating:

> Direct mail advertising is selling $40 billion worth of goods and services annually and providing $700 million in postal income while doing it.

My question is simply this: If the direct mail industry is doing a $40-billion-a-year business, should not this struggling, poor little industry be able to afford to pay the cost of delivery of third-class mail, which, after all, is all that my bill does? Why should the taxpayers of the Nation be forced to subsidize 40 percent of the cost of every piece of third-class mail?

I believe under our free enterprise system a business that produces $40 billion worth of goods and services should not have its hand out to the Government for subsidies. That is why I hope that the rates on third-class mail will be raised to 4.5 cents per piece of bulk mail, instead of 3.8 cents as recommended by the administration. Let us make third-class mail pay its way and help balance the postal budget.

THE TINY CRIME WAVE

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General says "there is no wave of crime in the country."

That he should say so is part of the crime problem in this country. The Attorney General of the United States is the chief law enforcement officer of the Nation. If he thinks, as he is quoted as saying, that "the level of crime has risen a little bit," then he is either misinformed about the statistics or badly mistaken about the size of a "bit."

Webster says that a "bit" is a "mite" or a "whit." Those who contend that the level of crime has risen only a mite are more than a little bit wrong. In the decade of the sixties, the growth rate of crime has outpaced the growth rate of the population by more than six times. To me, that sounds more like a wave than a whit.

The Attorney General was also quoted as saying that organized crime is only a "tiny part" of the picture. President Johnson last year, following a meeting with former Attorney General Katzenbach, said that organized crime "constitutes nothing less than a guerrilla war against society." The Katzenbach Crime Commission said that the estimates of illegal gambling profits alone, not counting profits from narcotics, prostitution, and racketeering, run as high as $50 billion a year. That may sound tiny to some; it sounds titanic to me.

The crime problem in American will never be solved by miniaturizing it with timid little words. The chief law enforcement officer must acknowledge it in its full dimensions and thereby set the atmosphere of urgency essential to its solution.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT ON SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the Wednesday message from the President, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 109]

Abbitt	Gathings	O'Konski
Abernethy	Goodell	Ottinger
Adams	Gray	Philbin
Anderson, Tenn.	Green, Oreg.	Pickle
	Gude	Pollock
Ashley	Gurney	Purcell
Ashmore	Halleck	Quie
Aspinall	Hanna	Reinecke
Battin	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Bell	Hardy	Reuss
Blatnik	Heckler, Mass.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brown, Calif.	Hicks	Rhodes, Pa.
Burton, Calif.	Holifield	Riegle
Burton, Utah	Hutchinson	Roudebush
Cabell	Jacobs	Ruppe
Casey	Jones, Mo.	St. Onge
Celler	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Chamberlain	King, Calif.	Steiger, Wis.
Clawson, Del	Kornegay	Stephens
Cohelan	Kuykendall	Stubblefield
Conyers	Kyl	Stuckey
Derwinski	Landrum	Sullivan
Diggs	Leggett	Taylor
Dorn	Lloyd	Teague, Tex.
Dow	Lukens	Tiernan
Dwyer	McClory	Tuck
Eckhardt	McDade	Waggonner
Edmondson	Madden	Watkins
Edwards, Ala.	Mailliard	Whalen
Edwards, La.	May	Whalley
Erlenborn	Meeds	Williams, Miss.
Fascell	Michel	Willis
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Charles H.
Flood	Mink	
Foley	Monagan	Winn
Friedel	Mosher	Wolff
Fulton, Tenn.	Myers	Younger
Gardner	Nix	Zwach

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT ON SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Fourth Annual Report on Special International Exhibitions conducted during fiscal year 1966 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

The primary purpose of the program—in which the Nation's economic, social, and cultural achievements are exhibited in international fairs and expositions—is to build bridges of understanding between the United States and other countries of the world. Each exhibit is designed to show how our accomplishments relate to the capabilities and aspirations of the different countries. Because the exhibitions feature the products of American industries, they also contribute to mutually profitable trade relationships.

Since the program began in 1954, more than 100 million people—primarily in Eastern Europe and the developing countries—have witnessed 176 exhibits designed to help them understand, appreciate, and benefit from American progress and experience.

During fiscal year 1966, the United States participated in a broad range of international events:

Trade fair exhibitions in Algeria, Ethiopia, Hungary, Iraq, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia: These exhibitions dramatized our progress in mechanical equipment for farm and industry, educational techniques, electronics, and space.

Expo 67: During the year, plans were laid for our participation in the World's Fair which opened in Montreal, Canada, in April 1967. "Creative America" was chosen as the theme of this country's exhibit, which pictures American achievements in the arts and space technology.

Labor exhibits at trade fairs in Ethiopia, Hungary, Iraq, Poland, and Yugoslavia: The purpose of these exhibits was to project the true image of the American worker and the role he plays in the affairs of this Nation.

Special-purpose East-West exhibits in the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia: More than 2 million persons attended these exhibits, which featured the machinery of American industry, American architecture, and the graphic arts.

As in past years, the program's effectiveness was the result not only of Government efforts, but also of the contribution of materials, time, and talent by hundreds of private firms.

All Americans are indebted to them for their efforts to help carry America's message to the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1967.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for fiscal year 1966.

For three decades the insurance system administered by the Board has been protecting railroad workers and their families against the economic hazards which accompany unemployment, sickness, old age, and death.

During the period covered by this report, more than 1 million individuals received $1.2 billion in retirement and survivor benefits—an increase of $82 million over the preceding year. These payments brought to $14.5 billion the total amount paid to retired employees, wives, and survivors of deceased employees since the program began in 1936.

In fiscal 1966 payments for unemployment and sickness dropped below the $100 million mark—to $88.1 million—for the first time in 13 years. This reduction reflects the unprecedented economic expansion which this country has enjoyed during the last 6 years. In each, unemployment among railroad workers showed a significant decline.

The increases in retirement and survivor benefits reported here represent increased comfort and security in the retirement years of many worthy citizens. But even greater comfort and protection would come with congressional enactment of the social security amendments which I have proposed this year. The proposed 20-percent increase would in the first year alone bring $65 million in added benefits to some 385,000 railroad workers and their families.

I again urge the Congress to take this vital step toward our goal of providing every elderly citizen an adequate income and a meaningful retirement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1967.*

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10345, with Mr. HAYS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, H.R. 10345, makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Federal judiciary, and 12 related agencies for the fiscal year 1968.

The total recommended in this bill is $2,194,026,500, which would be an increase of $60,938,300 over appropriations for the current fiscal year. The bill I have referred to is $148,915,500 below the amounts requested in the budget estimates.

The following table indicates the committee's action:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968
Department of State	$391,247,000	$404,543,000	[1] $382,327,400	−$8,919,600	−$22,215,600
Department of Justice	408,740,000	436,294,000	419,373,000	+10,633,000	−16,921,000
Department of Commerce	1,016,088,000	1,138,752,000	1,059,291,000	+43,203,000	−79,461,000
The Judiciary	89,850,700	96,379,000	93,997,100	+4,146,400	−2,381,900
Related agencies	227,162,500	266,974,000	239,038,000	+11,875,500	−27,936,000
Total	2,133,088,200	2,342,942,000	2,194,026,500	+60,938,300	−148,915,500

[1] Plus $15,606,000 to be derived by transfer.

The budget estimates for fiscal year 1968 for the Department of State total $404,543,000. The committee included in the bill $382,327,400 in new obligational authority plus a transfer of $15,606,000 from previously appropriated funds, making a total availability of $397,933,400, which is an actual reduction of $6,609,600 in the budget request and an increase of $6,686,400 over the 1967 comparable appropriation.

Under the general heading "Administration of Foreign Affairs," a total of $214,118,000 is recommended. For "International Organizations and Conferences," a sum of $99,448,400 is provided plus an additional $15,606,000 by way of transfer that I have just referred to. A total of $51,800,000 is provided for "Educational Exchange."

As to the salaries and expenses of the Department there were requested funds for "International Education Officers" to be stationed at various embassies throughout the world. We already have educational officers in the person of the cultural affairs officers of the U.S. Information Agency. The committee in toto denied any funds whatever for the start of this educational officers program. This was agreed upon with the other body in the supplemental appropriation bill recently passed at which time the House recommended no funds and the Senate concurred in language in their report likewise recommending no funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman in his hearings at any point——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, the gentleman has not let me get far enough along to explain what is in this bill. I am afraid I will get into such an interesting colloquy with my distinguished friend from Iowa that I may forgo explaining what we have done with regard to the nuclear ship *Savannah*.

We have provided funds in this bill insisting that the Administration sail the *Savannah* for another year. It would cost $1,350,000, as I recall the figure, to lay up the ship. We have denied the layup money but have recommended $3.3 million in order to sail the ship. It has cost a lot of the taxpayers' money to train these men to run a nuclear ship. This ship has been a showpiece as far as the United States of America is concerned all over the world and it should continue to be sailed. In some ways it is better as a propaganda means than some of the activities that the U.S. Information Agency carries on.

Now I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I can readily agree with the gentleman as to the latter part of his statement that the operation of the *Savannah* is better promotion and publicity for the United States than a lot of the other things on which we are spending much more money.

I really arose to ask the gentleman if in the hearings there was a listing, as is usually the case, of the cultural experts that are stationed all over the world. Is such a list in the hearings this year?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, of course; yes.

Mr. GROSS. I have not yet run across that listing in the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is also a list contained in here that becomes very interesting in connection with the educational exchange program, the so-called specialists list, where we use the money of the taxpayers—and when I say "we," I mean some misguided individuals down in the State Department to send abroad individuals who do not agree with the President on Vietnam and who say some very nasty things about him. We have taken this into consideration in arriving at the markup on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 716 of the hearings—and since the gentleman from New York has gone into the question of the "specialists"—page 716 of the hearings indicates the specialists by name and among those listed are Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren and his wife Nina P. Warren.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I was not sure whether that was the wife of the distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, or his daughter, because the Chief Justice has a daughter by the name of Nina. They are very fine people.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York will yield further, it seems to be fairly well confirmed that this is the wife of the Chief Justice, and she, apparently, is some kind of expert on social welfare. I do not know whether the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is an expert on social welfare or not. But it seems that the two of them collected about $946 of the taxpayers' money for a recent junket to three South American countries.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That cannot be the correct figure because 6 plus 2 makes 8. The total of the last two figures added together make 8.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman from New York will find that the figure is $586 and $362.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, the last figure would be 8, would it not?

Mr. GROSS. The figure would be nine hundred and some odd dollars—$586 plus $362 wou'd be $948 for a junket for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and his wife to South America.

My next question is this: What did we get for the junket made by Antonio Taylor, brother-in-law of the President of the United States and his wife—the State Department's curio and souvenir shop specialist?

What did we receive from the junket that he and his wife made to South America? Does the gentleman from New York happen to know?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have wondered about many of these things myself. We asked for these lists of specialists which, incidentally, have not been published heretofore in these hearings. We just happened to think about it on this particular morning. Therefore, we have the list printed here in the hearings. However, the list was not furnished to the subcommittee until the witnesses had said, "Goodby." We would have been glad to inquire as to the trip of the Chief Justice and Mrs. Warren with reference to the success of their visit to South American countries, as well as the curio dealer to which the gentleman from Iowa has referred, or did the gentleman say "souvenir" dealer?

Mr. GROSS. The "souvenir specialist" dealer.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the hearings of the Committee on Armed Services relative to the enforcement of the Selective Service law revealed the frightening testimony on the part of the Department of Justice to prosecute only the "cinch"-type cases.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Justice is either afraid to prosecute most violations or it is seriously short handed in staff personnel and is, therefore, unable to initiate and carry through the

prosecution of cases which exist in these areas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my question is this: Are there sufficient funds contained in this appropriation bill with which to enable the Department of Justice to expeditiously and effectively prosecute every violation of the selective service law?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Every dollar requested by the Department of Justice for this purpose is included in the bill. So, the answer would be, "They have ample funds and should proceed with dispatch in the prosecution of such cases."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his response.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, I do not know whether the gentleman's verbiage to prosecute only "cinch" type cases, and about the Department being afraid to prosecute these cases covers the situation, because I do not believe Attorney General Clark would be afraid to prosecute anybody if it became his duty to do so.

Mr. RIVERS. Let us hope so.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am quite confident of that.

Mr. RIVERS. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee is confident of that, but the testimony before our committee and the facts and figures before our committee indicate that there are over 12,000 to 14,000 violations a year, yet in 1962 the Department of Justice prosecuted only 321 cases, in 1933, 322 cases; in 1934, 301 cases; in 1965, 369 cases; and in fiscal year 1966, 642 cases.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman one other question:

Assistant Attorney General Vinson advised our committee on May 5, 1967, that substantial delays had occurred in the processing of conscientious objector cases under the Seeger case, because the Department of Justice had been "shorthanded until quite recently in both lawyers and secretarial personel relative to the increased caseload. We are adding personnel in an effort to minimize this kind of delay."

In the Defense Act, which we passed last week, we had a provision in there that they had to terminate these cases in 6 months, yet the testimony before our committee shows some cases have gone as high as 18, 25, and 30 months, and never been terminated.

The distinguished chairman has a great record in this area, and I just want to be sure that they have been given every dollar they have requested in carrying out prosecution of these violation cases. The American people are demanding that things be done to stop the draft card burners, the selective service evaders, and these so-called conscientious objectors.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that if it happens that the distinguished Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr., does not know how to recruit personnel, or to secure replacements of personnel; that that would be his responsibility.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very much. I have no further questions.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Proceeding further, we come to a second item in the bill, representation allowances, and which is a favored subject of my dear friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

I believe Secretary Rusk is entitled to a great deal of credit for his moderation in his approach to this item of these spirituous beverages, and elegant dinners and lunches. The Secretary is asking exactly the same amount they have had for the last 3 years, and the committee has approved exactly that amount, to wit: $993,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I cannot think of a better time for the Secretary of State to join with the downtrodden taxpayers of this country by suggesting a cut in his $993,000 lemonade allowance.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But did the distinguished gentleman from Iowa notice that I commended his approach to this subject?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I noted it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Because he has a far more moderate approach to this subject than they did during the Eisenhower administration, when I was also chairman of the committee.

During the course of the Eisenhower administration we had requests as high as $1.2 million, which we promptly cut to the proper amount.

Mr. GROSS. We are hearing these days, I will say to my friend from New York, that the deficit in the next fiscal year can go anywhere from $24 billion to $29 billion. And $993,000 for the tools of the trade, as my friend from New York calls them, will keep the "top of the mark" at the State Department really humming in the next year.

I tried to make a record of the number of booze allowances in this bill, but quit when I found so many.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is not all for booze. They might want a nice cool lemonade or orangeade or some drink such as that in a place such as Ouagadongon, which might cost more than it does on the Riviera.

Mr. GROSS. That is possible.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is a fact and the committee has studied this subject assiduously, as have the gentlemen and I.

Mr. GROSS. But can the gentleman tell me how much there is in this bill for liquor and entertainment? I got lost when I was taken from representation allowances to funds for hospitality I believe there is a $35,000 item for hospitality buried in the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not think you will find any money buried here for anything.

I am very pleased to advise the gentleman that in this bill now before the committee for its approval, the amount for representation and entertainment is $5,000 below the amount provided for the current fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. So it is $5,000 out of about $1,125,000 for booze—we are really doing business today.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is only a token sort of thing, but it does show that we are going in the right direction.

Mr. GROSS. I suggest you could have gone further in the right direction in view of the deficit that confronts us and the $336 billion debt that we have.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I know, but you would not want these poor gentlemen who serve us so well abroad to be deprived of this. I am reminded of those Arabs on television yesterday in New York at the United Nations. I think any diplomat who goes through such a thing as that is entitled to go out in the lobby and have a drink for himself. Does not the gentleman from Iowa think so?

Mr. GROSS. They might try a little British tea.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. I do not ask the question I am about to ask facetiously, but do so in an honest search for information.

Did anything develop in the hearings that indicates any tendency on the part of the State Department in using this representation allowance to purchase wines from the great State of New York and the great State of California rather than purchasing foreign wines?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, certainly.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As a matter of fact, I think the New York State wine is far superior to the California wine.

Now, continuing with the items in the bill, we find that we had an increase in numerous items, which we do not like to see but we must be realists about this, in the request for contributions to the international organizations.

There is included in the bill for this item a total of $109,341,400.

As I have previously mentioned, $15,606,000 is to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Loan to the United Nations."

This is money that had been resting in the U.S. Treasury under this title "Loan to the United Nations" for a number of years past.

Continuing to the next item, "Missions to International Organizations," for which there is included in the bill the amount of $3,770,000. For international conferences and contingencies the amount of $1,943,000 is provided.

Going down to the Mexican border, we find the "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico," consisting of a number of appropriation requests, all of which we feel have amply been taken care of. A total of $14,336,000 is included in the bill under this heading.

With regard to the item under "American Sections, International Commissions," there is included in the bill the same amount as was appropriated last year, $650,000, for payments of the U.S. share of expenses of the International Boundary Commission, the International Joint Commission, and the

Lake Ontario Claims Tribunal, which are all on the northern border.

Proceeding to the International Fisheries Commissions, the sum of $1,975,000 is provided in the bill to cover the U.S. share of expenses of eight International Fisheries Commissions in which it participates. We feel that this is ample money.

We previously mentioned the list of "specialists." The list of lecturers, research scholars and professors sent abroad under the educational and cultural exchange activities program is set forth on pages 634 through 687 of part 2 of the hearings. The list of "specialists" are set forth in pages 694 through 724 of the same volume. You might find some friends or acquaintances who have been sent abroad as "specialists" at the taxpayers' expense.

With regard to the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, in Honolulu, Hawaii, there is included the full amount of the budget estimate of $5,800,000, which is similar to the amount which was appropriated last year, except there was included an additional amount last year of $250,000 for plans for a library.

Getting to the Department of Justice, the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1968 for the Department of Justice total $436,294,000. The committee recommends in the accompanying bill $419,373,000, which is a reduction of $16,921,000 in the total requested, and an increase of $10,633,000 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The Criminal Division, to which the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] made reference a while ago, is included under the item "General legal activities" for which the sum of $22,375,000 is provided for the operating expenses of the Office of Solicitor General, the Tax Division, the Criminal Division, the Civil Division, the Land and Natural Resources Division, and the Civil Rights Division. This is an increase of $394,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year and a decrease of $150,000 in the amount of the budget estimate.

Of the additional amount allowed, $100,000 is to increase efforts in the organized crime field and to meet new responsibilities as a result of the President's national anticrime program.

I might pause here to say that also included in the Department of Justice budget are funds for the Bureau of Prisons I am happy to advise that Mr. Valachi, that stoolpigeon, who did not, with all the talk and publicity engendered by him, assist in the successful prosecution of one criminal, is no longer in the D.C. jail. Nothing developed from all that nonsense, and they had him down here in the District jail with extra guards, which were costing $30,000 a year, as I remember the figure, just for Mr. Valachi. Mr. Valachi is back as a member of the population in Milan, Mich., and we are glad to note that.

We are also glad to note that the Department of Justice is opposing his lawsuit to write a book in which he is asking to name a lot of names which have already been mentioned and names which belong to one particular race here in America, a race that has been maligned too often by too many people.

I will go on now to the Alien Property activities. This has dwindled to practically nothing, the sum of $48,000, which will cover other activities in the coming year.

The Antitrust Division has been allowed the full amount, and we want them to effectively enforce the antitrust and kindred laws. We gave them an increase, and it is for within grade salary advancements.

Funds are included for the use of the U.S. attorneys and the U.S. Marshals all over the 50 States. There is included the sum of $3,100,000 for fees and expenses of necessary witnesses. Also included is the amount of $10 million, an increase of $2,750,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year, for law enforcement assistance.

No additional personnel have been furnished for this purpose.

These funds are for grants and contracts to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime and for technical assistance as authorized by the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1962.

We have included the full amount requested, to wit, $186,574,000 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Incidentally, these increases in the funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are the result of additional burdens and duties put on them by the legislation passed by the Congress. During the year 1966, as pointed out in the report, the Bureau received 2,426,665 names for search through its files, which was up 43 percent over the prior year. It is expected that there will be a further substantial increase in the coming year.

With regard to immigration and naturalization, the committee has recommended the sum of $79,946,000 for enforcement of the laws relating to immigration and naturalization by this service. This is an increase of $1,111,000 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year, and is $454,000 below the amount of the budget request.

There is included the sum of $61 million for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Prisons. This is the area where they now let out a narcotics offender or a highway robber or a bank stickup man, to let him go back to work under the work release program and where he can even earn social security benefits—believe it or not.

In the old days, when I was a young fellow, I thought when a man was sent to prison, he stayed behind the bars, and anybody who let him out was guilty of jail delivery. I even thought that when I was a prosecutor in Brooklyn. Now, they let a man out on this work release program, and he is out working away from the prison in which he is supposed to be incarcerated by the sentence of the court.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, could we call that another "wild oat" of the Great Society?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not know whether it is the Great Society or the one before that. It could be. Of course, everything today is different. There is a statement in, I believe, this morning's New York Times with respect to a gentleman who has just been named the Director of Broadcasting for the Voice of America. He is already in the newspapers, although he has not even been sworn in as yet.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman referred to a statement by the new head of the Voice of America, Mr. John Charles Daly, Jr. It is a perplexing statement, and I would like to read it, if I might, into the RECORD, with the gentleman's permission.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Will the gentleman please do that. It is very interesting.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Daly says:

All we can do is fully and fairly put down the divisions within the country and the divisions internationally. Honest people have honest opinions and we'll see to it that they get heard. I feel that our policy in Vietnam is right, but we have an obligation to give a hearing to those who don't.

If Mr. Daly were editing a private newspaper or heading a television or radio news department, he would have the responsibility of giving coverage to varying shades of opinion. However, we are now dealing with a man who is going to head an official agency of the Government of the United States of America which presents our Government's position abroad. As such, he must be willing to emphasize and promote the Government policy.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid Mr. John Charles Daly is going to have to realize he is not on "What's My Line?" if he takes this job.

The job he has undertaken to do has nothing whatever to do with making statements such as contained in that newspaper clipping. The job of Director of Broadcasting of the Voice of America is an administrative job. It has to do with contracts for the building of radio relay stations and the purchase of very expensive and highly technical radio equipment.

Surely it has something to do also with the content of the program, but I always thought that the purpose of the Voice of America was to cultivate the minds of men to our way of thinking.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I suspect Mr. Daly will find that he is on quite a different program when he appears before the Rooney subcommittee next year in behalf of the Voice of America.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Let us be fair about this. I understand Mr. Daly will not take over this job until Septem-

ber, so he will be fairly green when we hold the hearings about next January or February or whenever it may be. We might give him a brass ring the first time. But then we will watch him.

Mr. GROSS. At any rate, it will be a different line, would the gentleman not agree?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It will be an entirely different line, because he is now in the administrative line and not in one of those, "you give me a compliment and I will give you a compliment" groups. How does that go?

Mr. GROSS. You scratch my back and I will scratch yours.

The reason I asked the gentleman to yield was to inquire about the New York Times. Are the taxpayers still spending $300,000 to circulate the New York Times around the world?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There was a time when we used to give 467 Members of the British House of Commons and 177 Members of the British House of Lords free subscriptions. We do not do that any more.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the work he has done in cutting this down. The taxpayers still are paying for too many New York Times newspapers being circulated around the world.

Does not the gentleman agree with me it is quite a situation when the USIA apparently buys one subscription to the Chicago Tribune and the Lord knows how many hundreds of the New York Times.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would imagine the USIA buys many, many more than the number the gentleman says when it comes to the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. GROSS. The record of the hearings does not show it, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would suspect there would be more around the shop than that.

We also took the same action with regard to the late New York Herald Tribune. The international edition of the Herald Tribune in Europe was sent all over the place, indiscriminately, also.

Mr. GROSS. It is unconscionable when we consider the amount of money today being spent upon newspapers for foreigners who can well afford their own subscriptions. Let them pay for these newspapers and magazines if they want them. Why should we load this on the backs of the American taxpayers?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe the analogy is that we have—and when I say "We" I mean the House of Representatives, with 435 Members—one copy of the New York Times, this morning, out in the Speaker's lobby, for any Member to read, as he waits his turn to do so.

However, to go to the extent that was done years ago with members of the British House of Commons and the British House of Lords is utterly ridiculous.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We are getting along pretty well today I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Not at all badly up to this point.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will now get to the Department of Commerce. Before doing that, I will say with regard to the Federal judiciary that there are sufficient funds in this bill to cover every court from the Supreme Court of the United States down to the district courts, their employees, books, and other expenses.

Now we proceed to the Department of Commerce. The amount requested for that Department was $1,138,752,000. The committee included $1,059,291,000 which is a reduction of $79,461,000 in the amount of the budget request but an increase of $43,203,000 over the comparable appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The largest increase here is for the Maritime Administration. Goodness knows they need an increase. I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who unfortunately brought to this House a bill a week or so ago which would permit a Member to make a point of order if this committee saw fit to increase appropriations and do what we did today with regard to the *Savannah*.

Does the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. GARMATZ. No, sir.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and as a Member of Congress, I want to voice my approval of this bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Of special concern to me are those portions of the bill related to the Department of Commerce and—more specifically—maritime activities.

As you are all aware, our committee has just finished a series of hearings on the administration's proposal to lay up the nuclear ship *Savannah*. After hearing all the testimony from many industry and Government witnesses, we are convinced that the *Savannah*—the world's only nuclear-powered merchant vessel—should be retained in operation.

I do not intend at this time to review the many reasons for our convictions, except to say that we feel strongly that this technological lead in nuclear propulsion, which may well revolutionize the world's maritime industry, should not be relinquished by the United States.

It was, therefore, especially gratifying to me to see that the Committee on Appriations included in its bill an additional $1,950,000 to keep the *Savannah* in operation for another year. In its report, the committee noted that it did not feel it was "in the best interest of the United States to lay up the *Savannah* even temporarily."

I think this statement reflects the dominant feelings of Congress on this vital matter.

I would like to add one other thought:

For some time now, there has been persistent talk about initiating a national maritime policy which would include a program of building American-flag ships abroad. Certainly, a constructive, forward-looking maritime program is badly needed; and it is also true that our declining American merchant marine must have more ships if it is to continue carrying even a small portion of America's commerce on the sea lanes of the world. But when ships are to be built for the American merchant marine they should be built in American yards.

I am happy to see that this feeling is also shared by the Appropriations Committee, which included a provision in the bill specifically prohibiting the use of any part of the maritime appropriation for "construction of any ship in any foreign country."

I think it is time for proponents of the pessimistic build abroad philosophy to accept the fact that this Congress will not turn its back upon American industry and the American workingman, and I am proud to voice my support of the bill reported by the distinguished chairman JOHN ROONEY and his Committee on House Appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. GARMATZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to point out that this committee took action with regard to the *Savannah* and furnished funds to the administration to proceed with its run. Under the language we put in the bill they will be required to continue operating the NS *Savannah*.

Mr. GARMATZ. I am not looking for credit. All I want to do is keep the *Savannah* afloat. Our committee held hearings several months ago, before the Committee on Appropriations started meeting on this particular subject. Nevertheless I do and I am sure many Members of the House appreciate the fact that you have specified money in your appropriation bill to keep the *Savannah* going.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for the other members of the subcommittee on the subject of maritime appropriations and maritime activities. I am one who has always believed that it is unfortunate that our merchant marine has not been built up as it should have been after the Congress passed in 1936 one of the finest pieces of legislation and a piece of legislation designed to be of benefit to the maritime industry. Instead, we have lost the lead in this area and we have lost the operation of passenger ships such as the *America*.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yielding to me at this time and I wish to compliment him also with reference to his statements, and the action of the committee on the use of the *Savannah*.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] knows, we in the Committee on Armed Services and on this floor have considered, only in recent weeks, legislation with reference to the fast deployment

logistics ships in the Department of Defense. Rather than mothballing the *Savannah*, we should keep her in service inasmuch as she can at least keep up with our nuclear team of capital A.N.P. surface vessels of the Navy.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, why would it not be more appropriate, rather than to put the *Savannah* in mothballs even in another year, to use her as a demonstration unit manned if need be by defense forces for point-to-point delivery on some of these logistic runs, if necessary, rather than investing in these other new experiments. Our sealift must keep pace with our military and strategic airlift capability.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly make this as a further suggestion, rather than mothballing the *Savannah* even a year from now. This represents a part of the basic premise involved, and it is my opinion that it should be strongly considered by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for his contribution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to continue on—and I promise to conclude in a minute or two so that others may express their views with reference to this bill—this bill does not include every amount to my satisfaction. I think in some instances we have appropriated too much money and I believe in other instances we have not appropriated enough. But, it represents the majority thinking of the members of the committee.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the "Related Agencies" there is a total of $239,038,000 in the accompanying bill for the 12 different agencies included under this title. This represents a reduction of $27,936,000 in the total amount of the budget estimate and represents an increase of $11,875,000 over the total amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, set forth in the report are the amounts for the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Commission on Civil Rights, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, civil rights educational activities, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Maritime Commission, as distinguished from the Federal Maritime Administration.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Small Business Administration, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations—and I was certainly glad to learn that what we had feared would happen during the Kennedy round did not occur, and that we did get something out of the Kennedy round of negotiations at Geneva at the last moment.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, Tariff Commission, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, U.S. Information Agency.

In closing I want to thank all the members of our subcommittee who worked so hard on this bill. We have what we believe is a good bill. We believe we have cut as much as we could. Strangely, in some areas like the Department of State generally speaking they had a tight budget. The Department of Justice also had a tight budget. We did the best we could, and have succeeded in cutting it to the extent of $148 million.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I require.

Mr. Chairman, I am pinch-hitting today for my colleague, the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Just before I get on with a few comments—and I will try to make them as brief as possible regarding this legislation—I want to say that it is real great to see our distinguished chairman from New York feeling so well. We recall a year ago he had been under surgery and he was not up to par, but I am sure with the colloquy that has taken place today between my colleague from Iowa and the distinguished gentleman from New York we can see he is back fit as a fiddle and raring to go.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to be able to sit under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York.

I am also able to report that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], although he has not been feeling so well lately, is coming along fine, and soon he will be back with the same feeling that our distinguished chairman has.

We met for some several months in hearings on this appropriation bill, hearing from the various agencies that are involved. We feel we have done a respectable job. I believe all of us would agree that there are some areas where we could have cut deeper. I really cannot think of any areas that I would like to increase. But I recognize that as we develop the programs for these departments and fund them, it becomes incumbent, in many instances, upon the Committee on Appropriations to go along with what some of the legislative committees do. We try our best to hold the line, but unless the legislative committees are going to take more jurisdiction on some of the activities in these departments, it places an additional burden upon the Committee on Appropriations to try to hold the line.

Take the Department of State. In looking over the Department of State's budget, especially in the area of salary expense, we find a pretty tight budget. As a matter of fact, most of the increases here are mandatory increases that have been proposed and passed by the Congress itself.

Another thing, some of the programs within the Department are adopted by the Congress. Many of these programs I believe could be cut and could be cut deeply. I am thinking of the educational and cultural exchange program. Here is an area that I believe has gotten way out of hand, from what was the original intention. And if you will look at the report you will find in all of these agency programs, in just this one area, we are spending something in the neighborhood of $449 million. And I am not convinced that we are getting that kind of a return in good will around the world. If you will look further in the hearings, you will find a list which has almost 100 pages of scholars, researchers, and lecturers, who have gone around the world spreading our doctrine, I hope, but in many instances I wonder if they are. And sometimes when we pass higher education bills under the pretext that we do not have enough professors to meet our present college needs, and then we find a 100-page list of lecturers, scholars, and professors running all over the world, I wonder how we take care of our own people here at home.

There is another thing that I think is dangerous or that can be dangerous about this program. I would have liked to have seen it cut substantially more and it is one that I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs ought to take a look at, because you have to look at it before we get to the appropriation and something could be done here.

But I think it is the kind of program that lends itself to possible abuse. It may lend itself to abuse regardless of the administration. I do not care whose administration it is. But it is awfully easy if you have a newsman here or a scholar here or a professor here to entice him to your way of thinking by sending him abroad to make a lecture in his specialty. I think you can probably see that this has been done in some of these areas. We have held it down quite well but I think it can be cut even more and I think the program has gone too far.

So far as the new employees of the State Department are concerned, we have held them to a minimum.

But take the Passport Office. There is a tremendous workload increase in the Passport Office. We are trying to expedite this increased workload and I think they are doing a pretty good job. But by and large I think the State Department budget is a pretty tight budget.

I would just like to say this. You know I think sometimes the employees of the State Department get a great deal of criticism which they do not deserve. I have had the opportunity to visit with many of them in many of our embassies around the world. I think by and large most of these people are dedicated to the jobs that they are assigned to do.

So I think so far as I am concerned, most of our Foreign Service people and those who work here in Washington are doing a good job.

So far as the Department of Justice is concerned, and the gentleman from New York has touched upon the details of this legislation, there are just a couple of areas that I would like to talk about briefly.

One of them is the Criminal Justice Act. This is the act under which an individual can receive counsel in cases coming before the Federal courts. This was adopted by this Congress some few years ago. As a matter of fact, the Federal judiciary and the Federal judges never heard about the program and were never consulted on the program at all, and as a matter of fact they would indicate that they are not very much interested in it.

But my concern is that here we have another duplication because under the

poverty program, we have now what is known as judicare. So in the judicare program under the poverty program, you can get counsel. This counsel is available for courts of any jurisdiction while here in the Criminal Justice Act it is confined to the Federal district courts.

In my opinion, if we are going to continue to expend judicare funds under the poverty program, we ought to do away with the Criminal Justice Act because they are duplicating programs.

As to law enforcement assistance, and the gentleman from New York touched on this briefly, this legislation is designed to assist local police departments. You will find the overwhelming amount of money went to the District of Columbia Police Department for the purchase of cars and for the purchase of motor scooters and the changing of the paint on patrol cars and for everything that you could imagine. And this is outside the budget that we use for the District of Columbia.

It is my understanding that in the legislation presently pending in the Committee on the Judiciary, this act will be done away with and be carried in the crime bill that is being considered.

I just want to voice my own personal opinion while I have the opportunity, if we ever get ourselves in this country in the position where police departments in all jurisdictions within the United States are dependent upon the Federal Government for their operation, whether it be for the purchase of cars or the payment of salaries or the buying of uniforms or other equipment, I think we will have gone a long way down the wrong road. We can in the foreseeable future have all of our police departments dependent upon Washington and on Federal sources for their maintenance.

I think this goes a long way toward a Federal police force. I think those who are in charge of the Committee on the Judiciary and on writing this crime bill ought to take this possibility into consideration.

As I read these hearings and hear what has happened with law enforcement assistance, you will find that almost all of your police departments or some agencies within your States are receiving some assistance. You know I was thinking the other day, when I was going over some of this, that once you get a program of this kind you will find that they put these programs in almost all of the critical areas around the country.

Various foundations and universities become involved in the grants. Then when the Congress wants to review them and take a good hard look at them, they assemble all of these pressures from around the country and they descend on the Congress with the cries, "Don't touch it. Don't review it. Don't look at it. We are satisfied with it the way it is. We have become used to these Federal dollars and we don't want the program disturbed."

That happens with so many of our programs. But I think this is an area in which the Judiciary Committee ought to take a good hard look. I commend a reading of the hearings, because this program, taken to its ultimate conclusion, could cost many billions of dollars.

As far as the Immigration and Naturalization Service is concerned, I would just like to say that I think the hearings will indicate that agency has done an excellent job. They have had some new duties put on them. They have tried to hold the line. I want to commend the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the work that they have done. I have only one or two comments about the Department of Commerce. One is regarding the Bureau of the Census. You will note in this legislation that the administration requested—and, I might say, this was a last minute addition to the budget, I understand, by the Bureau of the Budget—$20 million to carry a spot check survey of housing throughout many areas in the country. There was a million dollars carried in the supplemental appropriation. We struck that out and the Senate agreed.

So this was not there. We have taken this out because we recognize that the regular census is going to be taken in 1970, and it seemed to the members of the committee that we could well wait for this kind of sampling to take place during the regular decennial census.

I believe, however, in listening to the testimony over the years from the Bureau of the Census that there are many special censuses required by law and that it might not be a bad idea to have, instead of a census every 10 years, to have a 5-year census. This matter, I believe, should be studied very carefully, because then if that were done, we could do away with a large part of the special censuses, and every five years get the kind of information that would be gotten in the special census, and also with the shifting population that is taking place in our country, I believe it would be better for Government planners, business, and every other segment of our economy if we could have this about every 5 years.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. In reference to the Universal Law Assistance Act, which the gentleman mentioned earlier, I believe I am correct that our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] has placed an amendment on there which would eliminate the payment of compensation in the local police departments. I take it that that is the sort of amendment that you would favor in that act.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I certainly would favor that in the act. The only trouble is I notice, after having served here a few years, and I am sure the gentleman has noticed it in the time he has been here, that we start these programs, but then they have the habit of snowballing over the years, so we get into these things far deeper than we had originally intended. I agree that that is a good amendment.

Mr. HUNGATE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am certain he understands that part of the dilemma is among the members of the Judiciary Committee themselves. Court decisions on such subjects as alcoholism being a disease instead of a crime has resulted in some funds being provided for the hospitalization of alcoholics. I am sure that the gentleman is aware that we can no longer treat these cases as we usually have, for alcoholics have to be treated as hospital cases and funds become necessary in additional amounts.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am well aware of that. Frankly, I wish the Judiciary Committee was more aware of what has happened because of some of the Supreme Court decisions and would start taking a look at what the Congress can do as a result of these decisions, because I am not convinced that the crime bill you are considering in the Judiciary Committee will be very much about crime. I may be wrong.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Would it not help if each time the Judiciary Committee recommended these new laws that they would inquire as to the cost thereof?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is exactly correct. As the gentleman well knows, we had testimony that this Criminal Justice Act would cost about $3 million. If I recall correctly, the first request was for about $7 million. Then it went up to $15 million.

I believe the legislative committees have a responsibility, when they consider legislation, to find out how much it is going to cost. This, I believe, has been neglected in many areas, because we now are faced then with funding it. Many of the members of the legislative committee come back and say they had no idea what the cost of this program was going to be.

Mr. HUNGATE. If the gentleman will yield further, I believe it is spelled out in the current proposed legislation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act that it is something like $50 million for this year.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I might say I had a little to do with the requesting of a sum by members of the judiciary, that they ask how much this is going to cost. So I believe the committee does have some figures in there. My prediction is it will be on the conservative side.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for useful service in this regard.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, the economic development assistance is also in here. There has been some transfer of funds in this area. I am not completely clear on all that is involved, except I understand, with the reorganization downtown, Mr. Davis hopes to be able to do a better job in EDA than in the past.

I understand further, because of the tremendous backlog they had in EDA applications, they decided to go through the applications quickly and let those who filed applications know as soon as possible whether or not they were going to receive a grant. Too many of our communities have been relying on assistance when we know full well there is not enough money to take care of all the requests from around the country. So I understand EDA is going to write

these communities whether or not they are going to be recipients of aid and the communities can plan more efficiently.

The distinguished chairman has stated well the committee's attitude on the Maritime Commission and maritime activities. We in the minority agree 100 percent. We think it is overdue.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the discussion the chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, I believe, complimented the committee on what they have done for the maritime industry. Certainly I would like to have my words on record complimenting the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and the other members of the committee, because they have all given the administration the money it asked for in the budget for our merchant marine—and more.

I would like to point out that there is, I believe, on the horizon, some reason to hope. There are some private steamship operators who have proposals to build types of vessels which can compete in the world of shipping. I refer to the LASH-type ship—which stands for lighter aboard ship. These new types of ships will load entire barges. They will go at great speeds and load and unload very quickly. One of these new types of vessels will hold as much as three conventional ships. When we consider their speed and turnaround time, they will probably replace as many as 12 or 13 of the older type C–2 vessels. So I believe with the understanding of the Committee on Appropriations on these new proposals in future years, we will overcome this tremendous bloc obsolescence which is taking place, so that now we find ourselves something like 14th in the Nation's shipping and carrying only about 7 percent of our own cargoes.

I hope in expressing my commendation to the committee, they will continue their interest so we look forward to solving this problem of American shipping through private enterprise, without having to go to a defense type operation, such as recently was proposed for the FDL's—that is the fast deployment logistic vessels—which require 100-percent subsidy.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I believe we are all aware of the contributions he has made to being sure we have a strong maritime service in our country. He can be sure we in our committee will look with favor on anything that can be done logically in strengthening our merchant marine. We are all like minded in realizing the seriousness of the problem and wanting to do something about it.

The distinguished chairman of the committee did not mention the Travel Service. I know it is one of his favorite organizations. I might say I believe probably it is too bad the Travel Service did get off on a wrong foot. There is a job that it can do.

There is one thing I note they are going to try to do, which I hope will be successful. A large number of people from our own country go abroad to attend conventions. Businessmen, professional men, and others have conventions abroad. This is a real drain, I suppose, with respect to our gold flow.

The Travel Service, I understand, is going to try to convince those from abroad to hold some of their meetings in our country. I hope they will be successful in doing this. I believe it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Surely the distinguished gentleman from Michigan is not suggesting we increase the amount contained in the bill for the silly outfit known as the Travel Service.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am not doing that at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is this not the outfit concerning which a survey was made about 2 years ago in certain capitals of the world where they had offices? The Ambassador in London, Ambassador Bruce; the Ambassador in Rome, Ambassador Reinhardt; the Ambassador in Tokyo, Ambassador Reischauer; and the Ambassador at Bogotá, Colombia, all recommended that the offices be taken out.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I wanted to mention that, because I noticed the gentleman was very comfortable for a few minutes.

I do want to say I hope their attempts in this area will be helpful. That is my own comment in this regard.

I do want to ask the distinguished chairman to listen again, because I know he would feel remiss if I did not call this to his attention. It has always been considered every year by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

I refer to the matter of bankruptcies taking place under the Great Society. We remember how a few years ago under the Eisenhower administration our distinguished friend would recall all the time how bankruptcies were increasing. I thought it might be not inappropriate to just say that under the Great Society they are continuing to increase, with greater numbers every year.

Frankly, I do not really blame this on anyone. Probably it is just because of too loose credit.

I know the distinguished gentleman is going to want to reply, and I am delighted to yield to him to respond.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. My distinguished friend evidently forgets exactly what I said, as shown on page 185 of the committee hearings.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have it right before me.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I said:

> It might be noted, Mr. Cederberg, the number of business bankruptcies in 1966 was almost 500 less than business bankruptcies the year before.

Mr. CEDERBERG. We do not have the time to go into my response, but it was that the business bankruptcies went down a little bit but the personal bankruptcies continued to go up, so that in the fiscal year 1966, the nonbusiness bankruptcy figure was 175,924, which is almost double what it was in the last year of the Eisenhower administration.

Everything is getting bigger under the Great Society, so I suppose bankruptcies ought to be able to go up, too.

We just want to be sure, for the record, that it is clear the bankruptcy situation has not improved and has probably gotten worse than it has ever been before.

There is another item in this legislation to which I should like to call attention; that is, the civil rights educational activities.

The administration asked for $30 million in this program. Last year they had $8 million plus. It was this year decided that we could make it $10 million.

If Members will read the hearings, I believe they will see that the money which has been used for these civil rights educational activities has not been used in accordance with what was intended when Congress passed the law.

Why do I say this? If I read the law correctly and if I understand the debate which took place, the purpose of this legislation was to assist those school districts that were having problems in going from a segregated school system to a desegregated school system. What has happened is that much of this money has been used in areas of the country where there is not any problem of segregation. Some of it has gone to my State in Michigan, with the idea of desegregation.

We have not had segregated schools in Michigan at all. The University of Michigan got a grant, as did the University of Detroit and the Wayne township schools. I admit that there are problems we get involved in in these areas, but I believe we had better put the money where the problem is. So rather than give $30 million, we put it at $10 million, and I hope the administrator will take some recognition of the intent of the use of this money. I am not convinced Mr. Howe will do that, though, because as far as I am concerned he continues to flout the intention of the Congress year after year after year.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I think the gentleman has made an excellent point. It would be wise for the House to take a look at the hearings on page 111, where, in response to my question, Harold Howe, Commissioner of Education, admitted that $100,921 is going to a school district in Las Vegas, Nev., which has never been segregated. Since its inception it has been desegregated. This certainly shows up the fact that many of these funds are being used in places where there is no problem in the field of segregation.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I would like to point out that the House had a considerable discussion last week on the Green amendment and rather vigorously indicated to the administration that they expected

the law to be applied across the country and not just in the South.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. CORMAN. So I assume that there are instances of racial discrimination in the North and, if there is a need for funds to help overcome this discrimination, that that would be consistent with the intent of the Congress. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will read the exact law under which this was written, it says specifically that it should be used to assist schools in desegregating.

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is what it is for.

Mr. CORMAN. That is right.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not think you have in the State of California any schools that are segregated. Do you?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CEDERBERG. You have some that are?

Mr. CORMAN. There are schools that have wound up with racial segregation based on neighborhood segregation and sometimes on gerrymandered school lines. There was considerable discussion on this floor last week about the fact that there is racial segregation of schools in the North. A number of the Members of this body spoke out vigorously against the administration for only enforcing the civil rights bill in the South.

Mr. CEDERBERG. What we are talking about here is the fact that the schools in some areas are segregated by law. This law has been declared unconstitutional. This legislation was written to be of assistance in the transition from a period of segregation to desegregation. If you want to apply other legislation or have legislation to assist schools such as you are talking about, I would not be opposed to that. As a matter of fact, I recognize that there are many school districts that have problems along the line that the gentleman is speaking about, but in my opinion this legislation as written should not be applied here to the problem you are addressing yourself to.

Mr. CORMAN. It seems to me—and I do not want to take up your time—if there is a case where the segregation is based on racial discrimination, these funds then ought to be available.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman.

In closing I just want to make one comment on the U.S. Information Agency. This is an Agency, of course, that is charged with doing something about our image abroad. We have tried to fund it and always fund the Voice of America for every dime they ask for. We try to do the best we can in being sure that this Agency is properly funded. I heard some criticism, however, about Expo 67 and the U.S. exhibit there. I have not had an opportunity to visit Expo 67, but from the reports I have had from those who visited it, we have a wonderful building. The architecture is fine. However, they tell me that the contents of the building leave something to be desired. I have always wondered why it is we cannot put our best foot forward in some of these expositions. At the New York World's Fair I think the U.S. Information Agency did a miserable job in our exhibition there. I hope if there are these things that have been done this way and they need to be corrected in Expo 67, they ought to be corrected. Personally, I would be interested in hearing from someone who has visited it in order to give us some idea as to what we are up to there.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I fully share your feeling about the U.S. pavilion at Expo 67. I was privileged some 2 weeks ago to visit the pavilion in the company of some members of the Canadian House of Commons.

Individual members of the Canadian Parliament came to me after they had gone through our exhibit and said that they did not think it could have been this bad. They said, individuals of their constituencies had contacted them and said, "Have you seen the U.S. pavilion? It is excellent on the outside, but it is very, very sad on the inside. It does not show American life as it exists. It shows a tinsel-bodied Hollywood-style type of America rather than the true type of our neighbor America that we know and love."

On my visit there I found that there was indeed a lot of pop art and mod art and, perhaps, art in line with the new "beat" generation or whatever one chooses to call it. But it certainly does not convey to those visiting the exposition the great story we have to tell, and I only hope that the USIA will change its approach and begin to tell that story.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I too had some constituents to visit in my office only this morning, constituents who had just come back from Montreal. They expressed the same feelings with reference to our exhibit there, that it was a Hollywood-type exhibition. They pointed out further how inferior it was to the Soviet Union's participation in that field.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from North Dakota that the gentleman certainly has a point to which we should have given a great deal more thought and attention.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Washington that this is a subject that I generally stay away from. I learned this many, many years ago. I believe it was last Thursday, I was invited by the President of the United States to accompany him to Montreal and to observe Expo 67 for which this committee has recommended the appropriation of moneys in support of our exhibit there. However, I have learned that for everyone who criticizes one of these exhibitions, there is usually someone who supports it.

Mr. Chairman, we had that situation with reference to the New York world fair. We had that situation with reference to the Brussels exposition. And, in fact, Mr. Chairman, there was a lady who wrote a book not too long ago, and in four chapters thereof she criticized quite severely what I had to say about the Brussels fair which was held in 1958.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will have an opportunity to visit Expo 67 and I hope that an invitation will also be extended to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

And, further, Mr. Chairman, I hope that when we have had the opportunity to visit the exposition, we can get together and privately discuss our views.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would not make that discussion too private. We might as well make it public. In other words, we might call some of those who are responsible for the exhibit to come in and discuss the matter with us.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, we might not want to do it that way. When they come back for more money, we would be able to grade their presentation based upon the merits or demerits of the exhibit.

Mr. CEDERBERG. However, the problem is that they always work around this couple of million dollars, rather than giving us the world exposition and exhibit to which we are entitled. We are going into another such exposition in San Antonio, Tex., next year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, originally, the request for the world Expo 67 on the part of the United States was for $11,700,000. The House of Representatives recommended the appropriation of $8 million. The other body recommended $11,700,000. The conferees agreed on $9 million and that is how it came about.

Mr. CEDERBERG. It is my opinion that we have a good bill, generally speaking.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I believe the people who are in charge of it are sincere. I talked with one of them just the other day. We had a very interesting conversation about the experts down there in the U.S. Information Agency, one of whom seems to be quite mixed up with everything with which he is concerned. Incidentally, he was put on the payroll during the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. CEDERBERG. He must be a good man, if the Great Society has still got him over there.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We could not get rid of him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I know the problem involved.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Our distinguished chairman from New York has pointed out very well that we do appropriate the funds, but then we lose control. True, there are those who think this exhibition is fine, and this handful are the very artists and stylists who create a stylistic version of America that is not really true. But we should direct these exhibitions to the 90 percent of the

people who see them. And they are the 90 percent of the populace that I was talking about in talking with Members of the Canadian Parliament. We had a little straw vote taken among the 25 Members of the Canadian Parliament that I was with and the vast majority were disappointed with the internal arrangements of the American pavilion.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I might say to the distinguished gentleman that one day last week the Director of the agency, Mr. Leonard Marx, came to my office and had with him a considerable number of newspaper clippings which were highly laudatory of the content of the American exhibition in Montreal.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I understand his mayor even thinks it swings.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. You mean Fun City?

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Sometimes these newspaper writers are a little more the swinger type than the average members of our population. I believe everyone realizes that.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, with that I believe I will close, but may I end on a note of caution, and I hope the people in the departments downtown will take note of it also: that basically the legislation we are presenting to you today, in the overall not all are 100 percent satisfied with it, but by and large, in view of what we had to do and work with, it seems to me that this is the best we could do.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should just like to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan on his very fine statement and explanation of the various facets of this bill. Of course, I do not like some of the items, and I did not agree with the especially severe cut which was made to the educational items with regard to civil rights. I did my best in this regard, but I did not have the votes. So this being a democratic society, that is what we are bound by.

We were talking a while ago about the Bureau of Prisons releasing prisoners while serving their term in the prison under the so-called work release program and I am reminded of a clipping in the U.S. News & World Report of January 23, 1967, in which the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, the bishop of Rochester, is quoted:

> Social slobberers who insist on compassion being shown to the junkies, to the dope fiends, the throat slashers, the beatniks, the prostitutes, the homosexuals and the punks. Today the decent man is practically off the reservation.

Then I thought of the printed hearings with respect to the judiciary and the Department of Justice, beginning at page 506 on what the situation was. The Bureau of Prisons officials picked a day at random, to wit: February 2, 1967. There were released by the Director of Prisons on work release, prisoners who had been sentenced for narcotics, burglary, counterfeiting, white slavery violation—transporting interstate—robbery, postal burglaries, manslaughter on Government reservations, bank robbery, kidnaping, et cetera. These are the kind of people who are being released from the prisons under this program, some of whom earn social security benefits or credit under civil service retirement.

Mr. CEDERBERG. May I say to the distinguished chairman that I agree with him 100 percent, and, of course, I agree with Bishop Sheen. It is tragic, I believe, when we see what is happening in our country, and where people do not pay attention to statements like that which the good bishop made. They do not pay attention to statements made by J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI, since they are trying to downgrade him because of his attitude on criminals—crime across the Nation which the FBI tries to do something about, and then some of the social do-gooders these days demoralizing what is going to have to be done if we are going to try to control crime.

You are going to have to have a lot more medicine than that.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNT. I would like to refer to page 24 of the bill and page 14 of the committee report under that section which relates to economic development assistance for the purpose of making some legislative history.

It is the intent of the committee, and indeed the intent of the House of Representatives, is it not, that the administrator of the economic development assistance program should pay special attention to applications which come in which would further depress an industry that is already in serious economic straits?

For example, several years ago, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan I am sure remembers, at a time when the broiler industry throughout the country, that is the broiler segment of the poultry industry, was in a very serious economic plight. Then the director of this program, the administrator, almost undertook to approve applications for both grants and loans, which if approved and put into operation would have had the effect of causing even more small operators and large operators alike in the broiler segment of the poultry industry to become further depressed—which would have had the exact opposite effect from that which was intended by the Congress.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I can only state so far as I am concerned that we should be very careful and the agencies should be very careful to be sure that it does not try to place in business those things that are going to be competitive to a business that is already trying to exist and probably having a difficult time now.

Mr. FLYNT. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Michigan agrees with me that the purpose of this program is to create jobs and to create employment and not to kill employment and to further reduce it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Nor is it to place in jeopardy any business by any competitor by using these tax dollars to assist someone else in getting into a business, which may not be necessary, and that is my own personal opinion.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am sure that would be the sentiment of the Congress.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say we both almost forgot to say something about a subject that was uncovered in the hearings, and that is the fact that this covey of great experts out in the National Bureau of Standards, who have moved from the Connecticut Avenue, Reno Road property, to Gaithersburg, where they originally estimated that the cost of their buildings would be $62 million and they are now up to $107 million. But lo and behold, did we not find that they paid $45,000 for a flagpole, out in the middle of nowhere, in Gaithersburg—which amounts to $500 a foot for a flagpole.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let the record speak for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has consumed 42 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I take just a few moments of the Committee's time on an important subject, the subject of JOHN ROONEY. Not many people know even remotely of the close scrutiny which he gives to this bill, of the effective results which he achieves in holding down costs of the many and varied activities which the bill covers. Our country owes JOHN ROONEY a great deal.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to tell first about the United Nations. The United States has a large listing of representatives at the United Nations. In fact, our staff at the U.N. and affiliate organizations totals 2,811 persons. That is nearly 3,000 people, and that does not include those who work for Public Law 480 and some foreign aid personnel associated with U.N. activities.

We pay $113 million annually to the United Nations and its affiliate organizations. This is, by far, the largest share of the cost of the U.N. paid by any nation. Actually we pay uncomfortably close to half the bills of that organization.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear that such a large group of capable representatives, backed by generous, even unstinting appropriations, would be able to exercise a major influence in the affairs of the U.N. That influence, it would be anticipated, could be reflected in vigorous action by the United Nations in dealing with peacekeeping problems and leadership problems throughout the world. It could be reflected in effective operations by peacekeeping forces, by sanctions against troublemakers, and by prompt recourse to the World Court when it becomes necessary to do so.

I find woefully little to support that thesis. Lengthy debates are carried on in the U.N., but they are largely meaningless in that nothing of significance really

happens. The "have not" nations use the U.N. for a sounding board, and some of these "have not" nations are happy now to split themselves into smaller units, each calling itself a nation and sending the bill to the United States. Occasionally the U.N. does strike out against a responsible government like Rhodesia or South Africa, and regretfully I note that the United States usually tags along like a small boy trying to lead a large calf after the calf has found it can go where it wants.

Round 1 in the participation of the U.N. in the crisis in the Mideast must be chalked up as uninspiring—or blundering. Inexplicably, Secretary General U Thant withdrew the peacekeeping forces which had acted as a buffer between Arab and Israel forces, thus opening the way for direct confrontation by hostile units. U Thant himself has seemed to be floundering in his efforts to find appropriate channels through which to work. This is not the first instance.

The other major crisis affecting the U.N. is, of course, the war in Vietnam. In that situation the U.N. has carefully looked the other way while U Thant called for peace negotiations and an end to bombing. These gestures are of no earthly benefit to the United States. Instead they are quite harmful to a meaningful search for peace.

This brings us down to the fact that the United Nations is probably facing the greatest test of its existence. The organization which began 20 years ago with great hopes for an effective organization for the preservation of world peace has degenerated more and more into a debating society which costs much and produces little. It is a most disappointing situation. Unless the organization is able to realize its potentialities by facing up to crises in a responsible manner, the U.N. will have demonstrated that its usefulness as an international organization has come to an end. Many in Congress have for years felt that there was no justification for continuing to pay the lion's share of the cost of the U.N. We have urged with restraint that limitations be placed on these expenditures but these cries have fallen on deaf ears. I would think that the time may be near when this will no longer be the case.

Now let me get to the State Department. The problems of the Middle East focus with sharp clarity upon Moscow and the progress which Russia has made in that area. Whether there has been a breakdown in American diplomacy, or whether America's friendship with Israel through the years has soured on the Arab nations is not clear. What is clear is that the Russians have very definitely taken advantage of the situation and they are reaping the harvest. The situation need not be a lasting one, but for the time being the Arab nations are more solidly united against the small country of Israel than at any previous time. It places Moscow in the driver's seat in an area which has been troubled diplomatically for years, and the situation poses a direct counterthreat to America's actions in Vietnam. Even without consideration of Vietnam, the United States has a serious choice. We have a commitment to help preserve Israel, whose survival quite obviously is at stake. We have a very definite interest in the Arab-controlled oil, and in keeping open strategic routes to areas of major interest to the free world.

In Europe, France has kicked out the U.N.—lock, stock, and barrel. This has, of course, weakened the effectiveness of that organization and demonstrated a lack of unity on the part of the Western World. And not to be overlooked is the fact that France falls heir to very substantial U.S. military installations and to equipment which cannot readily be moved. For this she is obligated to pay, but the chances are that these obligations will simply be added to other billions which France owes to this Nation and which De Gaulle sublimely ignores.

There is an offset to the French defection. Spain would be very glad to become a part of the NATO Alliance, and Spain has effective forces and substantial manpower for producing still other forces. But some of the Socialist governments of northern Europe do not like the strongly anti-Communist government of Spain, and our diplomats are careful not to press the issue. After all, we must not offend anybody just to get allies with which to contain communism. That is not polite diplomacy.

I call attention also to the opportunity which now exists in Indonesia. Our relations with Indonesia were at a very low ebb for a long period while Sukarno courted the Communists. Now that period is past. The Communists have taken a fearful beating in Indonesia. There is a new order.

This presents a new opportunity for American diplomacy to move quickly and effectively to cement the anti-Communist posture of Indonesia's Government and to reestablish close and fruitful relations with that nation's government. Undoubtedly we are taking steps to achieve this but how positive are those steps and how effective have they been? There is very little to indicate any progress of moment in either respect. If this is another case of business as usual with no significant regard for time or opportunity, then American diplomacy is missing the boat very badly.

To me, it would appear that happier relations with Indonesia—the largest nation in Southeast Asia and a country of great potential and wealth—should be courted with all the ardor of a lovesick swain during full moon in June. This can be the most important nation in Southeast Asia in that area insofar as the future of democracy is concerned.

On the same side of the world, in Vietnam itself, pacification of liberated areas has had to be taken from State and related groups and placed in the hands of U.S. military forces. Poor progress, waste, and black marketing have forced a revision in the program. It is very clear that we will not have won the war in Vietnam until pacification is complete and effective and believed in by the people.

These are not cheering developments. They indicate a need for a very careful soul-searching in the higher levels of America's diplomatic agencies. It is high time for the elimination of deadwood. The dedicated, capable personnel, of whom there are many, should be given a freer hand to show positive accomplishment for the advancement of America's interests. But instead of careful pruning, there was much in the presentations to the committee of business as usual, with requests for a constantly mounting number of civilian employees. I am glad to state the committee has refused many of the requested additions but what is needed most is a coldly analytical facing up to the fact that they are not doing very well diplomatically in the hottest spots in the world. Neither this committee nor the Congress has the power to require more capable action. We can cut and scold but that is about all. The United States cannot fight everywhere. We have to be able to depend upon the diplomats in most parts of the world. I wonder if they realize that they have not been doing very well even though they have nearly all the money to do the job that they requested from Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I join with others in congratulating the subcommittee for the generally fine job with this bill. I notice that some of the cuts made are in sensitive areas. It is never easy to cut or reduce appropriations requests in such areas.

I also notice that, according to my quick mathematics, there is a reduction of between 6 and 7 percent in this bill under the budget estimates. Fifteen million dollars of that, I believe, is involved in the use of previously appropriated funds, but, nevertheless, the total cuts range between 6 and 7 percent.

However, I would like to ask a question or two of my distinguished friend from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee, if I may have his attention. I notice the bill authorizes the sale of $150 million in participating certificates. I just wonder how the subcommittee justifies that, in view of the record which indicates that SBA already has authority to sell $850 million worth of participating certificates?

If they sell this additional $150 million that will give them a billion dollars of money for use next year.

I notice in the budget itself that if they get the billion dollars in receipts from the sale of participating certificates and from repayments on loans and revenues from loans unsold, they expect to go into fiscal year 1969 with a carryover balance of $476½ million.

I cannot understand why it would be necessary to incur the obligation for the insufficiencies which will amount to $1,350,000 next year and every year thereafter so long as the PC's are outstanding. For the entire $1 billion proposed for sale next year, the insufficiency, or subsidy if you prefer that word, will be about $7,000,000 a year.

I see no need to sell the $150 million, according to the budget estimates and, I might add, according to the record which

was a very fine record, I thought, made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], beginning on page 79 and running over through page 81 of part 4 of the hearings.

If the gentleman will enlighten me or discuss the need for this $150 million, he may be able to convince me I should not offer an amendment to strike that $150 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I shall be glad to discuss this with the distinguished gentleman, a fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The page to which the gentleman referred in the printed hearings, to wit, page 79, contains testimony by Mr. Boutin, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. I believe it is universally considered, not only in the Congress but throughout the country, that one of the better run operations of the Federal Government is the Small Business Administration. It is one which is very important to the economic life of this country.

Mr. JONAS. May I interject to say I am not questioning the importance of the Small Business Administration or attacking the way it has operated. I am questioning whether they need the $150 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As my lawyer colleague would say, this is just preliminary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. At page 79, the testimony of Mr. Boutin was:

> We would have sufficient money to meet our responsibilities for fiscal 1967 and fiscal 1968 at the level of $850 million in sales, with one caveat, Mr. Chairman, that the $150 million is all for the business loan and investment fund. Part of the balance, $125 million of the $850 million, is for the disaster loan fund. So we would be running at too tight a rate to be on safe ground going into fiscal 1969.

If I may conclude this thought, we had a situation—and have a situation each year—in which disasters occur and it becomes very important that the Small Business Administration have on hand sufficient money to cover the disaster loans as well as the business loans.

I can recall when, only a couple of years ago, another gentleman was the head of the Small Business Administration, and he did not ask the Appropriations Committee of the House for additional funds.

In every region throughout the country when loans were not made it was contended that this was all the fault of the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress. It was the thought of our subcommittee in dealing with this matter that we could not jeopardize such a situation. So we included not $850 million, as was included last year, as I recall it, but $150 million in these participation sales certificates.

Mr. JONAS. May I say that $150 million is all the administration asked for this year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is true.

Mr. JONAS. And you give them every dollar that they asked for. May I state what follows in the quotation you read on page 79?

> Mr. ROONEY. Of course you will be here again a year from now for 1969, will you not?
> Mr. BOUTIN. Yes, indeed, Mr. Chairman.
> Mr. ROONEY. And this does not put you out at all coming up here to see us. We only see you once a year, generally speaking, and you have all of these fine-looking gentlemen with you.

Now, the question in my mind simply is, Do they need the $150 million or do they not?

May I add one other thing here? The reason I raise the question is because if you give them the $150 million, according to their own testimony and according to the budget, they will carry over into 1969 $476.5 million which they do not plan to spend or obligate in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman's figures are correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We cannot be sure, I say to my distinguished friend from North Carolina, that they will not need this money. I approached the witnesses at that hearing with the idea of perhaps using the pruning shears. Subsequently, though, we became convinced we were not going to take that chance and possibly be responsible for their running out of funds for business loans and disaster loans. I have in my hand a letter from the Administrator, the Honorable Bernard L. Boutin in which he states he is grateful for including in our bill the authority to sell before June 30, 1969, an additional $150 million of participation certificates. This authority will assure that the Small Business Administration will have the funds available in our revolving funds to carry out without curtailment the various lending programs authorized to this agency.

So it is a matter of assurance.

Mr. JONAS. May I say that if they do not get the $150 million as provided in this bill, they will still have $325 million in carryover funds. That seems like a pretty big cushion to me. I am sure Mr. Boutin would like to have $476 million in carryover funds, but the question is, Do we need to give him all of that?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Further I am informed that there is presently pending or about to come up a bill which will increase the lending authority of the Small Business Administration.

In conclusion, the committee did not want to take the chance of being criticized for not having furnished enough money to meet these disaster and business loans as we were accused a couple of years ago when it was not our fault. If we refuse to approve this action of the committee, we will be placed in such a position.

Mr. JONAS. I am sorry to take so much time, but I think this is necessary.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman should take it. He always asks fair and sensible questions.

Mr. JONAS. Thank you.

I am not trying to be an obstructionist, but am trying to find some justification for this $150 million, and I have not had an opportunity to do so before.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, if he would not agree to write into page 48 $1,350,000, the estimated amount of the insufficiency, instead of leaving it wide open as a permanent and indefinite appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that there are several reasons why we should do this, the principal one being that two appropriation bills already passed this year have written in the exact amount of the subsidy.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it would be inconsistent if we adopted this bill and left it wide open, in the form of sort of a blank check, may I respectfully say to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina will yield further, may I respectfully reply to the gentleman, that if we were to include this amount at the place suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina, at page 48 of the bill as suggested by the gentleman, it could very well cost more money. Therefore, it is my opinion that we should not take that chance. We are approving the sale of participation certificates, to the extent of $150 million.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I cannot see how it could possibly cost more than $150 million because the bill specifically limits the sales to $150 million and I would specifically limit the subsidy to $1,350,000—the exact amount Mr. Boutin estimated would be required.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But, Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina will yield further, is it not a fact that it could cost less, if the amount is not set forth?

Mr. JONAS. In the other bills we said, "not in excess of."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But what happened with regard to the other bills, I believe is incorrect. And, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the Small Business Administration is concerned, and I am sure it is concerned, I am not going to vote to interfere with the business and disaster loans.

Mr. JONAS. Again, I do not think anything I have suggested could be so construed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, that is what we are afraid of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time during which to discuss and to direct the Committee's attention to that

portion of the report on the bill which deals with the Environmental Science Services Administration and, perhaps, to ask a question or two of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] with reference thereto.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Illinois will yield, I shall be glad to attempt to respond to the questions of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we had an incident occur in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, a tornado in which some 22 lives were lost and a great amount of property damage was done.

Mr. Chairman, I learned, to my consternation, that the station of the U.S. Weather Bureau at Rockford was operating only upon a 16-hour-a-day basis, due to a budgetary cutback in 1964 and that they only had one trained meteorologist on duty most of the time.

Mr. Chairman, this one man simply could not handle the many calls which would have gone out to the various public service agencies and public news media agencies, and so on, in order to provide advance warning of the impending storm.

Mr. Chairman, because of that most regrettable incident I addressed a letter to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on the 26th of April and asked for an additional $30,000 to be put into the bill so that we might have the three additional people needed to man this particular office on a 24-hour basis Of course, the subcommittee's hearings had already adjourned by that time and there was no opportunity to go into it further.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the language as contained on page 16 of the report on this bill, which states as follows:

> The full amounts requested for hurricane and tornado, agriculture weather and fire weather have been approved, as well as the funds for the nationwide natural disaster warning system.

Mr. Chairman, there was a meeting which was held on the day after the tornado at Rockford, Ill., at which time there was present, Mr. Paul Kutschenreuter, Director of User Affairs of the Environmental Sciences Services Administration, Department of Commerce, and Mr. S. Barton, from their public information office. It seemed to be the recommendation of the experts in this field that this is what is needed by way of additional authorization for fiscal year 1968, if our area is going to have adequate storm warning.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the substance of this meeting was to the effect that the Weather Bureau was so understaffed that during that time they could not have given the consideration necessary to warn the schools and other public institutions as well as individuals as to the impending danger.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that there is this language contained in the report. However, these people who attended this meeting indicated that there would have to be an additional authorization and appropriation for fiscal year 1968 in order to make these three additional positions available.

I would appreciate some assurances at this time from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that what has been said at page 16 of the report is in fact so, and that there are moneys available now to the Environmental Science Services Administration that will make the personnel needed available because they are needed.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to say to the highly distinguished and capable gentleman from Illinois that I noted he has pursued this matter with the members of the subcommittee as well as myself, and I say now for the benefit of whoever hears my voice, or reads the RECORD, including the Weather Bureau, now known as the Environmental Science Services Administration, that we mean exactly what we say, that the full amounts requested for hurricane and tornado, agriculture weather, and fire weather have been approved, as well as the funds for the nationwide natural disaster warning system. I should further say that if the Weather Bureau feels there should be an around-the-clock, 24-hour service, that the funds are sufficient to do this, and we would expect them to do this if they think it should be done.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the distinguished gentleman for providing me with that information. I shall certainly pursue this matter with the Environmental Science Services Administration with the full expectation that they will staff the Rockford Weather Station on a 24-hour basis. I know the degree of importance that this agency will attach to the words just spoken by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I am also aware that officials of the Environmental Science Services Administration have already acknowledged in their conversations with Mr. Robert P. Selfridge, manager of the Greater Rockford Airport, that the need for 24-hour weather station operation at Rockford does exist.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my full support for H.R. 10345, the fiscal 1968 appropriations for the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments. I am pleased that the bill includes the full $5,800,000 budget estimate for the Center for Technical and Cultural Interchange Between East and West, the Honolulu East-West Center, created by Congress in 1960 and dedicated by then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1961.

The approval by the Appropriations Committee of the full budget request reflects the general recognition that the East-West Center is fulfilling the purpose for which it was established; namely, to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the peoples of Asia and the entire Pacific area. Americans and foreign students from more than 31 nations participate in the many and varied programs of the Center's Institute for Student Interchange, the Institute of Advanced Projects, and the Institute for Technical Interchange.

The East-West Center enables students from diverse cultures and backgrounds to gather and live in a cosmopolitan environment while pursuing intensive studies in their academic specialties. Senior scholars are enabled to meet in seminars and exchange ideas that eventually contribute materially to mutual understanding and respect, attitudes which hopefully will be carried back to many lands and will have ramifications for our international relations in the future.

Not only does the Center create an environment that fosters learning, but it has provided the means for intensive activity in the translation of foreign works, in the writing of books on subjects of cross-cultural concern, and the publication of many beautiful and valuable scholarly volumes through the facilities of the East-West Center Press.

The programs of the East-West Center have also made it possible for groups of scholars from Asian countries to attend summer sessions at mainland universities and to visit Washington, D.C., a trip which is a high spot of their stimulating experience in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot overestimate the implications of what is occurring at the East-West Center as a bridge to more meaningful relationships between the United States and our neighbors across the Pacific with whom our commercial and cultural interests are becoming increasingly involved. As the trade agreements and treaties we sign with Asian countries form a legalistic basis for our international policy in that area of the world, so do the intercultural activities made possible by the East-West Center provide the meaningful human element that will enhance the operative reality of such agreements. The foreign students at the Center are all of the highest caliber, rigidly selected from the most capable young people in their societies, and each year they return as cadres to assume leadership roles in their native countries. What they carry back with them from the East-West Center will expand and become more apparent as our relations with their nations continue to grow in every aspect.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the Committee on Appropriations for its vision in including the full budgetary request for the East-West Center in the 1968 appropriation and urge my colleagues today to approve this most significant legislation.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for the purposes authorized by section 104(b)(4) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), to be credited to and expended under the appro-

priation account for "Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad", to remain available until expended, $5,025,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and the members of his subcommittee, for the excellent hearings they conducted on the subject of this State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill. It would be my hope the Members of the House would spend some time reading these hearings, because there is a wealth of information to be obtained from them.

Now, having said that, Mr. Chairman, I must add that I do not believe the committee, on the basis of the evidence the committee adduced with respect to a lot of the spending, cut deeply enough.

I do not know how notice is going to be served upon the departments represented in this bill as well as other departments covered by other appropriation bills, unless the Committee on Appropriations raps the knuckles of those who are misusing the public trust by extravagant spending on questionable projects.

The committee leveled all kinds of criticism in the use of various funds, but it will be of no avail unless effective notice is served that this situation cannot continue.

I recognize, of course, that the authorizing committees of Congress are to blame for much of this, but somehow or other we do not seem to be able to get it over to those committees that some of these things must be ended.

There is, for instance, the Chamizal deal with Mexico at El Paso, Tex. I suppose the answer will be that having been authorized in the amount that it was and in the way it was, Congress had to come along today and provide the money in this bill. This Chamizal deal could only happen in Texas, I do believe. I will not go into the details, for most of them are in these hearings.

Another illustration of what I am talking about is the east-west cultural center in Hawaii. From reading these hearings, you have to believe that there is terribly poor administration of this cultural center.

The fact that one of the students who is tapping the Federal Treasury for some $13,000 to $15,000 for an education, would lead an anti-Vietnam demonstration in Honolulu and commit a symbolic desecration of the U.S. flag, is beyond belief. Apparently the heads of that heavily subsidized institution gave him and others only a slap on the wrist.

Somehow or other we have to get it over that if we are going to support these cultural centers, that we will not tolerate this kind of business. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] suggested a little while ago that the United Nations and the State Department are failing in their missions in behalf of the American people and he is so right. We are spending millions upon millions of dollars in this and other bills on the State Department and its so-called foreign policy, and upon the United Nations and its specialized agencies, yet around the world we have fewer friends than we have ever had. It is time to quit spending so much on bankrupt policies and organizations.

So it goes up and down the line, including the judiciary and the Justice Department. It is my understanding that there are about 2,000 attorneys in the Department of Justice—somebody correct me if I am wrong. Yet, using just one illustration, a man by the name of Fred G. Black, former high-flying lobbyist for North American Aviation and an associate of Bobby Baker, was convicted on tax charges but the case was thrown out of court about a year ago on a technicality. Why has not the Department of Justice brought him to trial again—as the court instructed? Why not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Are they afraid Black will talk? What is the story?

There is also the failure of the Supreme Court to do anything about the three Federal judges in Oklahoma who have been engaged for the last few years in calling each other names and accusing each other of corruption. Speaking of the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Warren finds time to load himself on the taxpayers' backs and take a junket to South America, along with his wife also on the payroll, yet he does not have time to dispose of the writ that was filed in the Court 2 or 3 years ago in the case of the three Oklahoma judges. Meanwhile, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives uses the weak-spined alibi that there is a legal action pending in the Supreme Court and therefore it cannot carry out an investigation of the three Oklahoma Federal judges who persist in denouncing each other and thus bringing the Federal court into disrepute.

It is about time the House and the Committee on Appropriations thereof, as well as the authorizing committees, rapped some knuckles around here. Let us cut down on the funds if that is the only way we can get decent performance and service out of some of these people.

Mr. Chairman, there is no possible way, based upon testimony given in the hearings, to justify many of the expenditures in this bill. Unless it is drastically reduced I have no alternative but to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Department of State Appropriation Act, 1968".

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last two words.

I take this time in order to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking member or anyone who has the information available as to the employment levels currently of the Department of State and how many vacancies exist. I am moved to ask the question because recently I saw a news article which quoted a State Department official as saying that steps were being taken to reduce overseas employment by 2 percent or to eliminate 2 percent of the jobs. Was that statement in error?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am advised that there were no vacancies at that time.

Mr. JONAS. Was this a correct statement? Has the gentleman checked that statement to see whether action was taken?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Actually all that was being done by the new Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Mr. Rimestad, was to bring employment to the level that it should have been. Is that a satisfactory answer to the gentleman's question?

Mr. JONAS. It explains what happened. I was a little surprised and pleased, I might add, and complimented the people in State for taking that action. I just wondered if I was premature in doing so.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I suppose Mr. Rimestad should have been complimented for doing what you and I would call the right thing.

Mr. JONAS. At any rate, it is a plus for the taxpayers that he has done what he should have done.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is true.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States for necessary expenses for the promotion of foreign commerce, as authorized herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses," $200,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF GEORGIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have a series of amendments beginning at this point. There are actually 10 amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The wording of the amendments is identical and basically the impact of the amendments is simply to put a time limitation on the funds that are appropriated, rather than having them remain available until expended at some indefinite period.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understand the request is that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. That is the request.

Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia: On page 27, line 3, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 29, line 4, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 29, lines 11 and 12, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 30, line 5, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 31, line 7, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 33, line 14, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 35, line 10, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 54, line 7, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 54, line 13, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

On page 54, line 23, strike out "expended" and insert "July 1, 1972."

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer these amendments is simply that I have been appalled when reading various reports relating to the total dollars that have been appropriated by this Congress, only to find there are dollars which are lying around and have not been expended.

A few minutes ago, in the colloquy between the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from New York, I noticed the gentleman was taking objection to a $150 million appropriation request merely because there was—and I believe my figure is correct—$400 million which had been appropriated by prior Congresses not used by the particular agency involved.

It appears to me it would be only good business judgment to put a time certain expiration date on these appropriations and not let them carry over indefinitely if they are not used.

I have attempted, in offering these particular amendments, to exclude areas in which construction is involved. Actually, as one goes through the appropriation bill, one finds that the term "to remain available until expended" appears in approximately 25 different areas. I have selected 10 of these, and feel it is proper to put a 5-year limitation on this money. If the money is not spent within the 5-year period it should then revert to the Treasury.

What are the areas? They are such things as on page 35, under "State Marine Schools." There is $1,275,000 to be appropriated to the Maritime Academy, and it is to remain available until expended. Probably this money will be expended within a 5-year period, but if for some reason it is not I feel the appropriations should lapse and should then not be made available unless reappropriated by a future Congress.

On page 30, under "satellite operations" there is $28,100,000 to remain available, to observe the environmental conditions of space satellites. I support the space program, but at the same time I feel very definitely that we should have a time limit on the appropriations made. If they are not expended within a reasonable period of time for that purpose—and I have adopted basically 5 years—then they should lapse.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge the adoption of these amendments.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, over the years I have learned for this subcommittee particularly—and I imagine it is true for all of them—not to bring to the floor an appropriation bill providing that the funds shall be available until expended unless authorized by law.

First, if it were not authorized by law it would surely never get by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. That is No. 1.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not just now. I want to make my argument, please.

No. 2: This amendment would play havoc with many Government programs. If the gentleman had come to the committee during the course of the hearings and presented his thoughts on the subject, we would respectfully have listened. To come on the floor and without further ado to move to do away with the continued availability of funds for State marine schools—I just cannot see it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not just now, please.

Mr. Chairman, the other items to which the gentleman offered an amendment have to do with the merchant marine. For instance, at the foot of page 32 and the top of page 33 of the bill there is the item "Operating-differential subsidies—liquidation of contract authorization." Does the gentleman want to do away with the availability until expended of funds which have already been contracted for? These funds are already entered into, in an agreement with the various companies and people concerned in connection with operating differential subsidies.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will yield to the gentleman, if he will be patient.

The gentleman's amendment would have to do with the item of $143 million for ship construction. We never fail to ask how much money they have available presently and how much money they had available last June 30 and how much money they will have available next June 30. The gentleman's amendments—and I believe there are 10 of them—would utterly play havoc with these items which are dealing with contract authority and have to be paid. There is nothing that can stand in front of their being paid.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. The gentleman is incorrect in that I have an amendment, as he stated, to the operating-differential subsidies. There is no such amendment. He is also incorrect in stating that I have an amendment to the maritime ship construction on page 32 and so forth.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am glad to learn that. Of course, the gentleman has 10 amendments. I do not think I have seen 10 amendments brought up all together once in all my years; but that is all right.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. My amendments are designed not to apply to construction for the simple reason that a contract cannot exceed a 5-year period.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The item at page 35 of the bill, State marine schools, is for the liquidation and obligation of contracts incurred by authority of the act. This is contract authority which would be interfered with by the amendment suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee vote down the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON].

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Environmental Science Services Administration, including maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; expenses of an authorized strength of three hundred commissioned officers on the active list; pay of commissioned officers retired in accordance with law; purchase of supplies for the upper-air weather measurements program for delivery through December 31 of the next fiscal year; $105,000,000 of which $1,013,000 shall be available for retirement pay of commissioned officers and payments under the retired serviceman's family protection plan: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed for at least press costs and costs of paper for navigational charts furnished for official use of other Government departments and agencies.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from New York. I came in a few moments ago during general debate and heard some of the discussion about the Environmental Science Services. I would like to inquire of our subcommittee chairman when did this change take effect?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It took effect during the time that John Connor was Secretary of Commerce. I might say to the gentleman that John Connor, in my estimation, is one of the greatest Secretaries of Commerce we ever had during all of the years that I have had connection with their appropriations. At that time the proposal was brought up by Dr. Holloman, who is going to be the new president of the University of Oklahoma, to put together the U.S. Weather Bureau, the radio propagation laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It was claimed that by amalgamating these three activities we would save the taxpayers' money. At that time—and this must be about 3 years ago—I warned them that we were going to look carefully at this whole business and if they did not save the taxpayers' money, that it might be necessary to unseparate them again, if I may use that expression.

Mr. RANDALL. How was the change from Weather Bureau to Environmental Science Services administration accomplished? Was it by Executive order?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is right.

Mr. RANDALL. I observe the report which refers to the change to the new name as a fancy enigmatic title. I wanted to be sure that all of our people out in our country would be clear about this, because they seem to associate Environmental Science Services with such things as water pollution and air pollution and things of that kind. What I must know, Will my constituents still be able to take a telephone book and look in it and find a listing for the Weather Bureau?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We say in this report that this fancy enigmatic title covers services which until last year were carried out under the names of the Weather Bureau and Coast and Geodetic Survey plus a portion of the National Bureau of Standards.

I do not know if the weather is getting any better in Missouri.

I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] has experienced some difficulty with reference as to the manner in which the Weather Bureau operates out in the State of Illinois and has so operated recently.

How is the weather with reference to the area which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] represents?

Mr. RANDALL. It is not improving. We have had some tornadoes this spring and are threatened quite frequently. We feel that we should be able to open a telephone book and there find in plain English the Weather Bureau's number listed and in a minimum of time to get a report in a hurry on an approaching tornado.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Missouri will yield further, if my memory serves me correctly, when we used to dial WE–6–1212, there was a short time during which the operator would say that "This is the latest report of the Environmental Services Administration," and then they got back to the Weather Bureau once again and its report thereon.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad I took this time to make it very clear that the Weather Bureau is still listed as such in the telephone directory. I am also pleased that the general public will be told that Environmental Science Services Administration is one and the same as the Weather Bureau.

I am glad to know that in the telephone directory listing of Environmental Science Services Administration or ESSA, there will be no doubt that is what was for so many years known as the Weather Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to ask the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], a question or two with respect to the amount of funds contained in this bill for the agricultural weather stations.

Could the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee give me that information?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman well knows the concern that the chairman and the subcommittee has for the weather conditions in his district in Nebraska. We have proved that upon a previous occasion. However, we have provided every dollar for the purpose about which the gentleman from Nebraska inquires.

Mr. MARTIN. Could the gentleman from New York tell me—and I appreciate the great interest that the gentleman and his subcommittee has shown in this subject—how much money is in this bill for the areawide teletypewriter circuit communications?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, I am sorry that I must say to the gentleman that under their reorganization plan it is almost impossible to find the total figure for a specific project.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is an item which appears on page 547 of the printed hearings, as contained in a chart listed thereon, entitled "Agricultural weather services," 173 positions in 1967, and the same number is provided for in 1968, and the amount of $2,747,000.

Mr. MARTIN. And, this is the amount that the agency or department requested of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes. I think that is all covered at page 16 of the report when we say as follows:

> The full amounts requested for hurricane and tornado, agriculture weather, and fire weather have been approved, as well as the funds for the nationwide natural disaster warning system.

Mr. MARTIN. I grant that, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to ask the distinguished chairman one more question.

Did the Department request any funds for setting up agriculture weather stations in phase 2?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska will yield further, we gave them the same amount as they had in the previous year for agriculture weather stations.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand from the Bureau that phase 1 has been appropriated for in the past and that we are now up to phase 2.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Nebraska will yield further, there is included, in toto, what they requested.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I notice in looking through the subcommittee report there is only one item that shows an increase over the budget request for fiscal year 1968, and that is for research and development under the Maritime Administration, $1,950,000.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is not exactly for research and development. It comes under that title because it is there that the operation originated. This is to continue the maintenance and sailing of the ship, the NS *Savannah*, which carries cargo, incidentally, and does collect money for the carrying of such cargo.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It does that in keeping with the limitation which is set forth on page 26 of the report which reads as follows:

> of which $3,300,000 shall be for operation of the NS *Savannah*: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated herein are to be used for a lay up of the NS *Savannah*:

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If I may say to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, when they came to the committee they requested $1,350,000 as the expense to lay up the ship in fiscal year 1968. This would really only provide for the period from a date in August to June 30, 1968. The committee denied all of funds requested for the layup of the ship, but on the other hand appropriated $3,300,000 to continue to sail it with its specially trained crew.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, the committee took the $1,350,000 which was recommended for layup and added to it $1,950,000 to come to the total of $3,300,000 for the operation of the NS *Savannah* for fiscal year 1968.

These funds in this bill are applicable to fiscal year 1968. Is there any possibility that the Maritime Administration acting under direction of some higher authority might commit funds that are available in fiscal year 1967 for the purpose of laying up the NS *Savannah*.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, that could not happen for this reason: The contract to operate the NS *Savannah* runs until the date I suggested, August, which is in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. For the operations?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes.

If I may say so, I do not believe they can get out of it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am delighted to hear the gentleman say that inasmuch as I strongly favor the continued operation of the NS *Savannah*.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe they will have to continue to operate the ship. Very often we appropriate money that the executive branch never uses. We have been quite fortunate. Last year we built an extra ship for the Maritime Administration in which the Government's half, or the Government's share, was then $7 million-plus, and they did obligate that money. So we have been fortunate in this regard, and I am sure they will continue to sail the *Savannah*.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

To enable the Small Business Administration to pay the Federal National Mortgage Association, as trustee, such insufficiencies as may be required by the trustee on account of such outstanding beneficial interests or participations in obligations of the Small Business Administration, as may be authorized by this Act to be issued pursuant to section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, as amended, such sums as may be necessary, to be available without fiscal year limitation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONAS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 48, lines 17 and 18, strike out "such sums as may be necessary to be available without fiscal year limitation" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed $1,350,000".

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not restrict the amount of participating sales certificates that may be sold by the Small Business Administration. It would merely change a permanent and indefinite appropriation into a line item so that we will know the amount of subsidy the Government is going to have to pay in order to sell the $150 million worth of certificates. It is exactly the amount the committee listed in its report would have to be paid in subsidy. See page 40 of the report.

Actually, as has been brought out in debate on this subject on previous occasions, this is really not a sale. It is a new method of borrowing money and it is a more expensive way of borrowing money than Treasury borrowing.

If we leave the language in the bill as written, the result will be a permanent, indefinite appropriation in the form of a blank check. It will be a continuing payment so long as these certificates are outstanding.

It may run for 20 years, or so long as the certificates are outstanding. If it runs for 20 years, the amount of the insufficiency would be about $27 million, if it costs $1,350,000 a year. If it runs for 10 years, it would cost half that much, $13.5 million. But whatever it is going to cost, we ought to know, and as the language now stands, we have no control over this in the future. This is a recurring obligation, a continuing, permanent, indefinite appropriation of any amount that FNMA determines is necessary to enable it to sell these participating certificates.

We have had this matter on the floor twice before this year. On both occasions the House wrote into the bill as a line item the amount of the subsidy, so that we would know how much it is. If it is different next year, we can change it next year, but we cannot change it if the language remains indefinite and permanent in the appropriation bill which now says "such sums as may be necessary to be available without fiscal year limitation."

In the independent offices bill we had a teller vote, and the House wrote into that bill as a line item the amount of subsidy that could be paid.

The HEW bill contained such language. The committee itself wrote into that bill as a line item the amount of subsidy that could be paid.

I think the House should be consistent in its handling of this matter. We have already written line items into two bills. I think we ought to write it into this bill.

But even more than the importance of being consistent is the importance of being right. I submit to you that we ought not to give a blank check to any agency of the Government that will run indefinitely. This is absolutely the only way we can have any control over how much subsidy is going to be paid on these outstanding particular certificates.

I do not think it will hurt the Department to write this language in, because they estimate that that is the amount they will spend and they know on the basis of past experience what rate of interest or rate of subsidy they will have to pay in order to market these participating certificates. They have so testified and so justified the amount before the subcommittee. I think in all fairness and in all our efforts to protect the fiscal integrity of the Government, and in order to keep from defaulting on our own obligations to ourselves and to the taxpayers, we ought to write into this bill the exact amount of the subsidy so that we will all know what it is going to cost the taxpayers for the administration to engage in this method of financing.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have listened with great intent to the learned remarks by my distinguished colleague, fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations, from the great State of North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]. Of course, when he refers to the fact that this issue has been decided before on, I believe it is, two previous appropriation bills, that is not exactly the case, because we are not confronted with exactly the same situation that occurred on both of those prior occasions.

In this instance the gentleman would insert the amount $1,350,000, which is the same amount that the committee has inserted at the tables on page 41 of the committee report. By putting in a set amount such as he does, it could very well result in making the cost to the Government and the taxpayers more than otherwise it might be. The $1,350,000 carried in the committee tables to which I referred is the top figure, according to the witnesses before the subcommittee.

It could very well cost less. But by placing a figure in the bill, those who are empowered to sell these certificates claim that the very presence of a such a limitation will raise the interest rate that will have to be paid. So, in conclusion, it would appear that this may very well cost the taxpayer more money than if the language is left as suggested by the committee at page 48 of the bill.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why this amendment should not be adopted. I believe the language says, "not to exceed $1,350,000." I believe it clarifies the situation and lets the Department understand more clearly what we really had in mind. I understand that the Treasury Department has decided to put these participation sales under the debt limit. If that is the case, I would hope that this would have the effect of reducing the use of them, because I would certainly think they would not want to pay the higher interest rates which results from the selling of participation certificates.

I would believe it would be the better part of wisdom if we would accept the gentleman's amendment, because I believe it is much more clear than what we have in the language as we have presented it from the subcommittee report. We have it in the report, but I believe it is much better to have it in the method the gentleman from North Carolina has presented. I just cannot see any objection to this amedment at all. I urge its adoption.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us are much concerned about the Small Business Administration. The Small Business Administration has not been a success in every detail, but its objectives are very laudatory and its accomplishments are considerable. I would regret to see us take any action which would make it more difficult for the Small Business Administration to operate in any way but the most efficient way possible. For that reason, I feel that we should oppose the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina.

It could be said, "Well, why do we not appropriate every year, in an annual appropriation bill, the interest on the public debt?"

This has been advocated from time to time. But the Treasury experts through the years have said—that whenever we introduce any element of uncertainty, we make the purchaser a little more skittish, and we create a condition which might make the interest rate a little higher. So the fear here is that by fixing this particular figure, there might be some element introduced which would tend to make the cost to the taxpayer greater.

Of course, there is a loss, and the loss as estimated here is at $1.3 million. There is nothing being swept under the rug or hidden in any way. But in the interest of trying to encourage this agency to do the best possible job for the least possible dollars, I am going to vote against this amendment now and if the amendment is approved, I shall vote against it again when and if a rollcall vote is ordered. I do not see why we should take action which might to some degree be injurious to the Small Business Administration and create more expense to the taxpayer.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the Small Business Administration, generally speaking, has the confidence of the American public and that the small businessman is depending to a great degree upon it?

Chairman Boutin, in my opinion, is a very able and capable administrator.

They say that this could well result in an additional cost to the taxpayer, because it is going to make it more difficult to sell the certificates.

Mr. MAHON. If it is an additional cost to the taxpayer, then this will militate against a successful program.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I do not believe there is any question about the need of the Small Business Administration or any question about how it is being operated. I am sure that most of us, at least, on both sides of the aisle support the Small Business Administration.

There is nothing in this amendment which affects small business or the opportunity of the people in the districts to be able to get their loans.

Actually they will have a billion dollars in this fund—$850 million from existing law and $150 million from this bill. At the end of fiscal 1968, they will carry over $476 million into fiscal 1969. So, SBA has all the funds it needs.

It seems to me we are not talking about small business and whether they will get their loans. We are talking about how much of a subsidy is going to be allowed on participation certificates.

This is the question, whether we will issue them a blank check, an open end subsidy, or whether we will limit them as to the amount of subsidy they have testified they will need on the participation certificate sales.

This is not an attack on the Small Business Administration or on the good it does, nor is it a limitation upon the rights of small businessmen to be able to make their loans. It is simply writing into the law what the SBA says the subsidy will be.

Remember, in this fund there will be a billion dollars.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to make certain that the record is clear, because it has been injected in the debate that this amendment would curtail the functions or the administration of the SBA. It is my interpretation, as it is the interpretation, I believe, of the ranking minority Member, that this would in no way curtail the functions of the SBA, but would merely set down a line item on the amount of subsidy that can be paid for these participation certificates.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is quite correct.

I should like to yield to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from North Carolina, to let him further explain exactly what it will do.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is quite correct. Absolutely the only thing the amendment will do is change an indefinite permanent appropriation to the amount of money the committee put in its report would be required, $1,350,000. It would make it a line item.

This is just exactly what we did on the independent offices bill. It is exactly what was done in the bill providing appropriations for HEW. It has nothing to do with the operations of the Small Business Administration.

It merely puts down, as a line item, the amount of subsidy that can be paid, instead of leaving it wide open. It is the exact amount the committee put in the table at the end of the report. You will find it listed on page 40 of the committee report on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONAS) there were—ayes 60, noes 57.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JONAS and Mr. SIKES.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for arms control and disarmament activities authorized by the Act of September 26, 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2589 (a)), $9,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped the subcommittee would cut deeply into this appropriation for the Disarmament Agency, in view of the fact that this country is peddling $2 billion worth of arms around the world each year and that is exclusive of Vietnam.

There was a time, only a few years ago, when this Government spent less than $1 million a year on the subject of disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that there is another staff in any agency or department of the Government, on a per capita basis, more highly paid than the staff of this Disarmament Agency.

This business of spending $9 million a year on disarmament, when the U.S. Government is peddling arms through the Defense Department and around the world at the rate of $2 billion a year, is a contradiction beyond belief.

Mr. Chairman, it would be my hope that the subcommittee would give the most serious consideration hereafter to cutting this appropriation back to no more than a million dollars a year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 57, immediately following line 7, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 704. Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered five times last year, and has been offered twice in this year. It should not require any further explanation. I will explain it briefly, however, just so your recollection may be refreshed as to what it would accomplish.

Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it would limit the expenditure of funds appropriated in this bill so that expenditure thereof would not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all other agencies provided for in the bill beyond 95 percent of the amount which the President's January budget estimated would be spent by these agencies in fiscal 1968.

To the extent that there are 1-year appropriations in the bill, and a great body of appropriations are for 1 year, the effect of the amendment would be to reduce the funds in this bill, excluding the FBI, by 5 percent, and the President's proposed 1968 spending by about 5 percent.

To the extent that there are multiple year appropriations in the bill, the amounts of the reduction in the bill and in the President's planned spending would depend upon the availability of carryover funds which the President could use to finance activities of agencies provided for in the bill.

The amendment does not affect the spending of previously appropriated funds, and it does not cut any individual appropriation item in the bill. Simply put, it limits the President's total proposed spending in fiscal 1968 to 95 percent of the aggregate amount that would otherwise be spent by the agencies, excluding the FBI, provided for in the bill.

Since the amendment goes to the aggregate spending rather than for spending on individual programs, it would give the President substantial flexibility in determining where cuts could be made without any crippling effect upon the essential services of Government.

As a matter of fact, within the framework of the bill the President would have the same flexibility in determining where individual cuts should be made as he had last fall when he announced a budgetary cutback of $5.3 billion in Federal programs in an effort to save $3 billion from planned spending during the current fiscal year.

Of course, the expenditure limitation amendment would make the reductions mandatory, and the administration would not be in a position to rescind the cuts, as has been done recently with respect to the President's proposed $3 billion reduction in 1967 spending.

If Congress fails this year to curb Federal expenditures, then spending on nondefense programs, exclusive of interest, will have almost doubled, a 97 percent increase, in the 8 years since 1960, when the budget was last balanced.

We simply cannot escape the fact that necessary expenditures for the war in Vietnam are increasing, and they probably will continue to escalate for the foreseeable future. Never before in our Nation's history have we attempted to fight a war on the one hand and on the other continue business as usual with respect to nondefense spending. The continued pursuit of such a policy at this time can only result in further price inflation, either increased taxes or an unmanageable deficit, and the threat of debility in the economy's private sector should a recession develop from the present slowdown in economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I do not offer this amendment in criticism of the great committee which has taken commendable steps toward cutting the budgets of the agencies and departments herein covered, nor do I take this step to single out any particular one of these agencies or departments, although I personally could perhaps raise some questions about the functions of several of them, but rather this action is taken on behalf of the forgotten man in our country; the man without whom none of these agencies could operate, the man without whom not one brick of one building of these agencies could stand upon the other, the American taxpayer. He is due for some consideration from the Congress. In the 89th Congress and 90th Congress also we have shown a great deal of proper concern for the poor, the old, the sick, and the young, but this is one group for which we have not yet shown enough consideration, the forgotten people who pay the bill for our Government spending. And this spending has been so great as to force and impose upon the old and the infirm of our country a burden of tax through inflation that is heavy to bear, so that their meager incomes will purchase little. We have also transferred the debt for what we are doing, the burden of what we are doing here and now, to a great degree to the shoulders of our children and their children, as we have built a pyramiding debt.

So it seems the reasonable thing to do is to cut spending at every place we can, and the time to do so is now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has consulted with the minority members of this subcommittee who participated in the marking up of this bill. I wonder whether or not he knows it was marked up on the basis of there not being a 5-percent reduction at the conclusion of the bill.

This is not the kind of bill that this sort of thing should apply to. Do you realize there is only one Government agency exempted—the Federal Bureau of Investigation—which incidentally gets the largest number of additional employees under the terms of this bill.

I wonder if we realize some of the items that are in this bill such as the Department of Justice and all of its activities including the U.S. attorneys and the U.S. marshals; the courts all over the Nation; and the Small Business Administration, that everybody a while ago thought would not be hurt the least bit—the least bit—by the adoption of the last amendment.

What do you suppose this amendment—this 5-percent amendment would do?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We will probably need more FBI agents to watch the Russians who would be roaming around the country under the infamous consular treaty that the Great Society has put over.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thought the gentleman from Iowa was going to give me a better one than that.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate my distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York, yielding. I think perhaps we have a paradox here. Would the gentleman not agree with me that the reason we would be having to increase the number of FBI agents is because the judiciary is failing more and more to back up the constabulary?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, there is a bit of truth to that, but not too much. I think more so is the fact that we have too many social reformers around who would make some of the courts, and agencies that should not be social agencies, to make them social agencies.

To be perfectly frank with the gentleman——

Mr. HALL. I do appreciate the gentleman's frankness.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. To be perfectly frank with the gentleman, I ask—What sense is there, for any fairminded gentleman or lady on the other side, to go to a subcommittee on appropriations and to sit every day, 5 days a week from the end of the month of January until this time of the year, going over a budget such as this one which contains so many important items—and then along comes what I think is an outrageous attempt to cut 5 percent on expenditures.

Do you realize that this committee cut $148 million out of the funds requested in this bill? I think the gentleman from Alabama should more closely become allied with his fellow members on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not think I have ever been known as a big spender around here.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I want to explain exactly what we do. We are all gentlemen on this committee. We respect one another. We have great understanding in the subcommittee, and that is the reason we are able to save the taxpayers as much money as we do year after year for all the years we have been considering this legislation. When we approached markup of the bill, the question was asked, "Are we going to consider figures here with the view of a 5-percent amendment at the end of the consideration of the bill when we get to the floor of the House?" It was the consensus of opinion that such an amendment would not be offered.

We marked up the bill. I know the majority of the members of the subcommittee felt that way, and I am glad that my distinguished friend from Michigan, who in my estimation has increased 3 feet in stature today by making the statement he did, agrees with me.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me say to my distinguished chairman that we had this understanding in the subcommittee and I intend to honor my commitment.

I want to say one other thing. If I understand the amendment correctly, it could cost more because it says 95 percent of what the President said he would spend in the budget he submitted in January. Is that not correct?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me explain this, and then I shall be glad to yield. Ninety-five percent of what he was going to spend. In this budget over 90 percent of the money in here is in salaries. We have already cut it between 6 and 7 percent. I do not think the amendment would cut this bill 5 percent further. To do otherwise you will have to change the amendment. That is my opinion.

I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Michigan knows my great fondness, admiration, and respect for him.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I appreciate that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I respectfully say to him that if the 7-percent cut which this subcommittee says is in effect——

Mr. CEDERBERG. Almost.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If that obligational authority, and only that, goes through and carries, and you are able to convince our friends at the other end of the Capitol, the fact that you have a 5-percent limitation on spending probably will not have any impact. But in my judgment it is healthy and salutary to have the 5-percent limitation on expenditures regardless of what you do in the way of an obligation recommendation.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader, is it not a fact that this subcommittee has a pretty fair record of conferences with the other body? I think the distinguished gentleman from Iowa would agree to that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I would say respectably well, although on some occasions the gentleman has capitulated.

I think it is the better part of wisdom to improve the bill with a 5-percent cut in spending, excluding, of course, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I can only say, as one member of the subcommittee, that we labored long and hard to come up with this bill, which I think is a very good bill. It contains a substantial amount in salaries, about which you can do nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN) there were—ayes 66, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and on the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 48, lines 17 and 18, strike out "such sums as may be necessary, to be available without fiscal year limitation" and insert in lieu thereof "not to exceed $1,350,000".

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 144, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—185

Adair	Biester	Burke, Fla.
Anderson, Ill.	Blackburn	Burleson
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bolton	Bush
Arends	Bow	Button
Ashbrook	Bray	Byrnes, Wis.
Ayres	Brinkley	Cahill
Baring	Brock	Carter
Bates	Broomfield	Cederberg
Belcher	Brotzman	Clancy
Bell	Brown, Mich.	Clausen, Don H.
Bennett	Brown, Ohio	Cleveland
Berry	Broyhill, N.C.	Collier
Betts	Broyhill, Va.	Colmer
Conable	Johnson, Pa.	Roberts
Conte	Jonas	Robison
Corbett	Keith	Rogers, Fla.
Cowger	King, N.Y.	Roth
Cramer	Kleppe	Rumsfeld
Cunningham	Kupferman	Sandman
Curtis	Laird	Satterfield
Davis, Wis.	Langen	Saylor
Dellenback	Latta	Schadeberg
Denney	Lennon	Scherle
Derwinski	Lipscomb	Schneebeli
Devine	Long, La.	Schweiker
Dickinson	McClure	Schwengel
Dole	McCulloch	Scott
Dorn	McDade	Selden
Dowdy	McDonald, Mich.	Shriver
Duncan	McEwen	Skubitz
Esch	McMillan	Smith, Calif.
Eshleman	MacGregor	Smith, N.Y.
Findley	Marsh	Smith, Okla.
Fino	Martin	Snyder
Fisher	Mathias, Calif.	Springer
Flynt	Mathias, Md.	Stafford
Ford, Gerald R.	Mayne	Stanton
Fountain	Meskill	Steiger, Ariz.
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Steiger, Wis.
Fulton, Pa.	Miller, Ohio	Stuckey
Fuqua	Minshall	Taft
Gettys	Mize	Talcott
Goodling	Moore	Teague, Calif.
Gross	Morse, Mass.	Thompson, Ga.
Grover	Morton	Thomson, Wis.
Gubser	Nelsen	Utt
Gude	O'Neal, Ga.	Vander Jagt
Hagan	Ottinger	Wampler
Haley	Passman	Watson
Hall	Pelly	Whitener
Halpern	Pettis	Whitten
Hammer-schmidt	Pirnie	Widnall
Hansen, Idaho	Poage	Wiggins
Harrison	Poff	Williams, Pa.
Harsha	Pool	Wilson, Bob
Harvey	Price, Tex.	Wyatt
Hébert	Quillen	Wydler
Henderson	Railsback	Wylie
Herlong	Rarick	Wyman
Horton	Reid, Ill.	Yates
Hunt	Reid, N.Y.	Zion
Jarman	Reifel	

NAYS—144

Addabbo	Gonzalez	Nichols
Albert	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Griffiths	O'Hara, Mich.
Annunzio	Hamilton	Olsen
Ashley	Hanley	O'Neill, Mass.
Barrett	Hathaway	Patten
Bevill	Hawkins	Pepper
Bingham	Hays	Perkins
Blanton	Hechler, W. Va.	Pike
Blatnik	Helstoski	Price, Ill.
Boggs	Holland	Pryor
Bolling	Howard	Pucinski
Brademas	Hull	Randall
Brasco	Hungate	Rees
Brooks	Ichord	Rivers
Burke, Mass.	Irwin	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Joelson	Rogers, Colo.
Carey	Johnson, Calif.	Ronan
Casey	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, N.Y.
Celler	Karsten	Rooney, Pa.
Corman	Karth	Rostenkowski
Culver	Kastenmeier	Roush
Daddario	Kazen	Roybal
Daniels	Kee	Ryan
Davis, Ga.	Kelly	St Germain
Dawson	Kirwan	Scheuer
de la Garza	Kluczynski	Shipley
Delaney	Kyros	Sikes
Dingell	Long, Md.	Slack
Donohue	McCarthy	Staggers
Downing	McFall	Steed
Dulski	Macdonald, Mass.	Stephens
Edmondson	Machen	Stratton
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Tenzer
Eilberg	Mahon	Thompson, N.J.
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Tunney
Everett	Meeds	Udall
Evins, Tenn.	Mills	Ullman
Fallon	Minish	Van Deerlin
Farbstein	Montgomery	Vanik
Feighan	Moorhead	Vigorito
Ford, William D.	Morgan	Waldie
Fraser	Morris, N. Mex.	Walker
Galifianakis	Moss	Watts
Garmatz	Multer	White
Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.	Wright
Gibbons	Natcher	Young
Gilbert	Nedzi	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—103

Abbitt	Anderson, Tenn.	Aspinall
Abernethy	Ashmore	Battin
Adams	Brown, Calif.	Boland
	Burton, Calif.	Hardy
	Burton, Utah	Heckler, Mass.
	Cabell	Hicks
	Chamberlain	Holifield
	Clark	Hosmer
	Clawson, Del	Hutchinson
	Cohelan	Jacobs
	Conyers	Jones, Mo.
	Dent	Jones, N.C.
	Diggs	King, Calif.
	Dow	Kornegay
	Dwyer	Kuykendall
	Eckhardt	Kyl
	Edwards, Ala.	Landrum
	Edwards, La.	Leggett
	Erlenborn	Lloyd
	Fascell	Lukens
	Flood	McClory
	Foley	Mailliard
	Friedel	May
	Fulton, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.
	Gallagher	Mink
	Gardner	Monagan
	Gathings	Mosher
	Goodell	Murphy, N.Y.
	Gray	Myers
	Green, Oreg.	Nix
	Gurney	O'Konski
	Halleck	Patman
	Hanna	Philbin
	Hansen, Wash.	Pickle
		Pollock
		Purcell
		Quie
		Reinecke
		Resnick
		Reuss
		Rhodes, Ariz.
		Rhodes, Pa.
		Riegle
		Rosenthal
		Roudebush
		Ruppe
		St. Onge
		Sisk
		Smith, Iowa
		Stubblefield
		Sullivan
		Taylor
		Teague, Tex.
		Tiernan
		Tuck
		Waggonner
		Watkins
		Whalen
		Whalley
		Williams, Miss.
		Willis
		Wilson, Charles H.
		Winn
		Wolff
		Younger
		Zwach

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs on this vote:

Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Zwach for, with Mr. Pickle against.

Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Stubblefield against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Wolff against.

Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. Foley against.

Mr. Erlenborn for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee against.

Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Boland against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Leggett against.

Mr. Whalley for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Pollock for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mrs. May for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. McClory for, with Mrs. Mink against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Nix against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Winn for, with Mr. Tiernan against

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Burton of California against.

Mr. Quie for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. Reinecke for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Gardner for, with Mr. Fascell against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Friedel against.

Mr. Mailliard for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Lukens for, with Mr. Gray against.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Myers for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Lloyd for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Ruppe for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Adams with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Cabell.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Hardy with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Gathings.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. WRIGHT changed his vote from "yea to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrosment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARRISON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 57, immediately following line 7, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 704. Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 156, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—171

Adair	Bush	Findley
Anderson, Ill.	Button	Fino
Andrews, Ala.	Byrnes, Wis.	Fisher
Arends	Carter	Ford, Gerald R.
Ashbrook	Clancy	Fountain
Ayres	Cleveland	Fulton, Pa.
Baring	Collier	Fuqua
Bates	Colmer	Galifianakis
Belcher	Conable	Goodling
Bennett	Corbett	Gross
Berry	Cowger	Grover
Betts	Cramer	Gude
Bevill	Cunningham	Hagan
Biester	Curtis	Haley
Blackburn	Davis, Wis.	Hall
Bolton	Dellenback	Halpern
Bow	Denney	Hammer-schmidt
Brinkley	Derwinski	Hansen, Idaho
Brock	Devine	Harrison
Broomfield	Dickinson	Harsha
Brown, Mich.	Dole	Harvey
Brown, Ohio	Dorn	Henderson
Broyhill, N.C.	Dowdy	Herlong
Broyhill, Va.	Duncan	Hunt
Buchanan	Esch	Ichord
Burke, Fla.	Eshleman	Jarman
Johnson, Pa.	Nelsen	Smith, Calif.
Jonas	Nichols	Smith, N.Y.
Keith	O'Neal, Ga.	Smith, Okla.
King, N.Y.	Ottinger	Snyder
Kleppe	Pelly	Springer
Laird	Pettis	Stafford
Langen	Poff	Stanton
Latta	Pool	Steiger, Ariz.
Lennon	Price, Tex.	Steiger, Wis.
Long, La.	Quillen	Stratton
McClure	Railsback	Stuckey
McCulloch	Randall	Taft
McDade	Rarick	Talcott
McDonald, Mich.	Reid, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
McEwen	Reid, N.Y.	Thompson, Ga.
McMillan	Rivers	Thomson, Wis.
MacGregor	Robison	Utt
Martin	Rogers, Fla.	Vander Jagt
Mathias, Calif.	Roth	Wampler
Mathias, Md.	Rumsfeld	Watson
Mayne	Sandman	Whitener
Meskill	Satterfield	Whitten
Michel	Saylor	Widnall
Miller, Ohio	Schadeberg	Wiggins
Minshall	Scherle	Williams, Pa.
Mize	Schneebeli	Wilson, Bob
Montgomery	Schweiker	Wyatt
Moore	Schwengel	Wydler
Morse, Mass.	Scott	Wylie
Morton	Selden	Wyman
	Shriver	Zion
	Skubitz	

NAYS—156

Addabbo	Gettys	Murphy, Ill.
Albert	Giaimo	Natcher
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gibbons	Nedzi
	Gilbert	O'Hara, Ill.
Annunzio	Gonzalez	O'Hara, Mich.
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Olsen
Barrett	Griffiths	O'Neill, Mass.
Bingham	Gubser	Passman
Blanton	Hamilton	Patten
Blatnik	Hanley	Pepper
Boggs	Hathaway	Perkins
Boland	Hawkins	Pike
Bolling	Hays	Pirnie
Brademas	Hébert	Poage
Brasco	Hechler, W. Va.	Price, Ill.
Brooks	Helstoski	Pryor
Burke, Mass.	Holland	Pucinski
Burleson	Horton	Rees
Byrne, Pa.	Howard	Reifel
Cahill	Hull	Roberts
Carey	Hungate	Rodino
Casey	Irwin	Rogers, Colo.
Cederberg	Joelson	Ronan
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney, N.Y.
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.
	Karsten	Rostenkowski
Conte	Karth	Roush
Corman	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Culver	Kazen	Ryan
Daddario	Kee	St Germain
Daniels	Kelly	Scheuer
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Shipley
Dawson	Kluczynski	Sikes
de la Garza	Kupferman	Slack
Delaney	Kyros	Steed
Dingell	Lipscomb	Stephens
Donohue	Long, Md.	Tenzer
Downing	McCarthy	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	McFall	Tunney
Edmondson	Macdonald, Mass.	Udall
Edwards, Calif.		Ullman
Eilberg	Machen	Van Deerlin
Evans, Colo.	Madden	Vanik
Everett	Mahon	Vigorito
Evins, Tenn.	Marsh	Waldie
Fallon	Matsunaga	Walker
Farbstein	Meeds	Watts
Feighan	Mills	White
Flynt	Minish	Wright
Ford, William D.	Moorhead	Yates
	Morgan	Young
Fraser	Morris, N. Mex.	Zablocki
Frelinghuysen	Moss	
Garmatz	Multer	

NOT VOTING—107

Abbitt	Clark	Fulton, Tenn.
Abernethy	Clawson, Del	Gallagher
Adams	Cohelan	Gardner
Anderson, Tenn.	Conyers	Gathings
	Dent	Goodell
Ashmore	Diggs	Gray
Aspinall	Dow	Green, Oreg.
Battin	Dwyer	Gurney
Bell	Eckhardt	Halleck
Bray	Edwards, Ala.	Hanna
Brotzman	Edwards, La.	Hansen, Wash.
Brown, Calif.	Erlenborn	Hardy
Burton, Calif.	Fascell	Heckler, Mass.
Burton, Utah	Flood	Hicks
Cabell	Foley	Holifield
Chamberlain	Friedel	Hosmer
Hutchinson	Myers	Smith, Iowa
Jacobs	Nix	Staggers
Jones, Mo.	O'Konski	Stubblefield
Jones, N.C.	Patman	Sullivan
King, Calif.	Philbin	Taylor
Kornegay	Pickle	Teague, Tex.
Kuykendall	Pollock	Tiernan
Kyl	Purcell	Tuck
Landrum	Quie	Waggonner
Leggett	Reinecke	Watkins
Lloyd	Resnick	Whalen
Lukens	Reuss	Whalley
McClory	Rhodes, Ariz.	Williams, Miss.
Mailliard	Rhodes, Pa.	Willis
May	Riegle	Wilson, Charles H.
Miller, Calif.	Rosenthal	
Mink	Roudebush	Winn
Monagan	Ruppe	Wolff
Mosher	St. Onge	Younger
Murphy, N.Y.	Sisk	Zwach

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. St. Onge against.
Mr. Zwach for, with Mr. Pickle against.
Mr. McClory for, with Mr. King of California against.
Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. Dent against.
Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Monagan against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Philbin against.
Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Holifield against.
Mr. Wynn for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.
Mr. Gardner for, with Mr. Aspinall against.
Mr. Myers for, with Mr. Flood against.
Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Foley against.
Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mr. Stubblefield against.
Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. Staggers against.
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Wolff against.
Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.
Mr. Lloyd for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.
Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Jacobs against.
Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee against.
Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Burton of California against.
Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Fascell against.
Mr. Goodell for, with Mr. Friedel against.
Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.
Mr. Lukens for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.
Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Leggett against.
Mr. Quie for, with Mr. Clark against.
Mrs. May for, with Mr. Rosenthal against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Gathings with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Hardy with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Messrs. KAZEN and TENZER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. TEAGUE of California and HALPERN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill H.R. 10345 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 57, immediately following line 7, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 704. Excluding the Federal Bureau of Investigation money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond 95 per centum of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1968 (H. Doc. 15)."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) entitled "An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

MIDDLE EAST AND/OR VIETNAM

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there appeared an article by the distinguished columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott entitled "Inside Washington" in the May 29 edition of the Long Island Star Journal. They reported that—

Congressman Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D.-N.Y.), an outspoken Hawk on the Middle East crisis, got a blunt reminder of his dovish position on Vietnam.

They went on further with a rather gleeful commentary about what they indicated was a strange inconsistency.

I would like to suggest that Messrs. Allen and Scott, together with some of my colleagues who may have similar feeling, read an editorial that appears in today's New York Times. The editorial is as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]

MIDDLE EAST AND/OR VIETNAM

The issues in the Middle Eastern conflict are being confused by some commentators and critics with the very different issues involved in Vietnam. Just as spokesmen for the Johnson Administration have drawn false parallels between appeasement of Hitler and what was described as appeasement of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung, so now the terms "hawk" and "dove" are being loosely applied to the Middle East as if they had the same connotation as in Vietnam.

It is neither accidental nor illogical that many of the same Americans who are calling for deescalation and unconditional negotiations in Southeast Asia also call for firmness on the part of the United States in insisting on freedom of passage to the Gulf of Aqaba and on honoring American commitments to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel.

The United States had no such commitments with regard to South Vietnam, least of all to fight a virtually unilateral and major war on behalf of Saigon. In 1954, when the SEATO treaty was signed, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles specifically ruled out "unilateral armed intervention." While SEATO's economic and defensive commitments were indeed extended in a protocol to South Vietnam, along with Cambodia and Laos, Saigon was not even a party to the SEATO treaty.

The other major document sometimes cited by the Johnson Administration as a commitment to Saigon was a letter from President Eisenhower to President Diem of South Vietnam on Oct. 23, 1954. In it General Eisenhower wrote of aid to Saigon, the purpose of which would be "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." However, this aid was made dependent of President Diem creating a Government "enlightened in purpose and effective in performance." Diem failed signally to do this, as virtually every Vietnamese from Premier Ky down now recognizes.

President Kennedy just before his death and President Johnson as late as 1964 both insisted—in Mr. Johnson's words—that the war in Vietnam "ought to be fought by the boys of Asia," not by Americans. Israel is not asking the United States to fight for her. There is no commitment to do so, and in present circumstances no need to do so.

But there are commitments, which can be documented precisely, by every American President since Truman to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel, and there are also commitments by Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson in favor of upholding the right of free passage through the Strait of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba.

In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.

In its great-power aspect the Middle Eastern crisis shapes up as a confrontation of the Soviet Union versus the United States. As the British and French were gradually forced out of the area following World War II, the United States took their place. The region is now of paramount strategic importance to this country, whereas until escalation of the Vietnam war, Southeast Asia was only a marginal power factor for the United States.

The Persian Gulf area produces 27 per cent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 per cent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than $2,500,000,000. There is nothing comparable in American interests that can be said of the Southeast Asian peninsula.

The American position has now reached the ironical stage where virtually every argument advanced for the Vietnam war—commitments, honor, security, interests, consistency, the self-determination of small nations—could be used in favor of helping Israel. However, it is not necessary nor is it valid to make such comparisons. These are two separate problems calling for different solutions, but they are alike in that they both require major policy decisions in 1967.

If Washington now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, this would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam.

I would also like to read one paragraph of that editorial, as follows:

It is neither accidental nor illogical that many of the same Americans who are calling for deescalation and unconditional negotiations in Southeast Asia also call for firmness on the part of the United States in insisting on freedom of passage to the Gulf of Aqaba and on honoring American commitments to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel.

A LONG, HOT SUMMER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there have been repeated warnings that our Nation is in for "a long, hot summer." There is growing apprehension about demonstrations which will lead to violence in the streets. Time is running out, and action is necessary. Yet it appears that efforts to be ready to cope with the problem when it arises have stalled on dead center. Strong leadership and positive action are needed.

I cannot believe that there is disinterest in curbing crime or preventing violence in the streets on the part of the Nation's leaders. I am seriously disturbed, however, by lack of forthright action, which is reflected by taking positive steps, in dealing with either. The Depart-

ment of Justice has been extremely slow to take steps to cope with treasonable actions or to encourage steps against flag desecrators and the like. If State and municipal law enforcement agencies are left with the impression that Washington is looking the other way when crimes are committed, there is less incentive for them to take action.

Crime and violence in the streets go hand in hand. Usually one leads to the other, and indifference to either can be fatal to the future of this Nation. America cannot stand many more summers of violence and winters of discontent. Unfortunately, the press media, and particularly the television channels, are open to every troublemaker who preaches violence, race hatred, or even treason and this aggravates the problem. The spectacle of a sit-in by beatniks and antiwar demonstrators at the Pentagon is revolting, but the fact that it took 2 days for the authorities to muster sufficient courage to throw them out is equally disturbing. During the time they were in the Pentagon, they claim they had access to top secret areas. These are not harmless manifestations of excess spirit. There is a sinister thread of Communist influence which extends throughout the pattern of resentment of authority and indifference to citizenship responsibility which is being exhibited in the United States.

The problem is here, and it is serious. Two editorials of recent date in local publications spelled out the story very well indeed. One of them appeared in the Evening Star of Monday, May 22, and was entitled "Crime—What's That?" The situation was again pointed up with clarity in an editorial which appeared in Roll Call on May 25.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 22, 1967]

CRIME—WHAT'S THAT?

There is one thing to be said for our new Attorney General, Ramsey Clark. You never know what to expect when he takes off on the subject of crime.

In an interview the other day, the attorney general was reported as saying in effect that all the talk about a national crime wave is much ado about nothing. "The level of crime has risen a little bit," Clark said, "but there is no wave of crime in the country."

As an item in support of this thesis, the attorney general told of one city (unidentified) in which crime was up 1 percent from last year. But last year, he added cheerfully, crime in that city was down 1 percent from the year before. As for official statistics which indicate substantial yearly increases in crime throughout the country, Clark said: "We do ourselves a great disservice with statistics."

For our part, we do not quite know how to interpret this comment. It is true that crime statistics do a great disservice to the Clark suggestion that the crime wave talk is a case of making mountains out of molehills. But our attorney general, in all deference, is talking through his hat—at least as far as the crime statistics for Washington are concerned. Whatever the fact as to the statistics for his unidentified city—statistics, incidentally, which he seemed to think were quite useful—the figures for the Nation's Captial add up to a devastating rebuttal of the Clark crime thesis.

The most recent statistics for Washington show a dismaying crime rise here of 59.7 percent last month over the previous April. This included a 103.8 percent jump in robberies. The rise in serious crimes in March was 51 percent over March of 1966. The President's message on crime in Washington, promising safe streets and so on, went to Congress in January. The local crime statistics for that month revealed a jump of 42 percent over the same month a year ago. And to take a longer statistical journey into the past, the crime index in Washington 10 years ago was about one-fourth of its current level.

Yet our attorney general tells us that "we do ourselves a great disservice with statistics." It would be nice, we suppose, if the nasty figures could be thrown down the sewer. Then it might be possible for some people to believe that there really isn't any such thing as a crime wave. Possible for some people that is, but not for those who are the victims day in and day out of robberies, rapes, burglaries, assaults, and you name it.

[From Roll Call, May 25, 1967]

EDITORIAL

If the war in Vietnam is being conducted as badly and irresponsibly as the President's war on crime, then this nation is in bad shape. If the President's advisers on the Vietnam war are as unrealistic and as stubborn as his advisers on the war on crime, then the bloom of American youth is being sacrificed recklessly.

Since the average citizen is not privy to the myriad decisions and strategies of the military planners, we can only hope and pray that the professionals are providing sound advice, intelligent planning, and tough execution of plans to repel the enemy at every turn and to offer the utmost protection to our boys.

On the other hand, we know that the war on crime is a flop. Nowhere is that more apparent than in the District of Columbia—the Nation's Capital where crime figures have been rising fantastically despite the ostriches, who attempt to lull us into complacency by pointing out that we're not (yet) first in the nation, that crime is increasing because the population is increasing (that's a nice way to look at it) and that criminals are entitled to their uncivil rights (something new has been added to the Bill of Rights—the right to commit crime).

The President answers the growing wave of citizen protest against crime by vowing he is doing all he knows how and asking for suggestions. The Congress presented him with a bill, which, despite the compromises made to the ostriches, contained enough provisions with enough meat in them to make a start towards coping with the problem. On the advice of his District of Columbia advisor, he turned it down. His highly-touted Crime Commission spent months of study and came up with a load of the old fuzzy answers which only postpone needed action.

Readers may think it incongruous that this newspaper devote editorial space to a subject not ordinarily tackled by a Congressional-political newspaper. We admit that in this instance we have negated our long-standing policy. But when we decided to bring the crime problem to the attention of the Congress, no major newspaper in Washington recognized it. We predicted the rise in crime four years ago, while other newspapers were minimizing it. Week after week we editorialized forcefully, and other newspapers (the Knight chain, for instance) followed our lead. Our editorial drive succeeded in improving conditions in the Capitol area which was becoming a hotbed of muggings, stabbings, robberies and other crimes. With proper leadership, this could be accomplished throughout the District and eventually throughout the nation.

Parks, playgrounds and schools can help in the future. But right now there is an air of permissiveness in the District and in the nation which encourages crime. We predicted four years ago that following the prevailing drift, law and order would change into anarchy. With the unruly sit-ins (at the Pentagon, no less), marches, riots, demonstrations and crimes against citizens, our prediction, unfortunately could well materialize.

The apologists can minimize the problem all they want to. Which of them would attempt to explain their high-sounding theories to Mr. and Mrs. Mark Robeson, grieving in Kansas over the brutal slaying of their 25-year-old daughter?

We predict that the drift away from law enforcement and crime prevention will be a major issue in the coming campaigns for Congress.

Perhaps the voters, living in fear from day to day and disgusted with the permissiveness of their elected officials, will demand that this nation be returned to a land of laws—laws that are respected, obeyed and enforced; where civil rights again means not only the guarantee of rights for minorities, but also the right to the protection of the law, and the guarantee of security to the individual on the streets of his community or in what used to be referred to as the safety of his home.

We call upon the Congress to lead the way.

MIDDLE EASTERN CRISIS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Middle Eastern crisis presents a severe test of our national will, our statesmanship, and the skill of our diplomacy. It also tests Israel's patience, Russia's sincerity, and the very workability of the United Nations.

The position in which it has placed us calls for our very best efforts and the total commitment and undivided attention of our national spokesmen. If indeed it is possible under the circumstances to follow the ancient Biblical injunction to be "as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves," this should be our aim.

There is no easy way out for anyone concerned. The precipitate withdrawal of United Nations forces and the overt provocation by President Nasser seem to have painted the world into a corner. But a solution must be found, if possible short of armed conflict. And whatever solution obtains must be one based upon principle rather than upon mere expediency. As we search for the elusive fragments of a solution, the following broad principles should guide our deliberations. Whatever we do must take into account these overriding facts.

First, we simply cannot and must not acquiesce to the bold and brazen closing of an international waterway. The Gulf of Aqaba has long been so recognized by solemn treaties to which this Nation is a signatory. Even apart from those treaties, this waterway would have to be so recognized in the basic concepts of international law. To permit the closing of this international artery of peaceful commerce would be to engage in a craven surrender of basic and fundamental

principles to which this Nation has been irrevocably committed for generations.

Second, we cannot under any circumstances accept the premise on which President Nasser predicates his present posture, that he regards "the very existence of the State of Israel as an act of aggression" against him. There is absolutely no credible evidence whatever that the Government of Israel was contemplating any unprovoked attack upon Egypt. Whether or not any individual may have considered wise or unwise the creation of the Isael Republic, it is in fact a sovereign nation of the world. Its equal and unrestricted right to exist free from depredations has been fully and solemnly recognized by the world community and ratified by almost a generation of sacrifice on the part of its people. To abandon it to destruction by external forces would be unthinkable.

Third, the preservation of the Israel Republic and its full rights in the community of nations is not in any sense an act of favoritism. It proceeds from the same identical principle which motivated this Nation in asserting its influence more than a decade ago to prevent the destruction of the United Arab Republic of Egypt by external force. Surely none at that time could have interpreted our position in behalf of the rights of Egypt as favoritism. Certainly the world community, and indeed Egypt itself, must recognize that the scales of international justice cannot be tilted at Egypt's whim nor the rules of international behavior changed to permit that nation's doing to another what was expressly forbidden to be done to Egypt.

Fourth, this is rightly a problem for the United Nations. It is to be hoped that the Security Council will be able to act firmly to arrest this provocation, assert the clear rights of international shipping in international waters, and make clear to all that the territorial integrity of each nation in the area will be respected by all and no infringement tolerated on the part of any.

Fifth, if the Security Council should find itself paralyzed by the exercise of a veto on the part of any of its members, the problem should be brought speedily and forthwith to the General Assembly. The United Nations has in this matter a clear responsibility which cannot be evaded if the fabric of the world community is to remain intact. It is the United Nations whose presence has preserved the peace in that trouble-prone and volatile area. And it was the sudden and undeliberated withdrawal of United Nations forces upon the demand of Nasser which upset the delicate balance that has obtained for more than a decade and precipitated the present crisis. If the United Nations is to maintain its integrity, it cannot merely wash its hands of the problem.

Sixth, it seems apparent that a continued United Nations presence in the area may be indispensable to the preservation of order. Mr. U Thant's sudden unilateral decision to remove UNEF personnel at President Nasser's demand is, under the circumstances, analogous to the immediate withdrawal of police from a neighborhood upon notification that a bank is about to be robbed. The unpremeditated removal of peacekeeping forces was undoubtedly an error. It permitted and abetted the development of the present crisis. This fact in and of itself, therefore, commands the responsibility of the United Nations in bringing about an early and decisive solution based upon international law in order that the delicate fabric of peace shall not, through its overt action and subsequent delay, be irreparably torn asunder.

Seventh, in the tragic event that the United Nations should find itself incapable of acting, then the responsible nations of the world must form some concerted plan to assert and firmly establish the rights of all nations to the unrestrained and unrestricted use of the Gulf of Aqaba. It is important that this be done in concert rather than unilaterally. All nations have a stake in the preservation of the principles of peaceful international shipping. Obviously, the principle must apply to all. A law which applies only to some is no law. An international right which exists for all but one would be no legal right at all. Clearly, no single nation may capriciously and cavalierly deny to any other so profound a right. The right of peaceful international shipping must apply to Israel and to its port of Eilat, or it cannot be said securely to apply to any nation anywhere.

Eighth, the Soviet Union must collaborate in the recognition of this right or surrender its recently asserted claim to being a builder of bridges to peace. The single most important imponderable element in the present situation is that of Russian intent. The Soviet Union indeed has a greater stake than most in this basic right of international passage. Russia's commerce depends profoundly upon free and unfettered travel through the Bosporus and the Skagerrak. The creditability of recent Soviet overtures could be destroyed by Russia's failure or refusal to cooperate in preserving the lines of territorial demarkation secure from external expansionism and protecting untrammeled the right of peaceful passage through the international waters of the Gulf of Aqaba.

Ninth, the time for a solution is relatively short. The Israel Republic's great economic dependence upon the Port of Eilat renders its entire economy and national viability peculiarly sensitive to prolonged closure. We must not permit, through deliberate dilatory tactics or indecisive delay in face of an unlawful international act, the destruction of a nation by economic strangulation any more than we should permit the destruction of a nation by armed marauding aggression. Prudence, therefore, is not to be confused with procrastination. A clear policy must be enunciated and implemented soon.

Tenth, and finally, Israel—which in this instance is the offended party—must forbear with patience. It must have faith that the United States and the peaceful nations which respect international law will indeed act before it is too late. Israel must meanwhile preserve the innocence of its position by refraining assiduously from yielding to frustration and attacking its neighbors. It must have faith in the world community and preeminently in the United States to create a peaceful solution enforced by international sanction. In this, the injunction to be as "wise as serpents and as harmless as doves" falls with special force upon Israel. Its patience must be beyond provocation while the world community works speedily toward a settlement.

If this action comes soon and in concert, and as an expression of clear international intent, there can be little question that Nasser will pacifically if begrudgingly accommodate himself to it. Surely he does not wish to provoke a bloody conflict from which he will emerge again defeated and discredited. The way to avoid this is to leave no possibility of doubt in his mind that the world cannot and will not tolerate the brazen closing of this international waterway or other overt acts of hostility against his neighbors. While peace is served by the present detente, it will not be served by a prolonged sufferance of an illegal act.

INADEQUATE FUNDING OF TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of our major problems before the Committee on Education and Labor has been brought about by the inadequate funding of title I of ESEA. The formula for distribution of funds in the present law permits the poorer States to receive one-half the national average per pupil expenditure. The Bureau of the Budget recommended only $1.2 billion for fiscal year 1968. This brought about a situation where several of the major States in the country would receive less funds than they received in fiscal 1967. For this reason a provision was written into the 1967 amendments and later deleted by the House of Representatives that deferred the operation of the national average factor until title I was funded to the full extent of authorization. On the House floor I voted against permitting the formula to go into effect this year.

I am most hopeful that the Bureau of the Budget will recommend a supplemental appropriation in order that the formula, as written into the bill last year, may go into effect without interfering with any other section of the country.

It was the intent of the Congress last year that we provide a floor under the poorer States by guaranteeing that they would be permitted to go to the national average. It was never intended that the Congress take money away from any State. We well recognize that it will cost an additional $350 million when we permit the poorer States to come to one-half the national average per pupil expenditure.

If title I had been fully funded, this question would not have arisen. In other

words, we gave all the States the option of either going to one-half the national average or one-half the State average per pupil expenditure, whichever is higher.

As chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, I wish to express my deep concern over the failure of the Appropriations Committee to approve increased funds for educational programs in fiscal year 1968. The number of children in our schools is increasing sharply, and yet we continue to cut and trim money from vitally needed programs. The effect is that each year we are spending less per pupil, at a time when improved instruction is essential for our continued growth as a nation.

I am particularly concerned about title III of NDEA, which suffered the most severe cut of all. During the current year appropriations for this title totaled $79.2 million. The amount recommended for 1968 is only $47 million, a reduction of 41 percent.

This, in spite of the fact that title III of NDEA has proved itself over the years. It originated as a bipartisan program in 1958, and over the intervening years it has had a tremendous effect on improving the quality of instruction in our schools. This has been amply demonstrated by testimony from educators in all parts of the country.

Title III is a going program, and its personnel and administration at local and State levels are efficient and well organized. Incidentally, many school districts have already completed plans and made financial commitments for next year's programs under this title, and if funds are not made available, serious damage will result.

It is often argued that title III of NDEA has been replaced by other newer programs. Actually, there is very little overlapping with any other program. Schools applying for title III funds are generally not eligible to receive money elsewhere. Funds under this program are aimed at strengthening the curriculum without regard to economic criteria.

Furthermore, it is significant that title III is a matching program, and that States are required to put up amounts equal to those obtained from the Federal Government. Nevertheless, moneys allocated have been fully utilized each year. This alone would seem to indicate that this is a program that is doing a good job, and that it is popular at local levels.

I should like to emphasize once again that title III of NDEA is a program that has proved itself; that it has had a great impact on raising the quality of instruction in our schools; and that it is strongly supported by schools everywhere.

I do not believe that a program such as this should be downgraded at the expense of newer programs, however promising they may be.

MEMORIAL DAY TALK AT NEBRASKA CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION BY GEN. BRUCE C. CLARKE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include pertinent material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, USA, retired, is well known to all and needs little introduction from this Missourian. He has journeyed to North Platte, Nebr., for the centennial celebration and Memorial Day talk, and uniquely tied commemoration in with history, challenge, heritage, and inspiration. One of the leading exponents of the volunteer program of the Boy Scouts of America, and a servant of that organization's national council, this retired general, who commanded all Army Forces in Europe in a most trying time, with headquarters in Heidelberg, is well worth reading for the sheer value of his thought, to say nothing of the timeliness of his challenge. His reverence in commemoration of those who have gone in defense of liberty and paid the supreme price with a role "infinitely more significant than speech" is stimulating and worth reflection and pondering by us all. The emphasis of responsibility, as well as knowledge of rights, is stimulating and should be made real in today's world. The concept that freedom is not free and must be rewon by each generation is beautifully reemphasized. The faith in youth of the United States of America, and demand for citizenship participation, is erstwhile. The simplicity of the message is elemental, and the timing is perfect. I commend it to all readers:

MEMORIAL DAY TALK GIVEN AT NEBRASKA CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION, NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.

(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, USA, retired, May 30, 1967)

Governor Tiemann, Comdr. Golbraith, Comdr. Smith, veterans, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, young men and young ladies, friends—

I am deeply conscious of the high honor that is mine in being here today. But I am, quite frankly, overwhelmed at the thought of finding words to fill this occasion, for it is always difficult to speak of those whose role was infinitely more significant than speech. It seems inappropriate to commemorate with lengthy tribute those whom the nation's love has long since made immortal. Yet, we can never fail to find renewed inspiration and dedication in their example. And it is important that we do so today, for never in our history has there been a greater need for inspired, dedicated Americans.

But today, Memorial Day, means much more to this great state of Nebraska. Many of you in this audience, many of your sons and daughters and your loved ones have served with distinction in the armed services of this great country. Your forefathers, beginning in the days when Nebraska was known as the Tree Planter's State and in the days of J. Sterling Morton, the originator of Arbor Day, contributed much to making Nebraska a great state.

Later, and today, known as the Cornhusker State, Nebraska is replete with historic achievements. Rather than discuss your state history, which is all too familiar with you, I think it is significant to mention that during President Johnson's term, President Andrew Johnson, Nebraska was admitted to the Union as the 37th state on March 1, 1867. So today, one hundred years later, during the term of another President by the name of Johnson, you are celebrating the centennial of the Cornhusker State. So I feel especially proud to be here today and to join with you in your celebration.

Memorial Day 1967 finds our young men answering a new call for courage and steadfastness in the age-old struggle against the forces that would suppress freedom or erect barriers against equality and justice for all men. Now we are confronted with dangers vastly greater than we or any other nation have before known, and we see no end or easy solutions to them. But you and I know that the great blessing of liberty is never secured without suffering. As Tom Paine, the American patriot, once said: "What we obtain too cheaply, we esteem too lightly."

And so in my remarks today, I intend to consider the meaning and the message that this Memorial Day brings to each of us.

For nearly a century, our citizens have set aside this day to honor those who served our Nation so well both in war and in peace. The real meaning of Memorial Day is found in the aftermath of the Civil War. Even after its end, the rumble of guns seemed to echo across the land—destruction and bitter memories marred the peace.

An inspiring symbol of unity and reconciliation was needed—a symbol from which the people could draw strength as they strove to become a united nation. That symbol was supplied in 1867 when a kind gesture by a small group of women in a little-known community in the South suddenly caught the imagination of the nation. As the women of Columbus, Mississippi, decorated the graves of their war dead, they saw nearby the graves of the Union soldiers—bare, cold and forgotten.

These women could not bring themselves to ignore the Union graves. Carefully they decorated them too, until there was nothing to distinguish Union graves from Confederate.

The story of the Mississippi women was printed in papers throughout the country, and their heart-warming performance was celebrated in sermons, speeches, poems, and songs.

The reaction was so great that in 1868, General John A. Logan, National Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Union's veteran organization, ordered its members to observe May 30th as a special day. It was a day his order read, "'for decorating the graves of the comrades who died in defense of their country and whose bodies now lie in almost every city, village, or hamlet churchyard in the land."

General Logan chose the date May 30th simply because of the abundance of beautiful flowers during this time of the year. But from then on, "Decoration Day" ceremonies were sponsored throughout the North, and similar rites were hold independently in the South. Gradually the legislatures of many states made the day a legal holiday.

In 1882, Decoration Day became Memorial Day to describe more fully the sentiment of the occasion. And with the passing years, Memorial Day has become a salute to the military dead, not only of the Civil War, but of all our wars.

Through the years, our soldiers have marched a tortuous road. It has taken them to frozen months at Valley Forge, to heavy fighting around Jackson's cotton bales at New Orleans, and to slaughter at Gettysburg. The road was wound from Monterrey to Mexico City; it has leaped the waters to Cuba and to the Philippines.

In the First World War, names previously unheard by the average American citizen took on new and terrible meanings; Argonne Forest, Chateau Thierry, the Marne River, Verdun—all became synonymous with the roar of gunfire and the struggle of men.

Then the Second World War came, and Americans fought on three continents—Europe, Africa, and Asia—and worldwide in the air and on the seas. They gave their lives at Anzio, at Normandy, and at Okinawa; they

fought in sun-baked deserts, steaming jungles, and frozen fields. There were bad times—the Death March at Bataan, early reverses in North Africa, the Battle of the Bulge—but the American fighting man and our allies proved equal to the task. They retook the Philippines, held at "the Bulge," and forced the enemy to lay down his arms in Africa.

The road led on to Korea, where Heartbreak Ridge, Pork Chop Hill, and the Pusan Perimeter became new landmarks on our soldiers' map.

And today Americans are again serving in the cause of freedom throughout the world, opposing the Communist aggression that threatens the self-determination of our friends; and, ultimately, our own security. The road has carried thousands of America's fighting men to Vietnam, where with our allies we are engaged in a life and death struggle with a powerful Communist aggressor. Here strange sounding names—Chu Lai, Hill 881, Pleiku, the Mekong Delta, and Cu Chi—are rapidly becoming household words. And in the coming months as more and more of our young men give their "last full measure" in defense of liberty, we shall perhaps be called upon to steel ourselves for longer casualty lists from Vietnam.

Today, as we place flowers on their graves, we realize that we cannot discharge our solemn obligation to these men with mere words of homage. They did not die for wreaths and words. They died for the right of Americans to enjoy freedom. They died for future generations. They died for us. They died so we would be free to assemble here today in peace.

On this Memorial Day, we should remind ourselves that military obligations are an inseparable part of our heritage, that military service in time of the nation's need is a fundamental responsibility of citizenship. One of our great American philosophers, George Santayana, has reflected that "only the dead are safe; only the dead have seen the end of war." While we may hope that conclusion is wrong, we cannot afford to assume so. Certainly war has always been hellish—and the present war is especially so. Nevertheless, the idea that nothing is worse, that our proper purpose—individually and nationally—is mere survival, repudiates the heroism of all the men we honor today and represents a reversion to an animal view of life. If we lack the courage to stand firm for our beliefs, or if we lack beliefs we are determined to uphold, then we do not deserve the heritage which is ours, and we are unworthy of the sacrifices that these brave men have made for us.

Let me say a few words to you young men and women of Nebraska who are present with us today.

You are the benefactors and the inheritors of the Heritage I speak about:

You have health and long life expectancy.

You have luxuries and comparable affluence.

You have education and intelligence.

You have rights.

You have privileges.

You have opportunities.

You are destined to soon become the controlling generation in our relatively young country. You have our hopes and best wishes. You have our confidence.

I know that you have mine for I have been privileged to command many millions of young U.S. soldiers and marines in many countries of the world; I know how the youth of America "stack up" and I am proud of them.

They (the youth) are jealous of their rights, and should be for their rights are a part of their heritage that over a million Americans have died for in the last 190 years.

While mindful of their rights, they are also mindful of their responsibilities. They know they do not get something for nothing in a realistic, competitive society and world.

In spite of their great heritage they realize that each generation must prove itself.

The youth of America realize that in spite of the benefits and wealths they have as Americans, they were born in debt to many people and to many American institutions:

To their system of Government.

To their parents.

To their community.

To their state.

To their country.

To their schools.

To their church.

To their God.

And to those whom we honor today; they realize they must cope with these debts and at the end will pass many debts on to their children.

I am sure they realize that the now living and controlling generation wishes for them only the best as they take over.

I have been connected with the Boy Scouts of America for many years and, at present, I am a member of the National Executive Board. I think it especially fitting today to recall to the young members of this audience the thought that many Scout masters keep in mind in dealing with young Scouts:

Our Constitution and its Bill of Rights gives us, as Americans, certain Rights. However, we must understand and accept the responsibility attached to each Right. If we do not, we are trying to "get something for nothing" . . . which is not an "accepted" way of life.

Just what our responsibility is under each Right is a matter for each of us to determine for ourselves.

In making that determination, the "I care" test serves as a very good guide for the boy who is trying to become a good citizen of America.

"I care for: my self respect, my family, my community, my country and my God."

Hence, America has given you certain rights and you as an American must accept responsibilities, *you must care for* your own self respect, for your family, community, country, and God.

If our honored dead were alive today, they would probably let Captain John McCrae express it again so well when he said in France in World War I:

"Take up our quarrel with the foe
To you, from failing hands, we throw the torch
Be it yours to hold it high,
If ye break faith with us who die
we shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flanders fields."

Friends, it has been a privilege for me to be here with you today and to have the pleasure of sharing in the ceremonies commemorating the centennial celebration of the 37th State of the United States.

DEDICATION OF NEW TRIER HIGH SCHOOL WEST, NORTHFIELD, ILL.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the 13th Congressional District of Illinois was honored to have the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, at the dedication of the New Trier High School West in Northfield, Ill., on May 7, 1967. Mr. Gardner spoke eloquently of the "themes of our national life" and urged students not to shun the problems of their day but to lend a hand, wherever they may be, to the betterment of their society. His words merit the attention of all who are concerned with the problems of our times.

Mr. Gardner's address follows:

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The name New Trier is known and honored in every school district in America. It stands for excellence in education.

Thanks to that tradition, one may be sure that the graduates of New Trier High School West will be well prepared. One may be sure that they will move smoothly into the colleges and graduate schools and complex specializations of modern life.

But I hope they will also be prepared in another vital dimension. I hope they will have a direct and personal concern for the problems racking this Nation, and be willing to exercise direct and personal leadership with respect to those problems in their own communities.

Far too many of our best educated people today are disinclined to provide such leadership.

The young people of this generation are perhaps more alert to the problems of the larger society than any preceding generation has been. But as they move on into their careers there is every likelihood that their concern will diminish. For all their activism, they show every indication of following the time-honored trend—a few years of indignant concern for social betterment, characterized by a demand for immediate solutions to all the world's problems, and then a trailing off into the apathy and disinterest of the young executive or professional.

If you want to avoid the toughest problems facing your generation, there are some classic forms of escape.

One is just to get so wrapped up in your personal life—job, family, bills, house repairs, bridge parties, office politics, neighborhood social competition, and the like that there just isn't any time for the larger problems of the day.

A more subtle exit from the grimy problems of the day is to immerse oneself so deeply in a specialized professional field that the larger community virtually ceases to exist.

This is a particularly good way out because the rewards of professional specialization are very great today, so you may become rich and famous while you are ignoring the nation's problems.

Still another and infinitely devious means of turning your back on the larger community is to assert that the whole society is so corrupt that nothing can save it. Such moral gamesmanship relieves the gamesman of all responsibility. With one shrug he shakes off the burden that serious men have carried from the beginning of time, the struggle to make an imperfect society work.

A variation on that theme is to tell yourself that the society has fallen into the hands of unworthy people, and that virtuous, clear-eyed spirits such as yourself haven't a chance. You can suck that lollipop of self-deceit all your life long and die secure in the belief that the world would have been different had they turned it over to you.

Unfortunately we can no longer afford such escapism on the part of our best people. We are facing social problems of unexampled gravity. I have observed the domestic problems of this Nation at first hand, and I can tell you that we have tasks of the utmost seriousness before us—tasks of alleviating poverty, of doing justice to Negro Americans, of redesigning our cities, of reshaping our governmental processes, of controlling the pollution of our natural environment, of learning how to educate deeply deprived children.

It has always been hard to stir our people to significant social action except in periods of great crisis. I would have no hope of changing that national attribute. I would simply say that another of our historic moments of crisis is upon us. If you can't sense it stirring under the surface of the news, then you don't understand the deeper currents of this Nation.

During the years ahead, our society will need the lifelong attenion and concern of its most highly educated young people. They must lend a hand. In doing so they will be committing themselves to an arduous assignment.

They will have to be willing to undergo the long, hard apprenticeship that is required to accomplish change in the modern world. It's a complex world. It can't be run by the untrained or changed by the untrained.

But education is only the beginning for those who hope to change the world for the better. After they're trained they have to have the fortitude and the staying power essential to the long, difficult task of accomplishing social change. Making a bad world better is tough, grinding, never-ending work. It's not for people whose chief interest is in posturing or striking an attitude or bandying words or venting the anger of youth.

I have little sympathy with those who have impossibly high hopes for social betterment and then the next day are wallowing in disillusionment and self-pity because their high hopes weren't realized. Social change isn't that easy. Creating a better world isn't that easy. Life isn't that easy.

Anyone who cares at all about improving the lot of mankind had better gird himself for a long struggle with lots of setbacks and defeats. That's the way it has always been and continues to be. It's backbreaking; but it's a man's work.

If enough of our young people are willing to commit themselves to a serious concern for the future of their society, then I have some hope for the years ahead. As some of your know, I have been keenly interested in what it is that makes nations decay. And as those of you who have read my book *Self-Renewal* know, the evidence convinces me that the decline of nations is not inevitable. As I said in the book if we go into a decline, we shall not be able to blame the inexorable forces of history. It will be an avoidable failure of the mind and heart and spirit of the American people. We now know beyond all doubt that nations die from within, and they are attacked less often by traitors within the gate than by traitors within the heart—complacency, apathy, cynicism, intolerance, self-deception and an unwillingness on the part of the individual to lend himself to any worthy common purpose.

Every morning and evening as I ride to and from work, I pass the Washington Monument, and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, and I often think of the men and events they commemorate. But as I look at the perfection of the monuments, I try to remember—and I ask you young people to remember—that this great Nation was conceived and designed by human beings imperfect as you and I are imperfect; capable of mistakes, even as you and I; who were once young, as you are now; who were subject to weariness and doubt and confusion, as all of us are. But with all their human fallibility, they had the courage and heart to believe that man *might* create a free and just society. And that made all the difference.

It is easy to be cynical about that effort because no society anywhere or anytime has really been wholly free and just. But over the years and over the generations we have moved slowly and often painfully toward those goals. And we have done so because some people had the vision and the steadfastness to try to make an imperfect world better.

That is hard and not always glamorous work and it is never finished.

A nation is never finished. It has to be built and rebuilt. It has to be recreated in each generation by believing, caring men and women.

That is what you are doing here at New Trier. This school is not a monument to the past. It is an affirmation of faith in what can be—an uncompromising commitment to excellence—an example of what people can create when they join that commitment to their most cherished values.

And what are those cherished values? I'd like to conclude this talk with a few comments on the things we value.

There isn't anything the American people believe in more deeply than individual fulfilment. Speaking of our forebears, President Johnson once said "They came here—the exile and the stranger—to find a place where a man can be his own man."

Opportunity and fulfilment. That's what education is about. At the base of our convictions as Americans is a concern that each individual have the opportunity to grow to his full stature and be what he has it in him to be.

When this Nation began, a good many people would have said that the chief requirement to achieve that goal was freedom from political oppression.

Now we know that there are other and more subtle tyrants than kings or dictators.

Ignorance is such a tyrant. Poverty is another. Racial discrimination another. Physical illness or incapacity another. Mental illness another.

We are now engaged in a great national effort—and I don't just mean we in the Johnson Administration, though we're working hard at it, I mean all the men and women in and out of government who care about these things—a national effort on a scale never before witnessed in this Nation to combat *all* the conditions that prevent individual fulfilment or stunt human growth. Teachers, social workers, citizens who do volunteer work, and all others who work with the handicapped and disadvantaged know the extraordinary scope of the task we have undertaken.

It is an effort of breathtaking magnitude, worthy of free men. It is an effort that is almost totally unrecognized by the press and the public. It is an effort that is sometimes mismanaged and always seems inadequate.

But it serves the deepest and truest goals to be conceived by the hearts and minds of the American people.

Study the line from the Declaration of Independence that is carved inside the Jefferson Memorial "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor." If we ask ourselves whether there is anything today to which we would pledge "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor," I like to believe that for most of us the answer would be "yes," because I like to believe that there is such a thing as an American commitment, not to affluence, not to power, but to the release of human potential, the enhancement of individual dignity, the liberation of the human spirit.

Those are the great themes of our national life. Everything else is a means to these ends. And it is to those ends that we dedicate this school.

ROHR CORP. TO BUILD SST ENGINE PODS

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Rohr Corp. of Chula Vista, Calif., recently won a subcontract to construct the pods which will contain the huge jet engines powering our supersonic transport—SST.

This significant award is only the latest in a long line of accomplishments by the company. The selection of Rohr for the subcontract, which could be worth up to $500 million, is really not surprising. Rohr has virtually locked up the market for pods for our new jet transports. Among the aircraft that have been or will be fitted with Rohr pods are the Boeing 707, 727, 737, and 747; the Douglas DC–8 and DC–9; the Lockheed C–141, C5–A, and JetStar, and the Grumman Gulfstream II.

The ambitious SST program, designed to thrust the United States to the forefront in the intense international competition to build the absolute airliner—obviously will be good business for Boeing, General Electric, Rohr, and the other firms that are undertaking the project.

Rohr, for example, will use about 500 employees on its share of the construction of two prototype SST's. I have been reliably informed that when the actual production program reaches full swing—hopefully in the mid-1970's—as many as 2,000 workers will be needed by Rohr. The company currently employs more than 8,500 persons at the Chula Vista plant.

Rohr also contemplates spending $5.4 million for new equipment to be used in the SST work and the addition of about 100,000 square feet in plant space for manufacturing.

But far more important than the impact on any individual locale or company is the contribution the SST will make to our national economy and to our position in the international trade arena.

By 1990, a market will exist for at least 650 SST's but more likely for as many as 1,100. In a praiseworthy collaboration, the Federal Government, the airlines, and the manufacturers have agreed to share in the $1.14 billion prototype investment. In helping get this program started, our Government is doing no more than the Governments of Britain, France, and Russia—all of which are aggressively backing the efforts of their own manufacturers to develop and build a first-line supersonic aircraft.

The investment our taxpayers are being asked to make in the SST certainly will not be money lost. The Government, in fact, will recoup its entire investment with delivery of the 300th airplane. By the 500th delivery, the United States will have recovered 6 percent interest on top of the original investment. It should be pointed out, also, that the United States, as a partner in this great endeavor, will continue to share in the profits until at least 15 years after certification.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I intend to provide every bit of support I can for this splendid program to shrink the world by permitting travelers to fly at nearly three times the speed of sound.

Under unanimous consent, I would like to insert at this point articles from the San Diego Union and the Chula Vista Star-News that describe Rohr's part in the SST development program:

[From the San Diego Union, May 4, 1967]

$15 MILLION JOB GIVEN ROHR IN SUPERJET PLANE—WILL BUILD PODS FOR ENGINES

(By Carl Plain)

Pods to contain the huge engines of the U.S. supersonic transport will be built by Rohr Corp. in Chula Vista under a $15 million program announced yesterday.

Company forecasts indicated that about 500 employes will be involved in Rohr's work on the pair of 300-seat, 1,800-mile-an-hour prototypes to be manufactured by Boeing Co., Seattle, under a go-ahead from President Johnson.

Eventually, the SST program could mean more than a half billion dollars of business to Rohr, said Burt F. Raynes, president.

"The large and complex pod assemblies to house the 60,000-pound-thrust General Electric engines include a variable-geometry engine inlet," Raynes said.

"They represent a technology and production challenge we will be most pleased to undertake."

Rohr engineers already are working with Boeing on design details of the engine pods. The assemblies will include streamlined nacelles, ducting, electrical wiring, fuel lines and other devices built up around the four General Electric engines.

Specialized facilities for the new program are being developed at the Chula Vista plant where Rohr's SST operations will be centered.

Company engineers have been working several years on advancing manufacturing technology to meet the structural and material demands of supersonic flight.

High speeds and resulting heat from air passing over the plane's surfaces prohibit the use of ordinary materials, so much of the SST will be built of titanium alloys that resist heat better than aluminum but weigh less than steel.

Rohr has been producing titanium parts for other aircraft since the start of Boeing's B–52 bomber program in 1952. Titanium forming and sizing facilities in the Chula Vista plant are being expanded to handle added volume.

The SST's four engine pods will be mounted under the horizontal tail. As the plane approaches an airport, the variable-geometry air inlet will help reduce engine noise by choking out high-pitched sound from the compressors.

[From the Chula Vista Star-News, May 4, 1967]

ROHR IS AWARDED MAJOR CONTRACT

A $15 million contract to manufacture propulsion pods for the U.S. supersonic transport has been awarded to Rohr Corp. of Chula Vista by Boeing Co. of Seattle it was learned yesterday.

News of the contract cames in a joint announcement by Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin (D-San Diego), and Burt F. Raynes, Rohr president.

The contract calls for manufacture of propulsion pods for two SST prototype aircraft.

The pods will house 60,000 pound thrust engines manufactured by General Electric, a prime contractor with Boeing on the SST.

On the basis of Boeing and Federal Aviation Agency sales forecasts, Rohr's participation in the SST program could mean more than a half-billion dollars in business for the company through the life of the program.

Rohr's SST operations will be centered at the Chula Vista plant, where specialized facilities are being developed for the program. Forecasts show that some 500 employees may be involved as the production phase of the SST program develops.

"We are very proud of this selection as a part of the Boeing team on the supersonic transport," Raynes said. "The large and complex pod assemblies to house the 60,000-pound-thrust engines include the variable geometry engine inlet. They represent a technology and production challenge we will be most pleased to undertake."

This is one of the largest aero-space contracts let in the county in recent years, Van Deerlin said.

Rohr is one of seven firms selected by Boeing to receive more than $165 million in subcontracts for work on the SST prototypes.

Rohr engineers have been working for several years on development of Rohr's manufacturing technology to meet the materials and structural requirements of supersonic flight.

Since the high speed and resulting skin friction temperatures of the SST prohibit use of conventional aircraft materials, much of the aircraft will be built of titanium alloys—material lighter than steel but offering substantially greater heat resistance than aluminum.

Rohr has been involved in production of titanium parts for other aircraft dating back to the start of the Boeing B–52 program in 1952 and is now expanding its titanium forming and sizing facilities to handle the additional volume created by the SST and other new programs.

Rohr engineers are already working with Boeing on the detailed design of the huge pods for the SST.

The four pods will be mounted under the horizontal tail and will be fitted with variable-geometry air inlets that will help reduce noise on airport approach by "choking" out high-pitched sound from the engine compressors.

The Boeing supersonic transport design features a variable-sweep integrated wing which combines with a large horizontal tail to form a single lifting surface for supersonic flight.

Aerodynamically, the wing will permit the Boeing SST to be three airplanes in one—a supersonic speedster capable of cruising at Mach 2.

SOUTH AFRICA'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of South Africa celebrates its sixth birthday and on behalf of the American people and my colleagues in the Congress, I extend best wishes to all the peoples of South Africa on the occasion of this anniversary. At the same time, in the spirit of brotherhood of all mankind, let me express my earnest hope that the "winds of change" which seem to be beginning to blow in that part of the great continent of Africa will continue in velocity. If so, a beneficial effect will be felt all over Africa.

Although Americans deplore South Africa's racial policy, and although as American delegates to the United Nations so often have declared we never in good conscience can condone her position on apartheid because it is degrading to a large portion of her population, these do not forbid the exchange of amenities on anniversary occasions. I am firm in my faith that dialog and the rule of law can achieve the objectives that we all desire.

South Africa has served as our loyal ally on past occasions and hopefully will be on our side in the future in the cause of peace or war. She is the natural repository of the large portion of the free world's gold, uranium, chromium, manganese, and diamonds. U.S. interests have invested well over $600 million in her mines and factories. In some instances I am advised that U.S. firms have been in the forefront in introducing progressive labor practices and employing nonwhite labor at high job and skill classification.

During the past year tragedy struck high in the Government of the Republic of South Africa with the brutal assassination of the Prime Minister. There were many who felt that the new Prime Minister would pursue even more ruthlessly his Government's policy of apartheid. This may not be the case. The world is watching the actions of Prime Minister Vorster and his seeming effort to improve his country's image.

We hear now that South Africa has agreed to allow multiracial teams in Olympic events and permit tours in South Africa of foreign teams that include some nonwhite players. We hear now that the Government has indicated that some white investment might be allowed in African institutions, another slight departure from total apartheid. Gestures like these, however modest, have received some response. Robert Gardiner, distinguished Ghanaian, has suggested that South Africa be readmitted to the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. He is executive secretary of the ECA, from which South Africa was expelled in 1964.

I look forward to the day, not many anniversaries away, when all Africa, including the Republic of South Africa, whose birthday we celebrate today, will work toward a common goal of making the continent truly a land of destiny and of racial equality.

MEMORIAL DAY IN THE SECOND DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I report to my colleagues in the House on the inspiring manner in which Memorial Day was observed in the community of Calumet Park in the district that I have the honor to represent.

From the bottom of my heart I congratulate, commend, and thank Commander Paul Luisi and all the 384 members of Calumet Park Post 1156 of the American Legion. I am not in position to state with proved accuracy that it was the best and finest community observance of Memorial Day in all the land, but I am sure that none could have surpassed it. It was truly a pattern for all the communities of our country. It was

in the finest traditions of American patriotism.

The parade passed through business and residential sections, the lawns of homes alive with men, women, and children. Among those on the speaker's stand were Tony Pizza, mayor of the village of Calumet Park, Jack DePlanche, Bob Griffin, Roy Logan, Harry Murauski, Casey Drozdowski, and John Bedorcin, trustees of the village. Village Clerk Mary Hodgson, Municipal Judge James Sparing, Committeeman Lawrence Petta, Commander Dan Sullivan of Calumet Memorial Camp of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Irene Gipta, president of American Legion Auxiliary Unit 1156, Father Madden of Seven Holy Founders Church, Rev. Dr. Swenson of the Community Covenant Church, Attorney Michael Hinko, and Col. John P. Gibbons of the U.S. Army, orator of the day. Judges of the parade were Nancy Kapp, June Orlowski, Ida Hathaway, and Ev Shields.

The parade consisted of 68 units in five sections. The organization of a parade of this size and quality requires a tremendous amount of coordinated effort and hard, hard work. I am extending my remarks to include the order of the parade that my colleagues may have some idea of the truly wonderful accomplishment of a post of the American Legion, with a membership of 384, working under the creed of the American Legion "My God and Country."

MEMORIAL DAY PARADE LINEUP

LEAD SECTION

All fire units.
All police units.
Car with Congressman Barratt O'Hara.
Car with Mayor Tony Pizza.
Car with Col. John P. Gibbons, U.S. Army.
Cars with Gold Star Mothers and Blue Star Mothers.

FIRST SECTION

U.S. Marine Color Guard.
Calumet Park American Legion Color Guard Post #1156 (Blue Devils).
Calumet Park V.F.W. Color Guard Post #8774.
Calumet Park American Legion Post members Post #1156.
Calumet Park American Legion Auxiliary Unit #1156.
Calumet Park American Legion SAL Squadron #1156.
Calumet Park V.F.W. Post members Post #8774.
U.S. Navy Band from Great Lakes Training Center.
Commander Wm. "Clem" O'Brian of the 8th Dist. American Legion Dept. of Illinois and Officers.
Phillips Photo Float.
Majorette Judy Bond.
Thornridge Lassies Majorettes.
Calumet Park Rams A. C. Float.
Calumet Park Chamber of Commerce.
Peppermint Majorettes (with car).
U.S. Army Recruiting Van.
Community Covenant Church Float.
Calumet Park Hardware Float.
B.S.A. Troop #792 led by Mr. Walter Kaiser.

SECOND SECTION

Napleton Motors Horse Cart, Mr. Ed Napleton.
Southwest Shrine Club, horses and "pooper scooper."
Evergreen Park Rangerettes.
The Silhouettes from Lucella's School of Twirling.
Cub Scout Pack #3788 Jr.
Cub Scout Pack #3788 Float.
3rd Batt., 122nd Arty., 33rd Div. of the Ill. National Guard under Capt. Orsi.
Boy Scout Troop #744—Jr.
The Jr. Band from Dwight D. Eisenhower "Old Main" High School.
Lar Daly.
Color Guard from Roseland Post #49 American Legion.
Kosciuszcko Post #30 PLAV.
Kosciuszcko Post #30 PLAV Auxiliary.
Monarch Laundry Float.

THIRD SECTION

Calumet Memorial Post #330 of the American Legion, Color Guard.
Marching Sts. from Harvey American Legion Post #155 Color Guard.
Tinley Park American Legion Post #615 Color Guard.
Park Forest American Legion Post #1198 Color Guard.
Illiana Post #220 American Legion Jr. Band.
Stanley J. Sukta Post #5414 V.F.W. Jr. Color Guard.
Stanley J. Sukta Post #5414 V.F.W. Sr. Color Guard.
Calumet Park Little League Baseball Team.
Roseland Moose Lodge #1062 Float and Clowns.
Whirling Debs Majorettes.
Calumet Park Women's Civic Club.

FOURTH SECTION

Ko-Tam-Ta Campfire Girls led by Mrs. Flieth.
Civil Air Patrol.
Yvonne's Royal Lancers Majorettes (with sound car).
Calumet Park Drugs.
B.S.A. Troop #788 led by Mr. Eugene Ratysik.
Calumet Park Troublemakers A.C.
Bluebird Campfire Girls.
Pope John Council of K.C.
Indianapolis Pacesetter Car courtesy Tony Piet.
The Jesters Drum and Bugle Corps from Mt. Greenwood.
Lois Riney's Campfire Girls.
Ravae's Dynamics Majorettes.
Seven Holy Founders Church.

FIFTH SECTION

Imperial Majorettes.
U.S. Navy Recruiting Car.
J. & R. Bike Retanl, 6 bikes.
Calumet Park Teen Club.
Chicago Civil Defense Truck.
Cub Scout Pack #3792 led by Mr. Bob Riney.
Polish Womans Alliance Majorettes, "The Garlando".
Hegewish Raiders Jr. Color Guard.
The Shannon Rovers, Irish Pipe Band.
The U.S.A.F. "BOMARC" Missile.

ON BELIEVING THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that there is a great dissatisfaction in our Nation regarding the Vietnam war. Much of this frustration can be placed at the door of our President and Mr. McNamara who have not been honest with the American people. We all know that Mr. Johnson made a political football out of the Vietnam war during the 1964 presidential election. In his effort to deride and defeat Senator Goldwater he attacked the suggestion by the Republican nominee that the United States carry out escalated military operations to bring the war to a conclusion and minimize our losses. Mr. Johnson's chickens are coming home to roost.

The policies he is now carrying out are those that he ridiculed in 1964, although with indecision and bungling. The American people—both the left and the right—clearly do not trust our Commander in Chief. The major frustration in our country today over this war is due to President Johnson's deceptive and insincere statements. To repeat his past pronouncements of his intended policy and endeavor to square them to what he is now advocating brings sadness to all of us who believe that we should be able to respect and support our President. He clearly does not deserve to have us ratify his mistakes and offer excuses to fill his credibility gap.

The latest casualty reports indicate that over 300 men died in the last week of the war and more than 2,800 were listed as casualties. Our boys are being sacrificed as cannon fodder while the Johnson administration fiddles. President Johnson reminds me of the old line fireman who thought the way to put out the fire was to bring the water level above the fire. In this case he is escalating our troop commitments—something he said he would not do but has consistently gone back on his word. Possibly he and Mr. McNamara think that we can win by using our troops like the old fireman used the water but at any rate the American people are getting increasingly sick of such folly. Failure to use our superior military power and the subordination of the best interest of our troops to State Department political decisions are putting our boys in the position of sheer cannon fodder.

I cannot feel sorry for the American liberals and peace advocates who were misled by Mr. Johnson. They should have known better and they got what they deserved. Unfortunately, the rest of us got it with them. I feel sorry for the boys who are being sacrificed at the altar of expediency and while I support our basic commitment to Vietnam and believe we must check Communist aggression, I resent the deception of Mr. Johnson and Mr. McNamara and disassociate myself completely from their policy of putting our fighting men last in their considerations. They are far more worried about what India thinks, how the U.N. will react, how to placate the "peace" Senators and liberals at home, and 1968, than they are in basic decisions as to what is in the best military interest of our fighting men. Politics rates first, our boys last. At the root of the administration difficulty is the failure to clearly perceive the true nature of communism and to follow soft line policies.

In Sunday's New York Times, Judge Henry W. Edgerton wrote an interesting letter indicating the disaffection of those of Mr. Edgerton's liberal persuasion. To repeat, I cannot feel sorry for those who fell for Mr. Johnson's line in 1964 but it is at least meritorious to consider some of the statements Mr. Johnson made which misled consider-

able numbers of voters who, like Judge Edgerton, voted for him in 1964. The letter follows:

[From the New York Times, May 28, 1967]

"COMMITMENT" IN SOUTH VIETNAM

To the EDITOR:

President Johnson has said "We are there because we have a promise to keep"; "we are committed"; "America keeps its word." Many Americans in and out of Congress share his illusion that he is America and "the country is committed." Only a declaration of war or an explicit treaty can commit America to an armed conflict. This war is not declared, justified by any treaty or consistent with the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Johnson seeks to use his two predecessors as examples. But President Eisenhower sent no fighting men and President Kennedy sent few. He said of the Vietnamese: "It is their war. They are the ones who have to win or lose it. We can help them, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam." Only President Johnson has sent hundreds of thousands of men.

ELECTION PROMISE

During the election campaign Mr. Johnson promised not to enlarge the war and not to go north. He said: "I have had advice to load our planes with bombs and to drop them on certain areas that I think would enlarge the war. . . . I haven't chosen to enlarge the war"; "There are those that say you ought to go north and drop bombs. . . . We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys"; "We are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them to save their own freedom with their own men, with our leadership and our officer direction, and such equipment as we can furnish them"; "We are not going to send American boys nine or ten thousand miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves."

Many of us voted for him as a peace candidate. After the election he enlarged the war and went north.

In giving the Medal of Honor to a soldier's widow he implied that but for dissenters the man would not have been killed. As Walter Lippmann said, "The obvious rebuttal to the President's use of the heroes is that if Mr. Johnson had remained true to the policy on which he was elected . . . Sergeant Connor would be alive today."

WEAKNESS OF CASE

As Senator McGovern said, "In trying to imply that it is American dissent which is causing the Vietnamese to continue the war, the Administration is only confessing the weakness of its own case by trying to silence its critics and confuse the American people. It is not the impact of the dissent on Hanoi that worries the Administration; it is the fact that the dissenters have exposed the contradictions, the falsehoods, and the resulting credibility gap which surrounds Administration policy."

The Secretary of State said in Vietnam, "We are here because we made a promise. . . . If Moscow or Peking ever discovers that the promises of the United States do not mean what they say, then this world goes up in smoke." Any one who reads the public record with an open mind cannot fail to discover that the promises of President Johnson do not mean what they say.

HENRY W. EDGERTON.

WASHINGTON, *May 23 1967.*

(NOTE.—The writer is Senior Circuit Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia circuit.)

ADDRESS BY HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech by the Honorable BURT L. TALCOTT.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from the 12th District of California, Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, was recently honored by the American Teens Against Cancer—ATAC—a youth subdivision of the American Cancer Society, for his unusual and effective work in encouraging teenagers not to smoke.

We can all appreciate the special concern and extra effort of busy Members of Congress who take the time to work with students in the improvement of their health. Mr. TALCOTT is to be commended for his contribution in this area.

Representative TALCOTT was the principal speaker at the annual ATAC awards conference here in Washington, D.C. His speech to the assembled award winners and student workers is worth calling to the attention of all teenagers, their parents and the public generally, and to local, State, and Federal legislators.

I am therefore submitting his speech for inclusion at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY MR. TALCOTT

Young ladies and gentlemen, fellow citizens: I greatly appreciate this opportunity to talk with you. It is not often that I have an audience like you—one that is young, enthusiastic and openminded—but more importantly, one that is united by a single interest. I commend you for your dedication to the fight against cancer. It is encouraging to find teenagers not only aware of the gravity of the situation, but anxious to do something concrete about it.

Last year I noticed that the television networks were overlooking some excellent anti-smoking spot announcements prepared as a public service by the American Cancer Society. There were many reasons that prompted me to instigate a Congressional inquiry into the situation. To begin with, I have long been concerned with the medical, financial and social detriments of smoking. However, there is much more to consider than the individual smoker. The effect of smoke, and smokers, on *society* is a topic that must not be ignored. But I would like to address myself first to the effects upon the individual.

The amount of money spent each year on cigarettes, cigars and pipes is astronomical. Americans smoke 541 billion cigarettes a year—that's eight a day for *every* man, woman and child of every age. Computed one way, this is about 10 cents a day *each,* or $180.00 a year for a family of five—over a period of 40 years this is over $7,250.00 or the equivalent of three good automobiles or a good airplane. This staggering figure does not include cigar or pipe smoking. Money spent on tobacco products in 1966 exceeded $9,210,000,000. This is more than three and one-half times the projected federal budget for *education* during the coming fiscal year, and twice the budget for Space Research and Technology.

Other out-of-pocket costs of smoking—the expense of shopping and supplies, of cleaning clothes, homes and offices—the extra costs of mouthwashes and dental care—the enormous costs of damaged or ruined clothes—ties, sweaters, suits and party dresses—may *exceed* the costs of the tobacco. *No one* can estimate the loss of furniture, cars, homes, office buildings or forests destroyed by careless cigarette smoking. I challenge anyone to estimate this loss at less than *twice* the cost of tobacco.

One of the strongest arguments against smoking, I believe, is the danger it poses to your health. Cigarette smoking is regarded as the most important cause of chronic bronchitis and a significant factor in cancer of the larynx. Cigarette smoking, based on clinical and autopsy studies, animal experimentation and population surveys, *does* constitute a definite risk to health. A nation-wide survey indicates that *smokers* spend more than a *third* more time away from their work, because of illness, than *non*-smokers. What more evidence is needed? An overwhelming majority of physicians and researchers will admonish, "Don't smoke; if you don't smoke, don't start; if you must smoke, be moderate."—Smokers are suckers!

The dangers of smoking are recognized all over the world—the Royal College of Physicians in Great Britain, the World Health Organization, the United States Public Health Service, the American Medical Association—*all* conclude that cigarette smoking is a serious health hazard. *No* agency or organization has yet given evidence that smoking is salubrious or healthful.

Manufacturers may denicotinize, and filter the tars; but this can only reduce, not eliminate, the hazards. And the hazards include loss of life—not only from indirect internal diseases, but often from burns or asphyxiation from fires started by carelessly disposed cigarettes. I doubt that any adult is lucky enough *not to* know someone who was killed in this way. I have known four.

There is another aspect of smoking that is seldom considered by smokers—that is the *rudeness* of the habit. Smokers seem to believe their behavior is so common that consideration of another's sensitivities is unimportant. They suffer from the same syndrome that permits some people to believe that washing and bathing are not socially necessary.

I recently attended a high level seminar on the subject of *air* pollution. In this meeting, 8 of the 12 persons smoked something—the air in our meeting room became so polluted that a smoker became dizzy and finally asked permission to open the windows and door to let in some fresh air. I thought this was a strange twist—no one asked permission to foul the others' air, but one had to ask permission to let some fresh air in! The pollution index of our room would have triggered a major alert if it had been out on the street.

But what can *we,* as individuals, do? There are *two* powerful forces in America working against us—1) the government, at all levels, and 2) the mass advertising media. But public opinion and the truth are on our side.

During the last session of the Congress we passed a labeling bill which required the printing of "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health" on each cigarette package. Rather than a benefit to the smoker, the whole legislation is a boon to the tobacco interests—simply because it is so misleading. Most people believe that if smoking were truly "hazardous," their government would say so directly—and would prohibit the further use, sale or distribution of tobacco, like it does with other harmful products. So, because the Government did *not* come out with a *direct* denunciation, but simply a "maybe," the smoker is lulled into a false sense of security. The smoker's reaction is, "Well, it must not be too dangerous. I'll take my chances." So the smoker has not been deterred and the manufacturing of cigarettes and cigars increases. However, this is not the only result of the legislation. Tobacco manufacturers have not only retained their customers, but they were given *special protection* by the law.

Let me point out one example. Before the labeling legislation, law suits against tobacco manufacturers were being filed, *and won,* to recover money compensation for injuries and

deaths caused by tobacco use. Now recovery is no longer legally possible. Every smoker has been technically warned of the hazards to his health. This is called "assumption of the risk"—a complete defense for the wrongdoer or tortfeasor. In law, if an injured party knows of a danger, and still proceeds, he is said to have assumed the risk and can recover nothing.

This warning label on cigarettes, not only aided the tobacco companies, but it put Congress in a rather ambiguous, if not duplicitous, position. Despite the labeling legislation, the Federal Government continues to *subsidize* the growing of tobacco. In 1966, $332,741 of your tax dollars were channeled into this industry. Now can you imagine a situation more incongruous than a government subsidizing an industry about which it feels compelled to warn its citizens?

When I started to discuss the role of our Government, I said that we are confronted by the Government *at all levels*. By this I meant that the Congress is not the only culprit—*local* and *state* governments were also involved, although in a less obvious and more indirect way.

When the Congress was considering the cigarette package labeling bill, local governments pleaded with Congress not to do anything which would jeopardize one of their principal sources of taxes—tobacco products. My state of California, for instance, received over $76,000,000 in cigarette revenues in 1966, and this figure does not even include revenue from cigar or other tobacco products. So local officials were culpable along with Federal officials in the passage of the mischievous legislation.

The second important force confronting us is the news and advertising media, which also have an interest in keeping tobacco on the market. In 1966 alone, newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations, received over $276 million from the advertisement of this one product. 76.9 percent of this total was spent on television announcements. Regrettably, their social conscience and their concern for the public health does not yet equal their avarice for money. How much evidence or persuasion will be necessary to change their advertising morality (or lack of it) is not yet known. It is ironical how persistent the news media are in stressing a "morality" in areas of "civil rights" and Vietnam; yet where there is a pecuniary profit, the morality of the issue is ignored. It appears that where there are thoughts of money in coffers, there are few concerns for people in coffins.

All of these factors: the medical and financial costs of smoking to the smoker; the deleterious effects of smoking on society—what it does to our air, our forests and homes; the degrading effect of the legislation on the Congress—putting it in an ambiguous position; and the *special* favor done for the tobacco industry—giving it legal protection—all stimulated my concern on this issue.

Last summer I discovered that the American Cancer Society had some excellent public service films on the subject of smoking, and that the networks, out of fear of losing the patronage of the tobacco companies, were not using them. Following my Congressional inquiry, however, the networks began using the anti-smoking announcements more frequently. This was gratifying. I am now studying the policy of the "equal time" doctrine—which was once thought to apply only to opposing political candidates on controversial issues. I hope that equal time might be allowed as a matter of policy or regulation to opponents of liquor and tobacco advertising as well as political opponents.

This was one of my reactions to the problem of smoking; but the dilemma is far from solved. We have enormous obstacles ahead of us, and your enthusiasm and interest can help overcome them.

I have two *specific* suggestions for your *constructive* action—to complement the many good things you are already doing.

1) Become more active in your communities—your school, your town, your church. Don't *just* read, attend conferences and talk with other non-smokers. In this venture, you must convert others. Talking with like-minded people does not convert others—although it does bolster our own reasoning and our esprit.

Form a committee to accumulate new ideas, to formulate plans and to carry out your projects. Enlarge your group, include the respected and influential students. Set good examples. Work with your teachers, the sponsors of school organizations—PTA officials, the clergy, the medical society. It may surprise you how sympathetic and cooperative the influential people and leaders will be.

I would like to suggest that your committees call upon public officials or influential civic leaders, *who smoke*. Schedule a meeting with them, share with them some of the facts, explain the power of example, and urge them to stop smoking "as an example for our youth." Such flattery, attention, publicity and a sincere appeal to their concern for student and public health *can*, I believe, have considerable impact. If only *one* promised to quit, as a public service to youth, you would have achieved a great victory. His quitting would focus attention upon the hazards of smoking; it would cause some to reconsider the benefits of quitting, or of *not* starting. You would have another ally—maybe a *key* ally the next time the city council increases the cigarette taxes or when the newspaper of the Chamber of Commerce considers tobacco advertising. Some leaders may be unwilling, or unable, to stop smoking—yet they may willingly denounce smoking—and their denouncement can be helpful to your cause. Even if you *fail* to convert *one* smoker, you will have gained an invaluable experience in the art of persuasion and the science of community action. Every success will fire your committee to more effort and more successes. Other youth committees will take up your practices. You *can* be persuasive with *adult* leaders, if you will only *try*.

2) My next suggestion is similar—it is activist; it requires teamwork and it involves politics. Every teenager should become active in politics. Political campaigns afford good opportunities to raise issues. Smoking is an issue of public concern as well as of personal commitment. Youth may not have the expertise to get involved on issues like Vietnam, balance of payments, or Federal aid to education, but you *are* experts on smoking and you have the essential concern. Actually, if *you* don't raise the issue, few others will.

So your committee should support the non-smoker candidate; you should work actively for him and tell the others why. Don't treat the election, or the issue, as a gimmick—be serious, be professional, try to be politically effective. This is one of the best opportunities I know for you to "sell" your views and to obtain some very practical political *experience* which will stand you in good stead in future political campaigns. You might even discover your future professional career or your bent for public service.

In addition to effective gains for your *cause*, you will achieve many valuable fringe benefits for your *community* and for yourself. Just as importantly, your work in the political arena and your direct involvement with the leaders of your community, will be exciting and fun.

I also want to pass along *two* reminders: One is that anything an adult can do, *you* can do also. You should work with adults—it is good experience for you; it is encouragement for them. Their experience and knowledge will complement your zest and action. But, you don't have to wait until you are 21, or until you graduate, or until you can vote, to be effective. You need only a goal, a commitment, and a willingness to *work* for that goal—age, wealth, and background are not important.

A second reminder—education to discourage cigarette smoking must begin with children in *junior* high school, or younger. The scare of cancer and other health hazards which finally catch up and kill in middle age, do not impress youngsters.

The conduct of parents may be the greatest influence—but do not minimize the influence you teenagers have upon *pre*-teenagers; it is enormous, for both good and bad. When you have this opportunity, you have a commensurate responsibility. So, I repeat, set good examples.

We have many people to reach in this crusade to eliminate or reduce the health and social hazards of smoking—the pre-teenagers, your own peers, your parents and other adults, the leaders and opinion shapers! *Teenagers* can effectively influence these groups—if they will only apply their knowledge and talents.

You have two of the toughest and most powerful adversaries in this crusade—the governments and the news and advertising media. But don't despair; this should only intensify the challenge. You have two of the most powerful allies—the truth and public opinion.

All of the educational materials will go for naught if we cannot develop some example setters, who are concerned with the esthetic, social and moral grounds for not smoking. This is your role and you are performing it well. I wish you increasing success.

STUDENTS VOW VIOLENCE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to an article from the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of May 16 entitled "Students Vow Violence," by Arthur C. Egan, Jr., which describes how some students plan to spend the coming long, hot summer. The second article in this series is unfortunately unavailable at this time and will be inserted later.

I think every law-abiding citizen will agree that this article is both anger-provoking and depressing. The account opens with this quote:

> We students are going to change the whole way of life in this country. We're going to do as we want, when we want and how we want. Let anyone try to stop us and they'll have a riot on their hands.

Of course the speaker quoted above was speaking only for a small but disruptive segment of our youth, but a whole system of permissive educational theories stands indicted as contributing to this present condition.

As for those planning this type of unlawful activity, it must be made clear that their long, hot summer might possibly be spent in a short, hot prison cell.

I insert the above-mentioned article in the RECORD at this point:

STUDENTS VOW VIOLENCE

(By Arthur C. Egan, Jr.)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—"We students are going to change the whole way of life in this coun-

try. We're going to do as we want, when we want and how we want. Let anyone try to stop us and they'll have a riot on their hands."

"Why man, we've got it made for sure this summer—we'll show the 'fuzz' just who the real boss is before it's over. Who is going to stop us, the police, the soldiers? Just you let them try it, we'll take over everything."

"We've got the people on the run. People quake with fear when they see demonstrations—the real honest 'johns' run for home. Yeah, we'll run things this year for sure."

"When you want something just take it; if you can't get it start a riot, but be sure there are 'blacks' in the mob. That'll keep the cops out; when a fuzz sees a black he just stands there and looks."

NOT A DAMN THING

"We are not going to do one damn thing we don't want to do—and no one is going to make us or we'll burn everything in sight."

These startling statements, these cold, matter-of-fact remarks, made in a callous manner with no pangs of conscience or remote thought of remorse, were not made by boys and girls from a ghetto. No indeed! They were made by students from three of Massachusetts' most respected institutions of learning, Harvard University and Radcliffe College, both in Cambridge and Smith College in Northampton.

Happily, not all the students in these famous institutions are sympathetic to the Vietniks, nor by any means are all students merely indifferent, or apathetic.

I was put in contact with leaders of a student group calling itself "Sons of Liberty." The name is taken from the historic pre-Revolutionary War followers of Sam Adams and other great Boston patriots who staged the Boston Tea Party and other events which led to the struggle for American independence.

The Sons of Liberty, 1967 version, is a Harvard-based group which says it is "the only 100 per cent pro-American organization on the Harvard campus."

AIMS EXPLAINED

The leader explained to me the aims of his group saying:

"We believe this country is in a fight for its life. Most of the faculty here are so liberal-minded they would see this nation destroyed just to gain their own ends. We intend to do all we can to prevent just such a thing from happening."

"On April 15 a group of students, both males and females, gathered in Freedom Square to attend the anti-war rally in New York City. Some students here expressed their views openly by playing a record of Kate Smith singing 'God Bless America'—they hung out a banner saying, 'American Overall' and unfurled a large American flag," said the spokesman.

"Believe it or not but the Harvard University police made the students stop playing the record, made them take in their banner and ordered them to take down the American flag," said the Sons of Liberty spokesman heatedly.

"We'll be damned if we will take down the American flag," Harvard police were told. The officers decided to not press the issue when they saw it would lead to a possible fight between the students and police.

"They didn't tell those damned anti-Americans to stop their music nor take down their banners saying things against the United States, So they (the police) must have had their orders from the university administration," said the spokesman.

TAKEN ON TOUR

The Sons of Liberty took this reporter on a tour of the Harvard campus pointing out the student activity undermining this nation's war effort in Vietnam. It was going on in the dining halls, the dormitories and the campus gathering spots. Everywhere there was anti-United States activity, literature against the Vietnam War, pamphlets on how to get to Canada and escape the draft, suggestions on how to organize and carry out demonstrations on a subject.

I asked and was shown college-patronized eating establishments in Cambridge where contact might be made with both male and female students from the Harvard area.

For three days and nights, I, dressed in old clothes, with a suede cap covering this fast-thinning hair, posed as a "recruiter of demonstrators against the Vietnam War."

For three days and nights I associated with a variety of students, the majority of whom were some of the most repulsive human beings he ever met—repulsive not only from the standpoint of personal hygiene but also from their views and opinions on life itself, and repulsive from their own personal aims in life.

As clearly as possible, without disclosing the names of the students involved, this reporter will relate some of the quotes gained from talks with these creatures.

HALPERN AMENDMENT TO GIVE WOMEN EQUAL RIGHTS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the worst of many forms of second-class citizenship imposed upon the women of America is discrimination against working women under the Social Security Act.

On March 2, 1967, I introduced a joint resolution in this House proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent the Nation, or any State, from denying equality of rights under law on account of sex.

That is an old debt we owe to the ladies, and one that should be paid promptly. But, without waiting for the long process of constitutional amendment, let us act at once now to end discrimination in our social security system.

The social security years are the most difficult time of life to bear such injustice. It is within our power to end it. Let us do so speedily.

Today, I have introduced an amendment to the Social Security Act, similar to the one introduced on May 8, 1967, by the distinguished Congresswoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] to end some of the most callous discriminations against working women.

Under existing law, a working wife or widow must draw social security benefits either as a wife or a widow or as a worker, whichever is greater. Frequently, that works out so that a husband and wife who have worked, draw lower social security benefits together than do couples in which only the husband has worked.

What is even more unjust, if the salary base on which social security taxes are paid is increased, as the President has asked, the discrimination against such working couples will be even greater.

Under present law, a widow with two minor children, who receives the highest social security benefits, loses $1,296 in benefits if she works and earns the mean average wage for women in covered employment.

Further, her added costs for lunches, transportation to her job, and clothing come out of the meager $2,000 left to her, and this certainly adds up to a cruel and unjust tax against womanhood.

The amendment I propose today would provide these changes to correct these injustices:

First, it would permit working couples to pool their credits and draw higher social security benefits on the basis of such combined credits, if they wish to.

Second, widows with minor children could earn income without reducing monthly benefits.

And, third, husbands, widowers, and children of working women would be entitled to the same benefits now granted to wives, widows, and children of men workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in this House to do everything in their power to see that these just changes in an unjust law be enacted.

RESOLUTION BY THE OHIO REPUBLICAN DELEGATION IN THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 the Ohio Republican delegation in the House unanimously adopted a resolution calling attention to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's failure to enforce the Truth in Negotiating Act, which is so important to the taxpayers of our Nation. The Congress, the administration and the public should know about this resolution. It speaks for itself. Because this is a subject so vitally affecting all Americans, the Ohio Republican delegation has taken this unusual means of bringing it to public attention. As chairman of that delegation, I am reporting to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Senator PROXMIRE, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS CURTIS, ranking minority member of that joint committee, have already examined this issue in recent public hearings. I would like to see their efforts continue, and I would hope that other committees—particularly those dealing with the Defense Department—see fit to pursue this matter as well so the executive branch becomes aware that it is the unalterable will of Congress that the law be enforced and enforced adequately.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a news story from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 23, which prints our resolution in full, giving suitable backgroud material, be inserted in the RECORD. The story follows:

NINETEEN OHIOANS CALL MCNAMARA "LAX"

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—In an unusual action, all 19 Republican congressmen from Ohio asserted yesterday Defense Secretary Robert S. Mc-

Namara "has been lax about protecting the taxpayers."

The lawmakers adopted a resolution urging Congress and the GOP leadership to check into overpricing of war contracts resulting from alleged failure to enforce the 1962 Truth in Negotiating Act.

Ohio's Republican delegation is the largest in the House. Though its members meet regularly to discuss legislative business, this is the first time they have spoken publicly as a group on a major controversy.

McNamara is not accustomed to such criticism. Frequently, he must defend his judgment on Vietnam and other issues, but his great strength has been his image as an economizer—which is seldom challenged.

Rep. Jackson F. Betts, R–8, Findley, presented the resolution to the caucus. He is the party's regional whip in 13 midwestern states, including Ohio.

Rep. William E. Minshall, R–23, Lakewood, explained the resolution and called for its adoption. At a meeting of the defense appropriations subcommittee recently, Minshall questioned a McNamara aide. He reported he was not satisfied with the answers.

Here is the complete text of the resolution:

"The Ohio Republican delegation in the House resolves that rampant waste and inefficiency in the Executive Department must be investigated and congressional action taken to curb this abuse of taxpayers' dollars.

"While examples of mishandling of public funds have been uncovered in nearly every department and agency, the most costly waste takes place in the Department of Defense.

"A recent series of articles in The Plain Dealer by Sanford Watzman disclosed startling facts about overpricing of military contracts.

"Millions of dollars are being wasted each week because Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has been lax about protecting his department and the taxpayers against procurement deficiencies.

"We recommend that the Republican leadership in the House give attention to the urgency of this problem and seek appropriate action in the 90th Congress."

After the caucus, Rep. Donald F. Lukens, R–24, Middletown circulated the resolution among members who were unable to attend. They concurred, and a copy of the resolution was posted in the House press gallery yesterday.

Betts will bring it to the attention of GOP Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford of Michigan.

In the Senate, two Democrats have been firing away at McNamara, Sen. Stephen M. Young of Ohio has inserted The Plain Dealer articles in the Congressional Record. Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin has made them a subject of inquiry by his economy-in-government subcommittee.

THE PANAMA CANAL: OUR DILEMMA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD a very fine, thought-provoking speech by our colleague, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, made on May 25 before the St. Louis World Trade Seminar, an all-day conference sponsored by the World Trade Club of St. Louis, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, and the U.S. Department of Commerce. The subject of Mrs. SULLIVAN'S speech, "The Panama Canal: Our Dilemma," is extremely important. There are few persons, if any, in or out of Congress who are more qualified to speak on this subject than our colleague, Mrs. SULLIVAN. Since 1957 she has been chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, but her interest in the canal, the Canal Zone area and the problems connected with it goes back many years before she came to the Congress. She knows this area, its importance, and she has very sound advice as to the best policy our Government should take to protect our own interests and at the same time deal with complete fairness to the Panamanians. I hope her speech will be read by many people, especially all Members of the House and the Senate.

THE PANAMA CANAL: OUR DILEMMA

(By Congresswoman LEONOR G. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Panama Canal)

It is most appropriate that this meeting today is taking place on water—aboard a ship—for the locale lends some symbolic significance to my reasons for flying in from Washington on a day when the House is in Session. In the 14 years in which I have served in the House of Representatives, I have seldom been away from Washington when the House was in Session unless my absence was very directly related to the work I do on one or another of the two important committees on which I serve in the Congress. This is such an occasion.

Most people in Washington can understand why I serve on the Committee on Banking and Currency and on the Subcommittees on Consumer Affairs, on Housing, and on Small Business. These assignments obviously fit in with my role as Representative for a major urban center and industrial center of the United States. But there is usually some surprise expressed over the fact that I am also the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Chairman of its Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, and a Member of the Subcommittees on the Coast Guard and on the Merchant Marine. What have these things got to do with St. Louis? I am frequently asked that question.

In this gathering here today, I think there is general understanding of the reasons why I have retained during all of these years in the House my membership on the Merchant Marine Committee and my interest in maritime affairs. So far, no ocean shipping seems to be able to navigate its way up the Mississippi River to St. Louis, although recently there have been some suggestions and proposals for constructing shallow draft all-aluminum vessels which could negotiate our great river and which could also maintain a fairly steady keel in ocean traffic. I don't know what success these designs will have, but, of course, all of us here look forward to the day when St. Louis can indeed be considered a port for ocean shipping. In the meantime, however, we are quite aware of the tremendous amount of commercial cargo which originates in the St. Louis area for destinations all around the world, or which comes here from abroad. That is why you are having *your* world trade conference here today and why there are so many people in the industries of St. Louis who are vitally interested in all aspects of world trade. World trade, of necessity, entails shipping and shipping, therefore, definitely becomes of great concern to St. Louis. Of course, many of our exports from St. Louis go by air freight and, in this week which marks the 40th anniversary of the arrival of the Spirit of St. Louis in Paris, with Charles A. Lindbergh at the controls, I would certainly be quite willing to acknowledge that the airplane is a most important factor in foreign trade. Its role will expand as ever-larger aircraft come out of the factories, and as our trade expands, but I don't think the day will ever come when we no longer need a merchant marine on the theory that all the cargoes can go by air.

Actually, the ships which are being built today—the ore carriers and the tankers, particularly—are of such vast size that I think it is safe to say ship capacity has been expanding proportionately in the same degree as airplane capacity. This creates difficult problems, of course, when there are disasters such as the one off the coast of England which fouled the beaches with a thick scum of oil. Ever-greater increases in cargo capacity mean, also, that more ships will no longer be able to use the Panama Canal. That is one of the reasons—but by no means the major reason—why we are now engaged very actively—very seriously—in the development of a new sea level canal to transit ships between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans in Central America. The fact is that even among those ships which are of a size suitable for transit through the Panama Canal, the volume of traffic across the Isthmus of Panama has been growing at such a steady pace that in a few years the delays occasioned by the heavy traffic load will make it worth while for some ships to take a longer route. The larger the ship, the more likely it is that extended delays in transit would justify an alternate route, because of the very heavy tolls that large-capacity ships now pay for use of the Panama Canal.

This is a factor which the officials of the Republic of Panama tend to forget when they agitate for substantial increase in Panama Canal tolls, in the hope that the increased revenue could then be diverted to the Panamanians. The Canal has been a tremendous source of revenue for the treasury of the Republic of Panama and also for the few families which control the wealth of that small country. But, as is well known, there is a prevailing feeling in Panama that all you have to do to increase revenues from the Canal is to raise the tolls anywhere from 50 to 400 percent and the world's shipping would pay the increases without any significant decline in traffic volume.

Just last week I conducted a hearing of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal at which time we heard a very interesting report by a group of economists from the Stanford Research Institute, which has been making a comprehensive study of the relationship between tolls and traffic in the Canal. This study clearly establishes that there *is* a point of no return in any revision of the Canal toll structure. This point would be reached somewhere between a 25% and 50% increase in toll rates.

Of course, any increase in tolls by the Panama Canal would be reflected immediately in increased revenues, but the revenue increases would be short-lived. The shipping interests would have a choice of a number of counter measures which they could take in minimizing the impact of an increase in Panama Canal tolls on their operations.

So the idea now so widespread in Panama that the Canal can be "milked" at an ever-increasing tempo in order to provide more of the good things for the people of Panama—or, at least, and this is more likely, much higher profits for the few families which control the country's economy—turns out to be largely wishful thinking. I don't know how much success we are going to have in selling that idea to the responsible leaders of the Panamanian Government, but

we must certainly do everything we can to get the point across.

Because the industries of St. Louis have a very great stake in the outcome of the negotiations now going forward for the revision of our Treaty of 1903 with Panama, I would like to use this opportunity this afternoon to discuss some of the terribly complex and terribly worrisome aspects of this important issue. I think everyone here who knows anything about my record in the Congress knows I am not an isolationist; quite the contrary. I am strongly in favor of expanded international trade, and I have always supported the efforts of our government through both Republican and Democratic Administrations to help underdeveloped nations to build up their economies so they can take a place in the world commerce which would enable them to bring more of the good things of life to their own people. In connection with the controversy which has been going on for many years now with the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal, I am sometimes pictured as a colonialist or imperialist or something of that nature. One of the Spanish-language newspapers in Panama recently accused me of trying to promote violence and revolution in Panama. Well, of course, that is just nonsense.

I have a responsibility to the Congress of the United States and to the people of the United States in connection with our administration of the Canal Zone and our operation of the Panama Canal that weighs heavily upon me, and I have tried *not* to shirk that responsibility. The facts as I have described them in Committee reports and in speeches in the House of Representatives are not popular with the Panamanians and they also inspire a good deal of skepticism among groups in the United States who feel we have somehow "taken advantage" of a poor little country to impose our own selfish interests upon the Panamanians.

Let us acknowledge the fact that if Teddy Roosevelt were President of the United States today, the chances are very remote that he could have sent a warship down to the Isthmus of Panama, and in effect, wrested that country's independence from Colombia. Things were a little different on the international scene in 1903. Let us acknowledge the fact that we exercised some national muscle in acquiring our present rights in the Canal Zone. We will never be able to obtain the same kind of favorable deal from any country in Central America for the construction of a new sea level canal that we obtained in 1903 for the present Canal. Much has been written about the one-sidedness of the American deal with Panama in 1903, but in the 64 years since that date the benefits and advantages of our action in building the Canal have been anything but one-sided. What we paid originally for the rights to the Canal Zone may not have been enough. What we have paid since then as an annual rental for the Canal Zone also may not have been enough. On the other hand, I think it is safe to say that from the standpoint of the Panamanians, no matter what we might have paid—and no matter how much we were to pay now—it would not be enough. Panama wants the Canal. Any concession which falls short of ownership and control over the Canal would be insufficient as far as the Panamanians are concerned. This is a fact we must live with and recognize.

Under those circumstances, how far do we go in trying to appease an unappeasable appetite? Do we walk out of the Canal Zone and surrender the Canal? That is the only way we would ever convince the Panamanians that we were treating them fairly. They have built all of their nationalistic hopes and aspirations around that 50-mile long engineering marvel.

As long as we are aware of the fact that Panamanian nationalist objectives will never be satisfied short of a complete take-over—a solution no responsible American could possibly tolerate—what alternatives do we have for avoiding continual friction and strife in our administration of the Canal? Must we give in to whatever is demanded short of a full surrender of the Canal? I don't think so.

The President has indicated his willingness to negotiate away our rights "in perpetuity" to the 10-mile-wide Canal Zone, and to give the Panamanian government or its representatives an increasingly larger voice in the operation of the Canal itself. I believe a Treaty based on such concessions would be a disaster for American commerce and a very serious threat to hemispheric defense. Members of the House of Representatives have *no* powers, under the Constitution, to block the ratification of Treaties—that is a power reserved to the Senate only. On the House side, we could block the legislation which would be needed to carry out a ratified Treaty, but this would be mischievous and perhaps dangerous to responsible government. We did not do that in 1955, even though the Treaty negotiated at that time was denounced by nearly all of us in the House as a major blunder which we predicted would reap the very harvest of additional pressures and demands and concessions which now confront us.

So we must now turn to public opinion, to explain the dilemma and to build up public opposition to the kind of treaty now being negotiated, in the hopes of stopping it before it is signed, or blocking its ratification in the Senate. Both are honorable courses.

What are the alternatives to the pending treaty's provisions which I have described as a disaster for American commerce and a threat to hemispheric defense? Well, first of all, of course, we could do nothing. That is not a very good solution—and it certainly is not what I counsel. Three years ago, when inspired riots broke out in Panama, climaxed by a march on the Canal Zone and a state of anarchy on the borders of the Zone, and there was shooting and bloodshed, we were fully within our rights to resist the rioters and to return the fire. The incident which set off the rioting was a clash of youngsters over a Panamanian flag flying over a Canal Zone school. This was no more worthy of an outbreak of shooting than the episode in New York's Central Park recently involving the burning of an American Flag by opponents of the war in Viet Nam. Both episodes were emotional excesses, of the kind which should be handled by firmness in dealing with juvenile irresponsibility.

Even though every objective investigation of the events which led to the rioting in Panama in 1964 cleared the United States Government and the Panama Canal Company of all charges made against us in that episode, we ended up offering to crown the rioters' efforts with some success, in the form of a new treaty which was supposed to satisfy Panamanian aspirations. We did not have to make such an offer, and it was a mistake to do so. But once the offer was made, and accepted by responsible leaders of Panama, we were then committed to the obligation to give *something*.

So we do not have the alternative—morally, that is—to do nothing and give nothing.

What can we give, and what can we do, then, which will resolve this dilemma, short of surrender of rights we dare not surrender?

It is now a principle of national policy that the present Canal must eventually be replaced by one more suited to expanding shipping requirements.

Any concessions we make to the Republic of Panama in connection with the operation of the present Canal should, in my opinion, be part of a multiple arrangement for solution of long-range Canal needs.

The most recent amendments in the treaty with Panama negotiated in 1965, turned over to the Republic of Panama as a gift 25 millions of dollars worth of real estate and industrial facilities which had been in excellent condition and utilized with great effectiveness by the Panama Canal Company. But in the interval since that property was transferred, it was allowed, in most cases, to fall into ruin.

Each time I see the lovely little gem of a hotel which was built in Colon—(the Washington Hotel)—I could cry. Two years after we relinquished it to Panama in the 1955 deal, its swimming pool was no longer usable; now the building itself is practically falling down and rotting away.

Perhaps the last thing in the world which the impoverished slum-dwellers of Colon need today is a fancy hotel with a lovely swimming pool on a spectacular site overlooking the Atlantic Ocean. But wouldn't it have been nice if the neighborhood kids at least had been able to swim in the pool? Wouldn't it have been helpful if the hotel had been operated to provide jobs for the residents, and a pleasant place for tourists who would spend money in the Colon shops, once so prosperous and attractive?

What happened to Hotel Washington happened also to excellent hospitals, and schools, and beautiful ocean-front residences included in the 1955 gifts. So the transfer of more and more real estate solves very little for the Panamanian people and nothing for us.

An *alternative* to further appeasement of this nature would be to persuade Panama to work harder—with our enthusiastic help—to vitalize their own economy and to provide more jobs and incentives for their own people through the development of agriculture and their tourist attractions and other resources.

We have done as much in that direction as the Panamanian government has made it possible for us to do. We could do much, much more, if we had their full encouragement—if there were a willingness there to democratize their economy to a greater degree, to raise wage rates in the Panamanian economy more in line with the excellent wages now paid to those 11,000 Panamanians working for the U.S. Government in the Canal Zone, and help a painfully slowly emerging middle class to win a place within the economy now so completely dominated by a few extremely rich and callously unconcerned families which constitute the Panamanian Oligarchy.

The Minister who guides the Panamanian negotiations for the proposed new treaty identifies himself with that oligarchy and makes no apology for it. In fact, he is proud of it.

This is a group which controls every source of wealth in the Republic. It parcels out the concessions and the franchises and the charters and power bases with complete indifference to the grinding poverty of the mass of the people. Very little trickles down. There is no solid base of mass purchasing power.

The 3500 Americans living and working in the Canal Zone are constantly held up to attack in Panama because they and their families live very well compared to the average Panamanian. Actually, they live like American middle class skilled workers—which they are. The 11,000 Panamanian nationals who also work in the Zone and are able to live there also enjoy good living conditions, but they are extremely vulnerable now as a result of the directions the treaty negotiations are taking.

First of all, most of them are descendants of West Indian laborers brought to Panama to build the canal, and although they pay Panamanian income taxes they are not regarded by the Panamanian government as "real" Panamanians. About 10,000 of them are employed in the auxiliary services connected with the canal operations—the piers,

the commissaries, and other service activities. The Panamanian negotiators are determined to have these Panama Canal Company service activities turned over to local businessmen to be operated as private enterprise. If they succeed, the Panamanian nationals now employed in the Zone will either lose their jobs to "real" Panamanians—and have to move out of their present attractive homes, or else they will have their present high wages reduced to the prevailing Panamanian wage scales, and will not be able to *afford* to live in their present homes. Either way, this large segment of Panamanian nationals would lose out as a result of their own government's policies, just as happened in 1955 when a number of other Panama Canal Company service operations were turned over to Panamanian private enterprise.

I have been unable to find out what would happen to the excellent housing which now exists in the Canal Zone if the Zone goes back to Panama. Would it, too, be turned over to Panamanian insiders to be rented or sold to businessmen, professional people, and other well-to-do local people, or would it just be allowed to deteriorate as happened to the properties turned over in 1955? No one involved in the negotiations has an answer to this question. I am convinced therefore that those Panamanians who need good housing will not get it.

Looking at the realities of the situation which confronts us, I feel that we must be prepared to swallow our pride and a little of our self-respect in the Canal Zone and give some substantial concessions to the leaders of the Republic of Panama. The current President of that country is probably the best, most responsible leader Panama has had in many, many years. As a political leader, he must produce some results in these critical negotiations, or else he will be overturned in a year by opposition elements capitalizing on discord and mass misery in that seething little Republic. We committed ourselves to some concessions in 1964 when we offered to renegotiate the existing treaty.

But unless the United States is prepared to say that it has brutally exploited and cruelly injured the Panamanian people for most of a century—and I certainly am not willing to concede any such thing—our concessions should be reasonable and rational and based on concessions of equal importance in return.

We need the rights in a new treaty to build a new sea level canal. Whether that canal should be built at the site of the present canal, or along the Costa Rica—Nicaragua border, or near Colombia, or elsewhere, is now being determined through test borings and surveys. But on the chance that it might well belong in Panama, we should couple our negotiations for a revision of the present treaty on the existing canal with concurrent negotiations and a concurrent treaty for rights for a new sea level canal.

We may not need those rights from Panama; we may decide to build elsewhere. But, just as we had treaty rights to several canal sites before proceeding with the present canal, we should have alternatives for a future canal. And Panama can give us such an alternative.

When, as and if a new canal is in construction, definite terms can be extended to turn over to Panama as much as, or all of, the Canal Zone not needed for a new canal operation.

We should insist on something for something. And, if we don't get that, or can't get it, then we should be in no hurry to make changes in the present treaty. This is my view, and I think it is shared by nearly every Member of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, I do not know how many Senators—who will have the power to act on any new treaty—know or care very much about the situation.

That is why I have taken every possible opportunity to try to alert American business and industry to their stake in the resolution of this controversy.

Complicating the problem is the fact that we are also negotiating a third treaty with Panama, in addition to one for the existing canal and one for a new sea level canal. The third one would deal with the use of our military bases there for the defense not only of the canal and of Panama, but of the entire hemisphere. This is of vital importance to us, and to the rest of the Americas, of course. Panama has always been guaranteed the full protection of the United States armed forces, and has never had to maintain any army of its own. I suspect there is a strong tendency there to try to exact as high a price as possible for treaty rights intended to increase our ability to defend the rest of the hemisphere, and this could very well put pressures on our canal rights that would be difficult to resist. If we give in, we may find it only another installment on an unpayable obligation—an international equivalent of the "balloon note" in shady credit transactions.

If Panama can grab a controlling, or an equal, or even a very large minority interest, in the operation of the present canal before a new one is constructed and in operation, American businessmen—and their customers—all of us—will pay dearly for transportation of the goods we buy and sell in international trade. For Panama seeks the "quick buck" on the canal's tolls—raise them as high as the traffic will bear and divie up the money among the owners of the Panamanian economy.

In the short range, most ships using the canal would pay the higher tolls, but they would soon begin to take alternate routes, until canal revenues are less than they are now. We have studies to establish this pattern very clearly. True, they are only projections rather than certainties, but the projections are based on economic data which can stand critical scrutiny.

What can you do to forestall a drastic increase in your shipping costs through ever-higher Panama Canal tolls? Let me interject here that the toll structure has been virtually unchanged since the opening of the canal more than half a century ago. The present tolls are by no means low—some bulk carriers pay as much as $45,000 for the 13-hour trip through the locks; the average is about $5,100. Ever-increasing use of the canal has increased revenues, but the canal does not make money. Maintenance, which the Panamanians consider a waste of money, is constant and meticulous; after half a century the canal is bigger, better and more efficient than ever, and we are still putting new money back into its improvement. We have never gotten our investment out of it. We are not concerned over *making money* out of this wonder of engineering genius; instead our interest is in speeding the delivery of the world's raw materials and trade goods. And in that objective, the Panama Canal has been magnificently successful.

I asked what you could do to help in retaining the efficiency and effectiveness of this great canal, in which all of you as businessmen have such an important stake. The answer is a simple one: exercise your citizenship rights.

If what I have said persuades you we must not ratify a give-away treaty, then let as many Senators as you can reach know how you feel about it. And let the President know, too. He has many great problems bearing heavily upon him; he cannot devote endless hours to each one. But he is a great accumulator of information and he is interested in what businessmen think and say and feel. And he is, above all, a patriot.

Many of you have occasion to see him or people who are close to him. Many of you have occasion to see and talk to Senators from other states who are not nearly as aware of this problem as Stuart Symington and Ed Long. Talk to them—and to Symington and Long, too.

If enough citizens who have a stake in our international commerce will speak up and make their voices heard on this issue of the Panama Canal—knowing that 65% of all cargoes transiting the Canal are either to or from the United States—we can save this great resource for America and for world commerce. Otherwise, like a little surgical clamp shutting off a great artery, Panama could strangle the long-range usefulness of the Canal in a short-run grab for the fast dollar.

Don't let it happen!

REYNOLD BENNETT COMMENTS ON "THE CRISIS IN PATENTS"

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I know, are concerned with the preservation of the American patent system as guaranteed by the Constitution in article I, section 8, clause 8 thereof, and therefore, are following closely any comment on the recent report of the President's Commission on the Patent System.

In that connection, they will be interested in a recent article on the subject by my constituent and friend, Reynold Bennett.

Mr. Bennett is a lawyer, a vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, and—together with Frederic O. Hess, president of the Selas Corp., and an engineer—he has written extensively in this area.

Their most recent article "The Crisis in Patents," appeared in Management Review for May 1967, and I commend it to my colleagues for a well-analyzed statement of the problem:

THE CRISIS IN PATENTS

(By Reynold Bennett and Frederic O. Hess)

The patent systems of the world are currently in a state of crisis. Obtaining airtight patent rights is a complex and time consuming business: It is posing a serious threat to technological innovation and could lead to a drastic curtailment of foreign investment and trade.

The U.S. Patent Office is probably the most efficient in the world, but even so it takes at least two to three years to issue a patent. West German inventors cannot get a patent in less than five years, and the Japanese take at least seven years.

But that's not all. Today the world's inventors and their collaborators look for legal protection to over 80 different national patent systems, each with its own policies, procedures and pitfalls. A creative American innovator who wants to guard his product rights often has to file applications in at least a dozen national offices in almost as many different languages, and at an ultimate cost of thousands of dollars. Individual corporations, the chief patent pursuers, must often lay out as much as a million dollars a year to secure concomitant rights. All this effort, time and expense is necessary in order to obtain a limited 17-year patent monopoly in

the United States, which is comparable to rights elsewhere.

Yet in these times of exploding technology and expanding world trade, patents are, and will continue to be, the main spur to invention. So in spite of the many requirements placed on inventors and their assignees, there is a vast and growing amount of patent paper filing going on in the world today—more than half a million applications annually. The mass of patent paperwork is only partly caused by the explosion of new technologies; much of it is a result of duplication. U.S. Patent Commissioner Edward J. Brenner reports that today "about 50 per cent of the applications filed annually throughout the world are simply duplicate or multiple filings of the same invention."

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

Late in 1966 this situation prompted a specially appointed President's Commission on the Patent System to recommend that the U.S. and other nations "promote and direct interim steps toward the ultimate goal—a universal patent [including] international harmonization of patent practices." And the Soviet Union, eager to step up its invention output and technological position, has also expressed a willingness to meet patent problems on a multinational basis.

Since its inception in 1883, the so-called Paris Convention has been developing as the basic document for international patent order. Seventy-four countries now adhere to it, including the U.S.S.R., which joined in 1965. The primary value of the Convention is that inventors have 12 months in which to apply to other countries for the same patent sought in the initial country. During that period no one can encroach on the patent.

The trouble is that almost one-third of the 120 member countries of the U.N. do not belong to the Paris Convention—mainly because they have no internal facilities to administer any competent patent system. This poses a worldwide threat to anyone pouring money into research in the hope of maintaining general protection for resulting patent rights.

Steps are now being taken to improve patent protection in new nations; and at its Stockholm meeting in June 1967 the BIRPI (Bureau for the Protection of Intellectual Property), the Paris Convention's working arm, will probably move to create an International Intellectual Property Organization to bring into some kind of association those countries that do not now adhere to the Paris Convention.

For the past few years government officials, as well as research and patent experts throughout Europe and in other highly industrialized areas, have also been seeking solutions to the patent crisis on a regional basis. A prime example is the uniform approach proposed by the six Common Market countries. The Nordic Patent System, including Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland, is slated to take full effect this year. Also, the 12 nations comprising the African and Malagasy Industrial Property Organization have adopted a uniform patent law for themselves. During the latter part of 1966, Mr. Denis Ekani, Director General of the African group, spent a month in the U.S. with the object of assuring key American officials and business and investment organizations that patents and research know-how would be duly honored in the countries under his jurisdiction.

IMPETUS FROM THE UNITED STATES

But the biggest impetus for international patent reform undoubtedly comes from individuals and groups in the United States, because Americans account for almost one-third of the half million patent applications being filed every year around the world and the stakes are high. Billions of dollars are poured into research in the hope of pioneering and patenting the kind of breakthrough that gave rise to the light bulb and the telephone.

For the past few years J. Herbert Hollomon, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, and Edward J. Brenner, the U.S. Commissioner of Patents, have been selling the idea of a world patent incentive system to private and official audiences in the United States, Europe, and developing nations.

Nor have efforts been confined to international solutions. U.S. Patent Office procedures have been streamlined and the bureau's corps of examiners has been strengthened. Microfilm, microform and other new techniques have been brought into bureau operations, along with computer and mechanical memory operations for registering and gleaning the information needed on many Patent Office questions.

ASKING THE QUESTIONS . . .

But streamlining of national patent systems is not enough. The examining patent offices of the world look at the application and try to answer such complex questions as "Was the result of the applicant's work 'unobvious' and an 'advance of the art'?" Today most of the answers can be reached only by skilled manpower using expanding information retrieval and documentation systems.

Mr. Brenner recently put it this way: "The task of translating a complicated 100-page electronic computer invention into a dozen or more languages or organizing these data into an equal number of special forms, and of separate processing, searching and examination of these cases by numerous staffs of highly trained personnel amounts to an incredible waste of creative talent in our generation."

. . . AND FINDING THE ANSWERS

Automated procedures can help. For almost a dozen years now, ICIREPAT (International Committee on Information Retrieval Among Examining Patent Offices) has been working to automate searching examination. But so far its activities have been limited to the chemical field, largely for technological reasons. It is estimated that about 5 or 10 per cent of the search files could be mechanized by 1972—but only if enough money is made available.

As an example of direct U.S. action, a series of bilateral exchanges of search results is being accomplished with a number of countries, notably West Germany. During the past year the U.S. Patent Office conducted an experimental exchange of information with the Munich "Patentamt" on 2,000 pairs of cross-filed cases. The ultimate ideal is that neither office will need to duplicate the other's complete search.

This search for true novelty and inventiveness is essential to the kind of examination that precedes the issuing of a strong patent in countries like the United States, West Germany, Japan and others. On the other hand, some important industrialized nations, such as France, Italy and Belgium, rely essentially on a relatively routine registration system for patent issuance. Still others, like Switzerland, have a mixed system. But a patent granted on the basis of examination almost always has the most immediate, and perhaps lasting, legal strength. The big problem confronting the examining patent offices is the almost prohibitive cost of maintaining search facilities.

The ultimate solution must come from the pooling of resources. Moves in this direction are already under way. For example, the existing International Patent Institute at The Hague is already carrying out searches and examinations for requesting nations and organizations. The U.N. is presently encouraging The Hague Institute to devise a system to conduct its search and examination work on a regional, and perhaps more available, basis.

Another front along which the United States and other nations can cooperate is in the blending of invention classification systems maintained by world patent offices. But progress along this line is complicated by the fact that there are different approaches to classification. For instance, one patent system will classify a new type of automobile clutch simply on the basis of its end use, while a system maintaining a structure viewpoint (like the U.S. Patent Office) will categorize the item according to whether a friction mechanism or hydraulic approach is utilized.

NEEDED: 700 MAN-YEARS

It has been almost ten years since an international patent classification (IPC) was recommended by a Council of Europe Convention, and still the work involved in developing subdivisions of this system is nowhere near completion. It has been estimated that even if the complete subdivisions were available, it would take the U.S. Patent Office 700 man-years of professional and clerical time, and cost more than $12 million to reclassify all U.S. and foreign patents into the IPC. It would take from 10 to 20 years to complete the job. Still, the work continues on a cooperative basis, inspiring confidence that someday a world patent classification system will become an operational reality.

David Sarnoff, Chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, described new electronic devices that might be joined to remote computers to carry out almost immediate patent information, creating ". . . a world patent center that could receive and process applications from inventors everywhere."

Hovering over the world of tomorrow will be high capacity satellites synchronized with large patent data processing and information storage systems. Through a desk instrument the inventor and his patent attorney will be able to submit their application to the international patent office. Within a matter of days—not years—the inventor might be informed that his patent has been filed and issued in Washington as well as in any other office adhering to the world system.

KEEP AQABA OPEN WHILE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE SETTLES ISSUE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following telegram to the President concerning the Near East crisis:

The present crisis in the Middle East, including the blockade by the United Arab Republic of the Gulf of Aqaba, is a threat to the continued maintenance of international peace and security. The matters in issue are essentially legal.

As such they should be submitted to the International Court of Justice at The Hague for adjudication along with other outstanding disputes between Israel and the Arab nations. Both Israel and the UAR are members of the Court. The United States, in joint effort with other great powers, should use its influence to persuade Israel and the UAR to submit the dispute to the Court for impartial third party adjudication.

Pending Court decision, the great powers should preserve free passage through the gulf in accordance with the established rules of law. Should neither the UAR or Israel be

willing to refer the matter to the Court—and accept its decision as binding—the United States should request the Security Council or the General Assembly of The United Nations to seek an advisory opinion from the Court on the issue of free passage through the gulf for Israeli commerce and other outstanding disputes. The declaratory judgment could then be the basis for a settlement.

Acceptance of this proposal would demonstrate our determination to settle international conflicts under the rule of law instead of on the basis of armed force or political expediency. Military defeat is often the first ingredient to renewed aggression. The course I propose would involve no loss of sovereignty, power or prestige through the use of force.

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY'S BIG INVESTMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a tremendous continuing effort is being made today by American industry to educate, train, and retrain employees and potential employees and to extend their programs to our least-educated and least-skilled workers.

Especially because of the attention paid to Federal Government programs in recent years, regrettably redundant, overfinanced, and ineffective, the huge investment by industry in training does not get the consideration in merits. It is almost inconceivable that the Federal governmental programs are administered from Washington, and certainly propagandized, without reference to these private programs. Fortunately at the local level those charged with carrying out the Federal programs are not quite as provincial as their chiefs isolated in Washington, D.C.

In a brief, but comprehensive, article by Sylvia Porter in the Washington Evening Star of May 24, these private efforts are described very well.

The article points out that $18 billion is now being spent annually by business. This dwarfs the $265 million the Federal Government will spend this year. It has long been clear that the private corporations is one of the Nation's best vocational educators and now this training is being opened up to more and more workers. Chase Manhattan Bank, for example, is training potential high school dropouts. Xerox is training unemployed men, many of whom have police records. The article provides other illustrations.

All of this points to two major legislative and administrative bottlenecks: First, the Johnson administration obstructive tactics in sidetracking the Human Investment Act; second, the similar tactics which prevent the jobs available statistical series from being developed and utilized as required in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article referred to in the RECORD at this point:

ON-JOB TRAINING INCREASING
(By Sylvia Porter)

A 19-year-old who spent most of his teens in and out of detention homes for youthful offenders and who was failing four out of five subjects in high school, this year signed up for a special part-time job-training program at New York's Chase Manhattan Bank. He now is learning to be a teller—and is planning to continue his education past high school under Chase's tuition refund plan.

A young Negro girl, victim of a broken home and getting poor grades in high school, is enrolled in another training program at J. I. Case & Co. in Racine, Wis. After high school graduation in June, she plans to attend a state college.

A 37-year-old prisoner in Danbury, Conn., is working days at the Dictograph Manufacturing Co. as a hearing aid repairman, after completing a job training course given by the company within the prison. He is supporting his family with his earnings, plans to continue working for Dictograph after his release.

These are success stories emerging from a stepped-up effort by private industry to provide education and training—and later full-time jobs—for school dropouts, unskilled, illiterate and other handicapped workers.

Industry is spending an estimated $18 billion a year to educate, to train and re-train employes and potential employes, and most significant, it is extending these programs to the least-educated, least-skilled workers.

This industry investment dwarfs the $265 million the Federal government will spend on vocational and technical training for 6.5 million students this year.

It long has been clear that the private corporation is among the nation's best-equipped vocational educators. To indicate how this field of on-the-job training is opening up:

has launched a training program for potential high school dropouts. Trainees receive individual counseling, attend lectures, take field trips to banking and investment institutions and work three hours a day at $1.86 an hour for as long as 21 months. Most of the students who have completed the course are now full-time employes.

In Chicago, Carson Pirie Scott, the big department store, is conducting another education-training program for actual or would-be dropouts. Two students fill a single job: while one works, the other attends school. Since 1961, when the program began, the work-study idea has spread to 31 Chicago companies.

In Racine the J. I. Case Co. is helping dozens of potential dropouts to finish high school by employing them as part-time trainees in a wide variety of fields.

In Rochester, N.Y., the Xerox Corp. last year launched a 19-week training program for unemployed men, many of whom had police records and were not more than "functionally literate." Trainees are given classroom instruction informal counseling, remedial reading, arithmetic and job training.

In Wilmington, Del., Du Pont has been training workers in 14 job categories from carpenter to chemical operator. Since 1959, 15,000 employes have completed more than 45,000 courses and Du Pont now is offering its series of 110 programmed courses to other companies as well.

The payoff for trainees, in steady employment, higher wages and increased self-respect is obvious. But the payoff to employers and to the U.S. economy may be even greater in increased productivity, in helping avert skill shortages, and in breaking the tragic cycle of poverty, illiteracy and joblessness.

In Manhattan, the Chase Manhattan Bank

WELL DONE, MR. PORTER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, during the past week, the New Bedford Standard-Times carried an editorial praising the career of the Honorable William J. Porter, who has been nominated by President Johnson to be our Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

Ambassador Porter, who is a resident of Westport, a lovely seacoast town in my congressional district, has worked tirelessly for 30 years in the Foreign Service of our country. I have the highest respect for his expertise and understanding, and I am sure he will be a credit to our country in his post in Korea as he has been in his many earlier assignments in years past. Now, when relations in Asia are particularly crucial, Mr. Porter will bring to his assignment the knowledge and experience which is so necessary if we are to acquit ourselves creditably on that troubled continent.

Mr. Speaker, the New Bedford Standard-Times, a large responsible and influential newspaper in my district, has editorialized:

WELL DONE, MR. PORTER

Greater New Bedford residents will feel justifiable personal pride in learning that William J. Porter of Westport has been nominated by President Johnson to be U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

This latest professional advancement for Mr. Porter climaxes a 30-year career in the U.S. foreign service, during which his assignments have taken him into numerous countries, from Algeria to South Vietnam. He has acquired an outstanding reputation for patience and competence, qualities highly necessary for successful diplomacy in today's delicate world balance.

The fact that Mr. Porter, recognized as a specialist in Arab affairs, was sent to Saigon and eventually placed in charge of the South Vietnam pacification program, is indicative of the confidence that the federal government places in him. It can be expected that he will represent this country ably in Seoul, another capital of the most critical importance to Washington.

It is an assignment most assuredly merited.

INTRODUCING BILL CALLING FOR RESTRICTIONS ON THE IMPORTS OF MINK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my district and from a meeting held with the mink ranchers in southeastern Wisconsin and a group from northern Illinois. These men spent over 2 hours telling me the

seriousness of the problem they are facing. It is evident that, unless something is done immediately, irreparable damage can be done to this industry in the United States. The mink ranchers cannot wait even a few months for relief from cheap imports. Relief from such imports must be given now.

I was shocked to learn that the representatives of this Government have shown an utter lack of cooperation with the mink ranchers in their attempt to save this industry which they have built through their own efforts and promoted through their own funds. Here is an industry which does not receive 1 cent of public money in subsidy or support of any kind. Certainly, the least they could expect would be the active support of their Government representatives abroad who seem more interested in promoting the foreign mink industry than the U.S. mink industry. It is unconscionable to tax these men to support a government which seems intent upon destroying their economic future. Some 1,000 mink farms and 3,000 jobs in Wisconsin are at stake as well as $54,354,000 in capital investment and $46,323,000 in gross sales in my State.

I have today introduced a bill calling for restrictions on the imports of mink and I trust that my colleagues in this body will join me in assuring its early passage.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR PEACE THROUGH LAW SPONSORED SHOWINGS OF "THE WAR GAME," THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following letter, which has been sent to all Members of Congress, inviting them to attend special congressional showings of "The War Game" Thursday afternoon on the House and Senate sides of the Capitol:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR
PEACE THROUGH LAW,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We write to invite you and your staff to attend a special Congressional showing of a unique film, *The War Game*—a work which raises issues of direct concern to those responsible for decisions regarding war and peace.

This forty-seven minute film was awarded the 1967 Academy Award as the most outstanding documentary of the year. Many who have seen *The War Game* feel it to be the most dramatic single film in their experience.

The movie depicts and explains the effects and consequences of nuclear war. As Life magazine remarked in praising the work, "*The War Game* is neither a pacifist document nor propaganda for better civil defense . . . the film is a work of truth."

We strongly believe *The War Game* should be seen by *all* Americans. Yet as the film discusses matters which bear directly on the business and policy of this nation, we believe it is particularly important that it be seen by members of Congress and government officials.

We urge you, therefore, to attend a free showing of the film on Thursday, June 1, 1967. For House members and their staffs, the film will be shown at the House Caucus Room, Room 346, Cannon Building, at 3:00 p.m. For Senate members and their staffs, the film will be shown at the Senate Auditorium, Room G 38 New Senate Office Building, at 4:30 p.m. A representative of the Atomic Energy Commission has been invited to offer comments and answer questions following each showing of the film.

The War Game is a remarkable, important film. We urge you and your staff to attend.

APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to establish an Apostle Islands National Lakeshore.

Located in northern Wisconsin, on the southern shore of Lake Superior, this is the only area of the Great Lakes that combines shorelines, islands, marshes, and highlands in one complex. This beautiful and unspoiled backyard of our great Midwest, only hours away from heavily populated areas, is readily accessible to millions of Midwesterners and offers the visitor a complete variety of recreational opportunities, such as hunting, fishing, boating, camping, hiking, and nature study.

The 57,511-acre project would include three sections:

First. Mainline section: Over 30 miles of winding shoreline, extending from Red Cliff Bay just north of Bayfield to near Cornucopia, Wis. A scenic road would wind through the approximately half-mile-wide area with turnover points from which to view the islands offshore. A hiking trail would follow the shore. The picturesque bays would provide various facilities for camping, nature study, beachcombing, and boating.

Second. The 21-island section: Including all but Madeline Island which is already substantially developed. The islands, to be kept as virtual wilderness, would provide minimum dock facilities, Adirondack-type shelters, and fireplaces.

Third. The Bad River-Kakagon Slough area: 10,000 acres of wild rice marsh just east of Ashland. It includes miles of navigable channels and abounds in deer, bear, beaver, otter, and 240 species of birds. Fishing is excellent. Facilities for hiking, fishing, hunting, and camping would be provided.

The natural beauty of this site, with its magnificent white sand beaches and wild islands, covered with luxurious growth of mixed hardwoods and conifers should be preserved as a great natural resource. In addition, the recreational activities of such a national park will also bolster the economy of northern Wisconsin which has been a tremendous decline in its principal industries. Senator GAYLORD NELSON, who has introduced a similar bill in the Senate, said:

We have exhausted many of the resources of this area, but its natural beauty remains. Now it's up to us to save the last resource—natural beauty—and use it for the aesthetic and economic benefit of millions of people for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, here is a fine opportunity to preserve the precious assets of one of the most scenic areas of our country. The late President Kennedy, when he visited northern Wisconsin in September 1963, was moved by the striking wild beauty of the Apostle Islands and the lakeshore. He said:

Lake Superior, the Apostle Islands, the Bad River area, are all unique. They are worth improving for the benefit of sportsmen and tourists. In an area of congestion and pollution, man-made noise, and dirt, Lake Superior has a beauty that millions can enjoy. These islands are part of our American heritage. In a very real sense they tell the story of the development of this country. The vast marshes of the Bad River are a rich resource providing a home for a tremendous number, and varied number, of wild animals. In fact, the entire northern Great Lakes area, with its vast inland sea, its 27,000 lakes, and thousands of streams, is a central and significant part of the fresh water assets of this country, and we must act to preserve these assets.

CHANGE THE COLOR OF OUR MONEY?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives an article entitled "Change the Color of our Money?" written by Mrs. Frances Spatz Leighton for the May 21, 1967, issue of This Week magazine.

For many years Mrs. Leighton was Washington correspondent for the American Weekly and now writes for This Week magazine. She is author and coauthor of a number of books about the Washington scene, including her highly entertaining book about "The Johnson Wit" which was published in 1965. Fran, as she is fondly known by her many friends, also writes for the Chicago's American, a leading newspaper in my own city of Chicago.

Her informative article indicates that from time to time suggestions have been made by both private citizens and officials in Government to change the color of our currency. Mrs. Leighton brings us up to date on current views on this proposal, and because of its significance to all of us who use U.S. currency daily, I would like the article to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

[From This Week magazine, May 21, 1967]

CHANGE THE COLOR OF OUR MONEY?

(By Frances Spatz Leighton)

"Please don't think I'm a nut," a man recently wrote to the Secretary of the Treas-

ury, "but if you really want to help the economy of the country, just call in all the present green paper money and change it to different colors.

"There must be millions in safe deposit boxes or hidden in homes by people who haven't paid taxes and keep their assets in cash. Colored money would bring it out of hiding."

The Secretary did not think the man from Winchester was a "nut." In fact, he filed the letter respectfully alongside those of many other Americans—in high places and low, in politics and out—who have been campaigning for years for changes in the color of America's paper money. (Leave the current $1 bill green, say—but color the $5 bill yellow, the $10 bill red, the $20 bill blue, etc.)

For the letter hit upon only one of many valid reasons for a change in the color of the currency—as Canada, to cite just one example among many, many countries, has done since 1870.

1. *Colored money would make it easier to identify the different denominations at a glance.*

2. *It would help people with poor eyesight to identify the amount by the color.*

3. *It would help businessmen make change in a hurry.*

4. *It would save millions of tedious hours spent in sorting and re-sorting money in banks and other cashiers' cages.*

5. *It would save the public millions of dollars a year which are lost in incorrect change.*

It was just such a "wrong change" mistake, 20 years ago, that led Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers of Massachusetts to open the first crusade to change the color of money. A cab driver had given her change for $1 instead of for $10. She went to the Secretary of the Treasury—John W. Snyder—on August 22, 1947, and strongly urged him to use his authority to change the colors of the various denominations so they would be easier to distinguish. She reminded him that, in 1929, Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon had used the power vested in *him* to cut the size of paper money.

After waiting over a year and getting no action, Mrs. Rogers introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, "To provide . . . new and different colors for each denomination." Congress treated her bill lightly. Not only was she a woman but a Republican in a Democratic Administration. But undaunted, she re-introduced her bill on the first day of her next term. The following day a male colleague, August H. Andresen of Minnesota, rose to chide her from the floor, and an amusing exchange followed:

Mr. ANDRESEN: That is what they did in Russia and Germany and a great many other countries. Does the gentlewoman think we should do what they are doing

Mrs. ROGERS: The gentleman can get no Communistic tinge from this. As a matter of fact it would help the United States to find the Communists. In many instances their money is hidden money. This legislation would bring it out of hiding . . .

Mr. ANDRESEN: What color would the gentlewoman have for the new money?

Mrs. ROGERS: Different colors. It could follow the same system as our United States postage stamps so that it would be easier for those who are making change. . . One day I gave a $10 bill to a taxi driver for a $1 bill. He wanted to return it to me, but I told him to keep it. So I made a mistake. Others have made mistakes in making change.

Mr. ANDRESEN: I am sorry to hear that the gentlewoman has made a mistake.

OTHERS IN CONGRESS HAD THE SAME IDEA

That ended the matter until February of 1960 when Congressman James Roosevelt, son of the late President, advocated (but did not introduce) a bill to make two changes in paper money—one was to add tiny perforations or an embossment on each bill so the blind could identify money by touch. And second was a plan to color key the money.

Then the next year big things happened—or almost happened. A new woman Treasurer of the United States, Elizabeth Rudel Smith, called for a change from greenbacks to different-colored money for each denomination. She, too, had been victimized in getting change in a cab one dark night.

She said, " I do feel that it is easy to become confused where there is a single color used. People, of course, have the number to look at but under different lighting conditions and with failing eyesight many people have reported to me that they have given somebody a $20 bill and thought it was $10."

Five years ago, asked whether she felt the change-over to multicolored currency would slow down counterfeiting, Mrs. Smith replied:

"The Secret Service, 20 years ago when recommendations of this kind were first introduced, were very much in favor of the multicolored currency. But now, with the advance in equipment to reproduce almost anything, they are of the opinion it would not make any particular difference. I understand they feel it would slow down the do-it-yourself counterfeiter but not the professional counterfeiter."

COUNTERFEITING IS TOO RARE TO BE A FACTOR

A recent check shows the Secret Service still feels that way. A spokesman added that the total loss to the public in counterfeit notes in 1966 was only $933,000, compared with $40,000,000,000 circulating.

Mrs. Smith's mail ran 4-to-1 in favor of the change. Many of her letters came from cashiers in stores and restaurants, who had to make good on the big bills they gave away by mistake. Many newspaper editorials praised her. But alas, after she had been in office only 16 months, and before she had really had a chance to fight the matter to a conclusion, Mrs. Smith retired because of ill health.

Her successor, Kathryn O'Hay Granahan, did not share Mrs. Smith's enthusiasm—"I feel our money in its present form is a tradition and I would not like to see it changed."

Case dismissed.

But now Mrs. Granahan, too, is gone from the Treasury scene—she resigned last November. How will a new Treasurer feel about it?

Acting Treasurer W. T. Howell cites the reasoning of Henry J. Holtzclaw, Director of the Bureau of Engraving, as his own for opposing a change. He told THIS WEEK, "Mr. Holtzclaw feels people will tend to rely on color and not look at the denomination. This is a danger because various chemicals can be used by counterfeiters to change the color and enable a bill of a small denomination to assume the color of a larger denomination. The color now used is more difficult to counterfeit than other colors. However, if it is changed by law or by the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury, we will of course abide by the law."

YOU CAN TELL CONGRESS YOU WANT A CHANGE

And it may well be changed, according to three Administration leaders. Two are ranking members of the House Banking and Currency Committee which considers all legislative matters affecting banking and the legal tender—Frank Annunzio (D., Ill.), and Thomas L. Ashley (D., Ohio). The third, Senator Howard W. Cannon (D., Nev.), is a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, which is concerned with the business welfare of the nation.

In discussions with This Week, all three expressed great interest in the subject and willingness to sponsor legislation if the public wants it.

Congressman Annunzio said, "I like the idea. I will talk with Henry Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, about it and I will poll my Committee. I will also talk with bankers who must handle millions of dollars in currency every day to see how a change of this kind would improve their system."

Congressman Ashley went a step further and promised to introduce legislation based on the outcome of the ballot on this page. "I feel the circulation of This Week is great enough to provide an impressive sampling of the will of the American people," Ashley said. "If the results of This Week's poll warrant it, I plan to introduce a bill directing the Treasurer to print money in different colors for each denomination. The change need only be made in the $5, $10 and $20 bills. The $1 bill, most-used, could remain green. This would require development of only three new inks, and should not be very expensive."

The strongest statement came from Senator Cannon: "I don't believe there is anything sacred about the size or color of the American dollar," he said. "Certainly, if it can be established that there is a better way to serve the people, the Congress should look into it. I definitely would support such an inquiry—if there is substantial public demand for it—and I would support any legislation resulting from it that might increase public convenience."

An earlier This Week poll (January 15, 1967) has already resulted in the introduction of a bill to create more 3-Day Weekends. If any of you readers would now like to change the color of your money—or feel strongly against such a change—here's your chance to say so.

Clip and mark the ballot and send it to This Week. We cannot acknowledge letters but we will forward them, along with the tabulated results of the ballots, to the three interested members of Congress.

EDITOR, THIS WEEK MAGAZINE
P.O. Box 455
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11202

Concerning the idea of changing money to make each denomination a different color, I vote:

Yes— No—

Name
Address
City State ZIP Code

YES

"I don't believe there is anything sacred about the size or color of the American dollar. If it can be changed to better serve the public, Congress should look into it."
—Senator HOWARD W. CANNON (D., Nev.).

NO

"People will rely on color and not look at the denomination. Counterfeiters will try to color-change small bills into large ones—and the present green is more difficult to counterfeit."
—W. T. HOWELL,
Acting Treasurer of the United States.

MAYBE

"If the results of This Week's poll warrant it, I plan to introduce a bill directing the Treasurer to print money in different colors for each denomination."
—Representative THOMAS L. ASHLEY, (D., Ohio).

ARCHBISHOP CODY ELEVATED TO RANK OF CARDINAL BY POPE PAUL VI

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, millions of Chicagoans are tremendously pleased and delighted with the announcement by Pope Paul VI that our own Archbishop John Patrick Cody is among the 27 new cardinals which he named yesterday.

Archbishop Cody came to Chicago in 1965 from New Orleans. During his tenure as archbishop of New Orleans, he became world renowned for his courageous support of racial integration in the New Orleans parochial schools.

On June 16, 1965, he was named to head the Chicago Archdiocese, and in the 21 months that he has been serving in this post, Archbishop Cody has won the hearts of millions of people in the Chicagoland area, non-Catholics as well as Catholics, for his keen insight and his humane and dedicated efforts to resolve the pressing social, moral, educational, and religious problems that confront us today.

As the Congressman of the Seventh District of Illinois, and as the general chairman of the Villa Scalabrini Development Fund which has raised over $2 million for the establishment of the Italian Old Peoples' Home owned by the Archdiocese of Chicago, I congratulate Cardinal-elect John P. Cody and wish him good health and long tenure as a prince of the church.

It is my pleasure also to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in yesterday's Chicago Tribune hailing the elevation of Archbishop Cody as a great honor both for Cody and the city of Chicago. The article follows:

APPOINTMENT CALLED HONOR TO CODY, CITY—CIVIC LEADERS HERE EXPRESS JOY

Chicago leaders in many fields termed the elevation of Archbishop John P. Cody to cardinal yesterday as an honor for Chicago and for a deserving man.

"His appointment is an honor not only to his flock but to all of the people of the metropolitan area," Mayor Daley said. "As Mayor of Chicago, and personally, I congratulate him and look forward to his great leadership in the future."

Mayor Daley said that Archbishop Cody, in his two years here, has "impressed everyone as a man of great courage, gentle kindness, resolute determination, and deep understanding."

A SOURCE OF JOY

Rabbi Seymour Cohen of Anshe Emet synagog, 3760 Pine Grove av., president of the Synagog Council of America, called the elevation "a source of joy" to all Chicagoans.

"He has been a tower of strength in improving interreligious cooperation and better understanding between the various racial and ethnic groups that make up our great city," he said.

The Rev. Raymond Goedert, a notary of the marriage tribunal at the chancery office, said the Association of Chicago Priests sent a congratulatory telegram to the Archbishop.

"I was thrilled to hear the news," said Morgan J. Murphy, chairman of the executive committee of Commonwealth Edison company and active in many civic affairs.

"I think it's a fine thing for Chicago. The archdiocese of Chicago, the largest archdiocese, is certainly a post that deserves a cardinal, and I believe Archbishop Cody personally has earned this high office."

GREETINGS FROM LABOR

Wiliam A. Lee, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, sent a congratulatory wire to the archbishop from the "500,000 families of the Chicago Federation of Labor and Industrial Union council." He said that people of all races and creeds are gratified by the elevation because of the archbishop's "dedicated work in behalf of our city and community."

Mrs. Lydon Wild, a school board member who is active in Catholic Charities work, said she was "delighted" and called Cody a "real doer."

"I'm exceedingly pleased not only for him but for the whole community," said School Supt. James F. Redmond. "Ours has been a most cordial and productive relationship. You're happy for your friends."

Dr. Edgar H. S. Chandler, executive director of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, also extended congratulations.

"The archdiocese is once again elevated in the status of the Vatican," he said. "The archbishop is to be congratulated on receiving the highest honor available to him in his church."

RECOGNITION OF WORK

Rabbi Robert J. Marx, director of the Chicago Federation of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, saw the appointment as recognition of the work Archbishop Cody has done in the community, coupled with an opportunity "to be even more effective in the days that lie ahead."

The archbishop was called a "capable administrator" by Methodist Bishop Thomas M. Pryor and a man of great ability by Bishop Gerald Francis Burrill, head of the Episcopal Diocese of Chicago.

The Rev. Comerford J. O'Malley, chancellor of De Paul university, said:

"The appointment of Archbishop Cody to the college of cardinals is a tribute to his many significant accomplishments thruout his priestly career. It is a tribute also to the clergy, religious, and laity of this great archdiocese."

Jan Berbers of Montevideo, Uruguay, president of Serra International, a laymen's organization to promote the priesthood, said "the organization is extremely pleased about the appointment."

Sister Mary Oliva, president of St. Xavier college, said.

"During his two years in Chicago, Archbishop Cody has consistently demonstrated his deep concern in many areas critical to our modern world—education, ecumenism, and human relations."

FLORIDA LEGISLATURE EXTENDS INVITATION TO NATIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my State of Florida extends a cordial invitation to both the National Democratic Committee and the National Republican Committee to hold their next national conventions in Florida. I join in that invitation, and endorse the following concurrent resolution adopted by the State legislature:

S. CON. RES. 1096

A concurrent resolution urging the national Democratic and Republican committees to hold their next national conventions in Florida

Whereas, Florida is known throughout the nation as a hospitable and enjoyable convention state, and

Whereas, the accommodations in Dade county are more than adequate to provide all of the necessary housing and convention facilities needed for this purpose, and

Whereas, this Legislature and the people of Florida would heartily welcome both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions to our state, now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the Legislature does most cordially invite and urge the National Democratic committee and the National Republican committee to hold their next national conventions in Florida.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the National Democratic committee and the National Republican committee and to the Florida delegation in the Congress of the United States.

HOUSEBOATS MODIFIED FOR USE AS MEDICAL CLINICS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my attention was recently called to a project sponsored by the Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, Inc., which envisages the provision of a fleet of houseboats, modified to serve as medical clinics for the Mekong River area in Laos.

In the thought that the membership of Congress would be interested in knowing more about this project, I wish to include in the RECORD the following background material supplied by the Dooley Foundation:

PROPOSAL

Project Showboat shall be a medical program on the Mekong River in the area of Laos and Thailand utilizing commercially available 38-foot houseboats modified as medical clinics. The program's primary purpose shall be to provide facilities for medical care to the people in the villages bordering the Mekong from as far north near the China border as security may allow to as far south to the Cambodian border as river navigability permits. Its purpose shall also be to provide educational and training opportunities for the local people as well as for the local health workers. The program shall further include culture exchange type activities with various forms of entertainment for the purpose of attracting and creating greater local interest.

Each 38-foot boat shall be equipped with surgical, laboratory, sterilization and x-ray facilities. Each boat shall uniformly be a distinctive bright orange for ease of identification, a practice that the Dooley Foundation has followed with all of its vehicles in Asia for the past four and one-half years. Each boat shall be based at one of the three hospitals in Laos now being assisted by the Dooley Foundation with American staff, supplies and equipment. American personnel on the boats will work in a counterpart relationship with Lao or Thai staff. Villages along the river shall be visited on a regular schedule.

Projected plans are to have three boats operational in six months and an additional three to seven boats in twelve months.

Financial support for the project will come only from private resources to permit the greatest program flexibility and local political acceptance. Industry and foundations shall initially be approached to provide the seed-funds to launch the program. Once operational, a public contributions campaign

will be undertaken to provide sustained support.

Project Showboat shall be truly a *Showboat* of American concern and friendship for the people of Laos and Thailand as well as all of Southeast Asia. It shall be a *Showboat* of the warmth and love and humor of the American people. It shall be a *Showboat* of American medicine.

It shall be a *Showboat* to the world of the determination of the American people to resist Communist aggression wherever, and by whatever means, necessary.

PURPOSES

1. To provide medical care

The population of Laos is 2.3 million, 83 percent of whom are represented by the Thai-Lao and Lao-Thoung tribes, all of whom live along or in close proximity to the Mekong River. There are also large concentrations of people living on the Thai side of the Mekong, which for great lengths represents the international boundary between Laos and Thailand. These people suffer from those acute and chronic diseases usually associated with conditions of poor sanitation, inadequate nutrition and ignorance. Commonplace are malaria, yaws, leprosy, dysentery, tuberculosis, skin diseases and respiratory infection, not to mention a high incidence of traumatic conditions, much of which is the result of local Pathet Lao guerrilla activity.

Project Showboat shall provide the needed medical care to these people. Each vessel will represent a medical clinic with all the facilities needed for basic diagnosis and treatment. This shall include laboratory facilities for blood, urine and stool examinations. Diagnostic X-ray equipment will be available as well as facilities for minor surgery. Designated villages along the river will be visited on a regular schedule. American staff working with Lao or Thai staff will work out from the boat into the immediate surrounding villages providing treatment and public health measures. Such cases as may require major surgery or long-term hospitalization would be evacuated to the base hospitals of the Dooley Foundation or other adequate medical facilities. Medical continuity between visits of *Showboat* would be provided by local health workers trained, supervised and supplied by Dooley Foundation personnel.

The medical public health team will be prepared to handle the common medical problems at the village and district levels. Those cases which the Health Technician and his team are not qualified to treat would be evacuated to a larger center at a provincial level which would be attended by more advanced medical personnel.

Project Showboat will work in conjunction with the school in Pakse by acting as field training centers as well as by representing opportunities for employment after graduation. Such job opportunities would be either on the vessels themselves or in the village shore facilities serviced by the river boats. *Showboat* would work in cooperation with other teaching programs in Laos now sponsored by various national and international health agencies such as the Royal Lao Ministry of Health, the Lao Red Cross, WHO, UNICEF, AID and Operation Brotherhood.

Education and treatment represent the core of the purpose of *Project Showboat.*

2. To teach local health workers

Much of the practice of medicine in Laos today is carried out by the local village herb-doctors following those ancient practices and traditions of China and India handed down through many generations, as well as by the Shamans, or spirit doctors, and the elderly Buddhist bonzes.

Laos has but two western-trained M.D.'s. Other categories of physicians include the *medecins-indochinois* and the *infirmiers.* The former, having graduated from high school, were trained in Hanoi by the French for four years. The latter represent medical officers who have received a six-month course in medicine in Laos under French supervision. Neither of these categories of medical personnel is now being trained, although they represent the only reservoir of medical personnel available today in Laos.

The Dooley Foundation intends to establish in southern Laos, in the provincial capital city of Pakse, a Health Technician Training school at the local provincial hospital. This will be a category of medical officer similar to the *infirmiers* but with a longer training period of one to two years. These technicians will be trained to work as a part of a medical/public health team which will include a nurse/midwife and a sanitarian. The school will also provide a training program for these nurses and sanitarians. The Dooley Foundation currently has a nurse/midwife training school at its Khong hospital, near Pakse, which is being carried out as a cooperative effort with the Lao Ministry of Health, UNICEF and WHO.

3. To educate the villagers

The village people of Laos and Thailand have, over the years, come to *respect* western medical and public health practices—but not always to *accept* them. Ignorance, apathy and adherence to traditional customs are the main deterrents to such acceptance. These can be overcome only by time, example and education.

Utilizing the techniques of modern audio-visual teaching methods, education would be extended by *Project Showboat* to the villager and tribesman in such basic health areas as food handling, food preservation, eating habits, use of safe water, garbage and waste disposal, personal cleanliness, protection against insects and birth control.

The problem of good health is essentially a problem in education and economics rather than penicillin and surgery. *Project Showboat* must, however, fill both needs. Public health and education follow in the wake of therapeutic medicine. Therefore, in the course of treating patients, we must also educate them if any lasting results are to be attained.

4. To promote cultural exchange

In Southeast Asia the villages are numerous and small and the cities are few. The population is 90 percent rural.

To create interest, to attract people, and to promote awareness of American culture in the performing arts, entertainment will be a part of *Project Showboat.*

To show a Walt Disney cartoon, to play a guitar, to sing folk ballads, to teach an American dance—all contribute to a psychological climate conducive to acceptance of modern medicine, new teachings, better methods and, perhaps most of all, an awareness of the true meaning and intent of America.

5. To further understanding and friendship

As is true of most problems, of whatever nature, lack of communication is a basic deterrent to solution. In the world political mess, medicine has a unique and powerful role to play in promoting better understanding between people. It represents one of the best media of communications that America possesses. For whatever else, good or bad, the world may think of America, it is represented and admired most for its medicine.

A sick man knows no politics—he seeks the best care possible for himself and his family. A Pathet Lao or Viet Cong is no exception. Testimony to this is the freedom with which the Dooley legend has been allowed to operate in Southeast Asia for the past twelve years. *Project Showboat* will further promote that American legend and make its own contribution to the need for communication to promote friendship and world peace.

Such a program as *Project Showboat* will be successful, however, only to the extent of its caution in its own presentation to the national governments, the local officials and the village people. The effort must be directed toward the essential end of strengthening the national government at the local level to counter Communist subversive methods. It must be presented as a Lao or Thai program with the *assistance* of the Americans.

Project Showboat must not compete with local medical organizations, methods or customs. It must only supplement and assist them. On these terms, host country acceptance, cooperation and participation will continue at all government, political and social levels. The American presence will inevitably speak eloquently for itself.

Project Showboat then becomes very much in the combined interest of the Lao peasant, the Lao Government, the American people and the free world.

NASSAU COUNTY, N.Y., CONSUMER UNIT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in yesterday's New York Times an article of considerable interest to me, reporting the establishment in Nassau County, N.Y., of a department of consumer affairs.

As the author of legislation pending in the House of Representatives, to create a Federal Department of Consumer Affairs, I was most happy to see that some action, geared to benefit the consumer, has been initiated on the local level in my own State.

I am taking the liberty of including the news item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, so that my colleagues can take note of the responsive voice now available to the consumer in Nassau County. Similar activities should be made available to the consuming public on the Federal level. The article follows:

NASSAU APPROVES A CONSUMER UNIT—NEW DEPARTMENT WILL ADVISE RESIDENTS ON PURCHASING—SUBPOENA POWER GIVEN

MINEOLA, L.I., May 29.—A County Department of Consumer Affairs was established today to give Nassau residents information on buying and to protect them from fraud.

The department is being formed through expansion of the county's Department of Weights and Measures, which is headed by John Occhiogrosso, the County Sealer. The new Commissioner of Consumer Affairs will be assisted by a nine-member advisory committee that would reflect a cross-section of consumer and business interests.

Mr. Occhiogrosso said that consumers would receive information about buying on credit and on the Federal truth-in-packaging law that goes into effect July 1.

He also said that his office contemplated a meat inspection program to insure that consumers have bought correctly labeled items. Consumers will also be warned about purchasing meats that are packaged in such a way as to misrepresent their true quality.

The department was formed by the Board of Supervisors after an eight-month study by an advisory committee, which reported a need for "positive consumer educational programs." The committee's study found

inadequate coordination of existing public and private consumer programs, and the lack of a central point to which consumers might turn.

The Commissioner of the department approved today was given subpoena powers but no enforcement powers.

He will receive complaints and initiate investigations of fraud or unfair dealings against consumers. He will also represent the interests of consumers before administrative and regulatory agencies and legislative groups.

DR. WALTER BUCKINGHAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with the very deepest regret that I call to the attention of the House the tragic death last week of Dr. Walter Buckingham, a member of the faculty of the Drexel Institute of Technology, and a former director of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, of the House Education and Labor Committee. Dr. Buckingham was staff director of that subcommittee, while I was its chairman, and, as such, he played a major role in the birth of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. It was my hope, which I had discussed with him, to draw from his insight during the course of the study my subcommittee is holding this year on Federal manpower programs. His profession and all of us who knew him and worked with him, are deprived of a wise counselor and a good friend. I am sure that I speak for the other members of the subcommittee when I offer my deepest sympathy to Dr. Buckingham's wife and family.

CRISIS IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity of bringing to the attention of my colleagues a wonderful statement by a distinguished American, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of the State of New Jersey. I append a copy of his letter to me dated May 29, expressing his views on the Near East crisis and I am sure this will be of great interest to all Members of Congress, not only the New Jersey delegation.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, May 29, 1967.

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I am taking the liberty of writing you concerning the current crisis in the Near East, a subject beyond the normal purview of any Governor, but yet one with such profound implications that all of us in positions of public leadership should speak out. The views I express herein are personal, but I believe they also reflect the thinking of a large majority of the people of New Jersey.

I have been gratified by the President's prompt and clear-cut affirmation on May 23 of the international nature of the waters of the Gulf of Aqaba—and of the involvement of international law and its relationship to the very survival of mankind. His noble appeal to the international community deserves the support of all who cherish freedom.

Today, when any threat of war strikes terror into the hearts of men, the continuing hope and the goal of humanity must be world peace. Now the tension which has arisen between Israel and the Arab States has faced the world with a new and very grave danger.

The President of the United States, like men of good will everywhere, has expressed his earnest support of "all efforts in and outside of the United Nations and through its appropriate organs, including the Secretary-General," to join in standing behind the President in this hour of crisis.

I am particularly concerned, as is President Johnson, with the serious threat to peace posed by the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping, for this is an international waterway, and a denial of the right of innocent shipping is a violation of international law. I share President Johnson's commitment—a commitment expressed also by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy before him—to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all Near Eastern nations. And I wish to add my voice to his in calling upon all concerned to bear in mind and act in accordance with their solemn responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations.

As a great President and former Governor of New Jersey, Woodrow Wilson, said more than half a century ago:

"Peace can be rebuilt only upon the ancient and accepted principles of international law, only upon those things which remind Nations of their duty to each other and, deeper than that, of their duties to mankind."

Never has the duty of nations to mankind, to keep the peace and maintain the sanctity of international law, been more clear or more urgent.

I know you will support the President at this critical time in our nation's history.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

NOTRE DAME SEMINARY HONORS REPRESENTATIVE HALE BOGGS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the distinguished leaders of the U.S. House of Representatives, the able majority whip, HALE BOGGS, was honored by Notre Dame Seminary of New Orleans with an honorary doctor of laws degree, on May 25, 1967.

Nothing is more indicative of a man's worth than recognition by his peers, particularly by those whom he has dedicated his life to serve. In citing the reasons for the award of the degree to the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman BOGGS, Notre Dame Seminary has so honored its representative in the House.

In glowing words the seminary has etched on parchment what many of us in the Halls of Congress have long known—that HALE BOGGS is a leader among men, an exemplary Catholic, an able legislator, and above all, a great human being.

After receiving the degree, Congressman BOGGS delivered a perceptive and visonary address to the seminary graduates. It was a typical HALE BOGGS speech, expressing his faith in humanity and adding a new dimension to his belief in the future of America. The audience responded with a standing ovation.

The citation and the address bear reading by all of us:

To All Who View These Present Letters From the President and the Faculty of Notre Dame Seminary, Greetings in the Lord:

As an anxious world watched the lights of peace flickering in Europe during the summer of 1939, the newly elected Pope Pius XII wrote in his inaugural encyclical: "The human legislator must attain to that balance, that keen sense of moral responsibility, without which it is easy to mistake the boundary between the legitimate use and the abuse of power. Thus only will his decisions have internal consistency, noble dignity, and religious sanction, and be immune from selfishness and passion."

A few months after these words were read by a world in turmoil, an honor graduate of the Tulane School of Law, already showing traits of leadership in public service coupled with a keen appreciation for democratic processes, became the youngest legislator of his party elected to the 77th Congress of the United States. Before his two-year term had expired, his country was itself engaged in the Second World War. Sharing its commitment to human freedom and its abhorrence for dictatorship, the young legislator temporarily left political life to serve as an officer in the U. S. Naval Reserve and the U. S. Maritime Service. His nation at peace once again, he returned to Congress in 1946. Today, as the third ranking Democrat in the House of Representatives, he still displays that sense of balance, awareness of moral responsibility, internal consistency, noble dignity, and immunity for selfishness and passion which Pope Pius XII considered the chief characteristics of an effective and efficient lawmaker in a well-ordered society.

In promoting and supporting legislation which has run the gamut from education to urban affairs, from domestic housing to foreign trade expansion, from interstate highway finances to flood control and waterways development, from taxes and tariffs to narcotics control, he has been guided by the wise dictum of the poet Dante: "Just as the laws are made for the sake of the body politic rather than the body politic for the laws, likewise those living under the law do not exist for the sake of the legislator but he for them."

That his constituents are convinced of his embodiment of this democratic ideal is evident from their returning him to the halls of Congress each biennium of the past two decades. That his colleagues appreciate his legitimate use of power is crystal clear from the leadership they have entrusted to him. That the Presidents of the United States have respected his decisions and admired his noble dignity have been manifested by the confidence they consistently placed in him.

Numerous and notable as have been his achievements as legislator, perhaps none reflected so luminously his sense of moral responsibility and his deep compassion for his fellowmen as did his sponsorship of a special hurricane relief bill providing, for

the first time in the history of the country, direct financial assistance from the national government to victims of a natural disaster. With parliamentary skill, relentless energy, and quiet persuasiveness, legislation was passed in record time providing $125 million in loans to persons affected by Hurricane Betsy in late 1965. Some 128,000 otherwise demoralized families were made aware that they existed not for the sake of the legislator but he for them.

Success as lawmaker, acclaim from constituents, honors at home and renown abroad, have not kept him from remaining a devoted husband, dutiful father, and loyal son of Mother Church. Internal consistency has marked his career as honor student and public servant, private citizen and Catholic layman, Phi Beta Kappa graduate and House Majority Whip, political reformer and member of Presidential Commissions.

Notre Dame Seminary is honored to bestow its own accolade on one who has been at once a human and humane legislator and has remained, in those other words of Pope Pius XII, "immune from selfishness and passion".

Therefore, Most Reverend Chancellor, We, the President and Faculty of this Seminary in view of the reasons adduced in these letters, have esteemed worthy of the doctorate, and present to you for the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws, the Honorable Hale Boggs, M.C., May 25, 1967.

WILLIAM J. RAFTERY,
President.

ROBERT J. STOHL,
Dean.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT OF LOUISIANA, NOTRE DAME SEMINARY, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MAY 26, 1967

Archbishop Hannan, very Reverend Father Rector, Reverend members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, and friends, it is my distinct honor to be honored by you today, for this occasion affords me the opportunity to salute Notre Dame Seminary, its faculty and student body, as it should be recognized. The honorary degree that you have so graciously conferred upon me is one that I especially treasure because it comes from an institution that is distinguished in many areas.

Notre Dame Seminary, we all know, can rightly be called the Alma Mater of the Catholic clergy of New Orleans. Many of the excellent priests that serve the Catholic body in this area are graduates of this institution. Notre Dame Seminary, as many of us also know, is a distinguished institution of the national scene. Its influence has filtered out into the entire life of the Catholic Church in our Nation. It has been recognized throughout our Nation for many years as a center of advanced Christian social thinking. It has produced many distinguished members of the Catholic clergy who have left a decided mark upon the Catholic body in our national life. I need not recall for you the names of but two of your many distinguished alumni. I refer to Monsignor Joseph Gremillion, who is presently secretary of the Vatican Secretariat for peace and world justice, and Monsignor Marvin Bordelon, who will assume the office of secretary of the American Secretariat for peace and world justice next month. Notre Dame Seminary has been a leader within the Catholic Church in the United States in the promotion and dissemination of the social teaching of the Catholic Church. For this reason, among many other personal reasons, it is my distinct honor to be honored by you today. I wish to assure you that I am both humbled and happy to be the recipient of your honorary degree.

Since we have just referred to the fine tradition of teaching the social doctrine of the Church that has distinguished Notre Dame Seminary these many years, I felt that a few words from me, as your elected representative on this subject might prove to be worthy of our consideration today. We all know that we are the enriched members of a Church that has for the past 75 years been among the leaders of a sound and sane social teaching. Our church has given to all of us a vast literature on the subject of the social teaching of the Gospel and has striven, from Pope Leo XIII down to our present Pontiff, Pope Paul VI, to make Catholic clergymen and laymen among the leaders of a rapidly changing and expanding social movement in our world today.

I need not recall, least of all to you, the teachings of Leo XIII's immortal *Rerum Novarum*. Nor need I review with you the reiteration of that teaching in Pius XI's classic *Quadragesimo Anno* and Pius XII's many papal messages concerning the social question. To all of us the teachings of the beloved Pope John's two masterpieces, *Mater Et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris* are also milestones along the church's journey to serve the needs of modern man. Finally, Pope Paul's recent encyclical, *Progressio Populorum* is a document that we have all already read with great enthusiasm and will continue to study and strive to apply in the months and years that lie ahead.

These are the principal papal documents that have already shaped and will continue to shape, our Christian consciousness of the needs of a world in transition. To these we must immediately add that monumental document of the Second Vatican Council, the pastoral constitution on the church in the modern world, which has made all of us Christians more and more deeply aware of the witness that we must give, not only as Christians, but especially as truly human beings, to a world that in so many ways has become alienated not only from God but from reality itself. The opening words of this document should, I believe, in some way be the spirit of dedication shared by all men of goodwill everywhere. The opening words of this constitution are:

"The joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted, these are the joys and hopes, the griefs and anxieties of the followers of Christ. Indeed, nothing genuinely human fails to raise an echo in their hearts. For theirs is a community composed of men. United in Christ, they are led by the Holy Spirit in their journey to the kingdom of their Father and they have welcomed the news of salvation which is meant for every man.[1]

Indeed, as I read the pastoral constitution on the church in the modern world, I see that our religious leaders are inviting all of us, as the people of God, to become involved in the real, and sometimes agonizing, issues of our times. I do not believe that you, as the priests of tomorrow, any more than I, as your civil representative today, can ignore the voices that come to us from the world in which we live. We know that we have many problems and we know too that we do not have all the answers to these international and national problems that weigh heavily upon us. Would to God that we had ready-made solutions! Would to God that we lived in a world where issues are clearly defined and we could all distinguish good and evil as Dick Tracy can separate the good guys from the bad guys. But we know that is not the situation and we must not only live, *but we must work* as Christians, in a world that is confusing and complex. I am trying to say that we are members of a pilgrim church and as such, be we clerics or politicians, we will always be in this life on the road. Heaven awaits us, it is not already upon us.

There is one aspect of the church's social teaching that I should like to elaborate upon for a few brief moments because I feel that the theology of secularity is one that deeply concerns and involves not only you as the priests of today and tomorrow, but also my colleagues and myself in the legislative halls of our Government. We are all dedicated to working for, what Pope Pius XII called "a better world willed by God" and we are, I believe, convinced that before that objective is achieved, "the whole world must be rebuilt from its foundations, transformed from savage to human, from human to divine, that is to say, to make it as God would have it." [2]

I believe that we are entering upon a new era of humanity. A man whom, I am sure, you are much better acquainted with than I am, has told us prophetically, that we are surely and steadily evolving into a creative perfection that we ourselves are not even aware of. "The human world of today," wrote de Chardin, "has not grown cold, but it is ardently searching for a God proportionate to the newly discovered immensities of a universe whose aspect exceeds the present compass of our power of worship." [3]

I believe that this is the vision we should grasp in our assessment of the future. Some of the old conflicts are resolved, but greater ones have arisen. By and large, these old conflicts between the employer and employee; between capitalism and socialism; between unions and corporations are already resolved.

On the other hand, I believe with De Chardin, that we are moving into a new cosmic understanding of man and how he must continually develop in a total evolutionary process. This process involves even more fundamental issues, such as, the problem of unbelief that is rampant in the world today; the problem of understanding and development of those basic truths that we have for so long accepted as the warp and woof of Christianity; the problem of making a transcendental god a reality in a world that is dedicated to secularity; the problem of war and peace, wealth and poverty, hatred and love, knowledge and ignorance. These problems, I submit for your consideration, are not purely religious problems, nor are they purely political problems. These problems, involving the very future of man himself, are the great issues of our society for the future of that society depends upon how we will measure up to them. This we must do, not simply as a cleric or a politician, housewife or scholar, but all together as witnesses of a Christian faith and a Christian message that we firmly believe does contain the germinal seeds of solution.

This same vision comes through in Pope Paul's encyclical, *Progressio Populorum*. In that magnificent document, our Holy Father invites all of us to look to the future. He tells us that the church wishes to offer mankind "a global vision of man and of the human race" (No. 13.) This vision, he says, is, "In brief, to seek to do more, know more and have more in order to be more: That is what men aspire to now when a greater number of them are condemned to live in conditions that make this lawful desire illusory." (No. 6)

In spite of obstacles, Pope Paul insists that man is more than his environment, that he is on the march to a rendezvous with a destiny that will make him more and more perfectible, both as a Christian and a human being. "By the unaided effort of his own intelligence and his will," writes Pope Paul, "Each man can grow in humanity, can enhance his personal worth, can become more a person." (No. 15). And, adding a Christian dimension to this vision, Pope Paul continues, "By reason of his union with Christ, the source of life, man attains to new fulfillment of himself, to a transcendent hu-

---

[1] Lumen Gentium, No. 1, *The Teachings of the Second Vatican Council*, Newman Press, Westminster, Md., 1966, pp. 439–40.

[2] Pius XII, Address to the People of Rome, Feb. 11, 1952.

[3] Pierre Tellhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man*, Harper & Row, Publishers New York, 1964, p. 268.

manism which gives him his greatest possible perfection: This is the highest goal of personal development." (No. 16)

My friends, you are in a very real sense, the hope of the future. It is not only the Catholic people of our beloved state that look to you as the harbingers of that "second spring" and "new Pentecost" as a result of the Second Vatican Council. It is, as I intimated in the beginning of these remarks, the entire Nation that looks to you as the religious leaders of a new and reawakened South. Far be it from me to attach a moral to these remarks for far be it for a layman—even in these days of renewal—to preach to those who will be preachers. Permit me, however, to remind you of two quotations from those two remarkable men—both called John—who have shaped so much of our thinking today. The first is from an address of the late Pope John. Speaking on April 11, 1963, he said:

"There lies ahead an immense task for all men of good will, if the mutual relations of the human family are to be restored in truth, in justice, in love and in freedom. This is a most exalted task, for it is a task of bringing about true peace."

These words of good Pope John were echoed in words uttered by the late President John F. Kennedy, delivered on November 8, the same year. He said:

"And let the word go forth . . . to all who are concerned about the future of the human family . . . that we will not weary in well doing and we will faint not; and we shall, in due season, reap a harvest of peace and security for all the members of the family of man."

You must be prepared to face a world of ferment; a world boiling with resentments. Since history repeats itself, perhaps today is but a repetition of history, a repetition of past eras in which advocates of change and new ideas fought strenuously and with every weapon at their command against those who would not move forward.

It is possible that the troubles of today are even more pronounced. Now youth seems more involved. Some seem to confuse license with liberty, laissez-faire with democracy, legitimate and reasonable authority with authoritarianism, elimination of discrimination against them as giving them a right to discriminate against others, protection of their rights as giving them the right to trample on the rights of others.

Our job is to teach that responsibility goes with freedom, that liberty is not license.

The twentieth century has seen us go from horse and buggy to space ships that land on the moon in a matter of days; from diseases that took many lives and crippled or disfigured thousands to miracle drugs, to miraculous vaccines, to transplantation of vital organs. But, with all the advances of technology and medicine and knowledge have come a plethora of problems—problems to which our society must find a solution.

We are faced with a world in which a single word can produce a holocaust and destroy our civilization.

Yet you, the members of the class of 1967, are the ambassadors of the prince of peace. With the openness of Pope John, with the dedication of President John F. Kennedy, you can bring to your future charges the spirit of truth, justice, love and freedom that will, I sincerely believe, "reap a harvest of peace and security for all the members of the family of man" and contribute immeasurably to the answers of the problems of our times.

CONCENTRATED INTEREST ON THE POOR CAN BEST BE ACCOMPLISHED THROUGH OEO

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, our domestic war—the war on poverty—has been the target of much criticism, from those who want nothing done and those who contend that not enough is being done. The Republican leadership of the House, paying lipservice to the needs of this effort to raise the standard of and reason for living of so many people, proposes to kill the OEO and distribute its programs among other Federal departments and agencies. The effect of such action would be to dilute the effort to aid the poor and impoverished and lose them in the jungle of Federal bureaucracy.

The Philadelphia Inquirer this morning carried an excellent article on this very matter written by that eminent journalist Roscoe Drummond. I commend the article to my colleagues:

GOP ERRS IN ATTACK ON WAR ON POVERTY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty. Voters are 60 percent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows.

Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "Opportunity Crusade," avows that it favors all of the antipoverty programs and backs all the antipoverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already over-burdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered. These facts ought to be borne in mind:

Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing. To each, Shriver is the enemy, though in fact Shriver is the best friend the war on poverty has.

The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program.

But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them all well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Head Start. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no community action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class America that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

And without the OEO there would be no single strong voice raised in behalf of the poor, no single Government enterprise devoted solely to the multiple problems of the poor, no one place the poor can call their own when they want to protest an injustice or an inequality in the life of the community.

Finally, with public support for the war on poverty growing, it is politically tempting to play both sides of the street—praise the goals and attack their administration.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing department which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

These are the reasons I think it is a mistake for the Republicans—all of whom don't agree—to tie their support for the antipoverty programs to getting rid of coordinated control. Coordinated control ought to be strengthened, not weakened.

PHILADELPHIA CITY WATER DEPARTMENT EARNS NATIONAL HONOR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that from time to time I am able to point out various departments and agencies of the government of the great city of Philadelphia which are the recipients of national honors. The receipt of these honors certainly points out that Philadelphia is one of the foremost cities in the country. It is therefore a pleasure for me to report that the Philadelphia Water Department will receive the John H. Murdoch Advancement Award from the American Water Works Association at the association's annual convention in Atlantic City on Monday. The award is a golden statuette of "Willing Water," symbolic water drop of the association.

The Philadelphia Inquirer this morning carried a news story regarding this award and the reason for the Philadelphia Water Department being so honored. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

CITY WATER DEPARTMENT EARNS NATIONAL HONOR

The Philadelphia Water Department will receive the John H. Murdoch Advancement Award from the American Water Works Association at the association's national convention in Atlantic City on Monday.

A golden statuette of "Willing Water," symbolic water drop of the association will be presented to Water Commissioner Samuel Baxter at ceremonies in Convention Hall.

Philadelphia is being honored for its public information program, which started in 1959, its $528 million modernization program running from 1942 through 1972 and public acceptance of a 26 percent increase in water-sewer rates to help finance the city's water-sewer improvement projects.

The national award is presented annually

to top water utility companies of public agencies in the United States and Canada with more than 25,000 customers. The association also will honor Alexandria, La., and Valley Center, Calif., utilities with fewer than 25,000 subscribers.

AWWA is comprised of 20,000 members, including engineers and management personnel in 4500 water utilities in this country and 91 other countries.

The Philadelphia Water Department won the AWWA's Pennsylvania award last year, placing the city in competition for the national award against State and regional winners.

The AWWA noted that Baxter's department made a successful and "comprehensive effort" to explain the need for water rate increases in the city through announcements in newspapers, brochures and talks before civic groups.

Some of the city's accomplishments noted by the AWWA were the completion of a $2.3 million intake at the Torresdale Plant on the Delaware River, modernization of a raw water pumping station, basins at Upper Roxborough for storage of purified water, two large storm water conduits for Mill Creek and main relief sewers and 60 miles of water and sanitary sewer mains.

RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL BY BROOKLYN COMMUNITY LEADERS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on Memorial Day, I attended a meeting of more than 150 community leaders of all faiths in my congressional district in Brooklyn to discuss the crisis created in the Middle East. The situation was discussed at length. Expression of support for our democractic ally in the Middle East, Israel, was unanimous. They commended our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for his forthright and unequivocal stand in the crisis presently existing in the land held sacred by the three great faiths of the Western World.

Their desire that the United States do all within its power to maintain peace there and everywhere else in the world was strong and undeniable.

On that occasion it was my privilege to offer the following resolution urging that Israel be supplied with all necessary aid for her defense. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

The text follows:

Resolved, That we commend the President of the United States for his restrained but firm and unequivocal statement reaffirming that the Gulf of Agaba and the Straits of Tiran are international waterways that must be kept open to the traffic of all countries unimpaired and unimpeded by any country or countries and we commend the President for his continued and determined efforts to keep the peace and to restore it in the troubled areas of the world and urge him to use every avenue that may lead to restoration of peace everywhere and we further urge him to reaffirm the intention of the United States to do all in its power in and out of the United Nations and alone or together with such other nations as will join with us to prevent aggression everywhere and in that connection to supply to the State of Israel all the planes, tanks, missiles and other materiel she may require for her defense against aggression and infiltration and against interference with her peaceful pursuits, and to do everything within his power to maintain the territorial integrity of the State of Israel.

MAY 30, 1967.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO DENY FURTHER ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN MIDDLE EAST COMMITTING OR SUPPORTING AGGRESSIVE ACTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any and all further grants, aid, assistance, loans, leases, and sales of any and all kinds by the United States or any of its agencies, departments, boards, or corporations, to the United Arab Republic, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, or Jordan, be suspended until such time as the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran are opened to all international shipping, including that of the State of Israel, and until all threats to blockade the same by any and all of the countries named have been withdrawn.

The crisis in the Middle East is far from over, Mr. Speaker, and it will not be over until the Arab countries stop their threats and their aggressive acts toward Israel. Our President has made it quite clear as to our position on the Gulf of Aquaba and the Strait of Tiran; they are international waterways. This can only mean one thing, that the ships of Israel must also be permitted to continue to use that waterway, and we have pledged to keep it that way.

One of the ways that we can best bring President Nasser and his allies to their senses, perhaps, is to cut off all aid to those countries in the area who support the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel is not a warlike nation; since its founding 19 years ago it has tried to live in peace with its Arab neighbors. It cannot, however, meekly stand by and see its trade with the Far East cut off merely to benefit the political aspirations of pan-Arabism as dictated by Nasser.

To put the situation in focus, Mr. Speaker, we need only consider what this country would do if Panama tried to close the Panama Canal to our shipping.

I believe that the crisis in the Middle East can be solved peaceably. In the meantime, it is our responsibility to take affirmative action, such as the cutting off of aid, to accomplish that purpose.

The text of my resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 367

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary to suspend forthwith all further grants, aid, assistance, loans, leases, and sales of any and all kinds by the United States or any of its agencies, departments, boards, or corporations, to the United Arab Republic, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, or Jordan, until such time as the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran are opened to all international shipping, including that of the State of Israel, and until all threats to blockade the same by any and all of the countries named have been withdrawn.

SOME DOUBTS ABOUT LAWS TO CONTROL GUNS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Chicago Daily News by John M. Johnston regarding restrictive gun legislation has just come to my attention.

In this article Mr. Johnston expresses serious doubts about the reduction in accidents, crime, and violence that gun reform proposes to achieve.

Mr. Johnston's article, printed May 15, 1967, follows:

SOME DOUBTS ABOUT LAWS TO CONTROL GUNS

(By John M. Johnston)

Manufacturers and distributors of firearms have a major stake in the outcome of current agitation for laws to restrict the sale of guns. An estimated 25,000,000 Americans engage in some form of recreational shooting, and the sale of ammunition runs around $100,000,000 a year.

The willingness of the industry to accept reasonable restrictions on sale and ownership is indicated by the support given by the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce to gun-control legislation at Springfield.

In view of the intense agitation for such laws sparked by the murder of President Kennedy, good public relations dictates this support. But I, for one, would forgive anybody who retained private doubts that this reform is going to accomplish the reduction in accidents, violence and crime that its sponsors promise.

These misgivings are based on long observation of crusades that failed to deliver as described in the prospectus. Such as national prohibition, that was going to banish Monday absenteeism, wife-beating, alcoholism, marital infidelity and five-eighths of the crime and disorder.

Such as the direct primary that was going to make the back-room politician obsolete.

Such as court reform in Illinois, which was going to clean up the six-year backlog of cases.

Such as the United Nations, that was going to bring the belligerents to amiable conference with tea and soft music, and so on and so on.

This recital may confirm the perspicacity of the sardonic Ambrose Bierce, who defined a conservative as one who accepts existing evils, in contrast to a liberal, who wishes to replace them with new ones.

There is some evidence, nevertheless, on what happens under tough gun laws. Philadelphia reacted promptly to a crime wave and after April, 1965, required permits even to buy shotguns and rifles. In 1966, homicides resulting from gunshots increased, although the total of homicides had declined.

The effect on the sale of guns was striking, however. Fourteen of 82 dealers in firearms had discontinued business entirely, and sales dropped to one-ninth of the former rate.

New York City has the toughest gun laws in the country. Still, 131 cities had lower

homicide rates, and New York's rate of killings by pistols exceeds the national average. Such statistics prove nothing, of course, but neither does the emotional rhetoric unleashed upon each misuse of a gun.

Knives or other sharp instruments were used in 11 times as many New York homicides as long guns, but it seems acknowledged that it would be pointless to register bread knives.

It is simply not credible than an ex-con upon deciding to turn bank robber would hesitate to arm himself with a pistol before running the bigger risk. Nor that there would be a thriving bootleg market to supply him.

It ought to be apparent that without federal legislation to control interstate shipment there can be no effective check on sales to the mentally unbalanced or criminally inclined. The evils are plain enough, and an attack on them is overdue. But don't bet too much that by 1977 you will be able to tell the difference.

OUTLAW AGGRESSIVE WAR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, excerpts from a speech delivered last month at Valparaiso University by Mr. Thurman Arnold, a former Assistant U.S. Attorney General of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, were brought to my attention by Mr. Louis Stulberg, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union. The excerpts of Mr. Arnold's address were published in the May 15, 1967, issue of "Justice," a publication of the ILGWU. At this point Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD this address because I feel it is so timely and noteworthy that it will be of benefit to all of my colleagues:

OUTLAW AGGRESSIVE WAR!

(By Thurman Arnold)

It is in the field of international law where the greatest danger lies. We are living in a lawless world, a world where small and relatively impotent nations can nevertheless start brush fires which may spread to our own shores. We have seen it happen twice—the First World War and again in the Second.

But the world is even smaller today than it was in the Second World War. It has become a world so small that lawless aggressive action by any nation against another can threaten world peace. It is also a world where poverty and misery in the crowded nations which cannot feed themselves threaten revolutions which upset the balance of power.

In such a world we need some sort of a world constitution ever more desperately than the Thirteen Colonies needed the Constitution of the U.S. after the Revolutionary War. And the keystone of that world constitution is the principle that no nation must be permitted to expand its borders and its power through an aggressive attack upon its neighbors. We are today attempting to enforce that principle in Vietnam.

It was our feeling of desperate need for a principle of international law against aggression which led us to abandon our distaste for the League of Nations and become a leader in the formation of the United Nations. But this action we felt was not enough. We wanted some judicial sanction for that fundamental principle on which all international law must rest—the outlawing of aggressive war. And so, after Hitler's defeat, the U.S. joined with the victorious nations, including the Soviet Union, in the first Nuremberg trial to prosecute the national leaders of Hitler's empire.

The paramount purpose of that trial was to declare that an aggressive war was an international crime which justified imposing the death penalty on the leaders of the nation which started it. The trials for German atrocities represented no novel principle. The great principle of international law announced for the first time at Nuremberg was that an aggressive war is in itself an international crime regardless of the way it is conducted.

At the time of the Nuremberg trials those who write the think columns in our press, such as Walter Lippmann, and independent organizations of intellectuals, such as Americans for Democratic Action, and liberal professors on our college campuses, acclaimed the principle of the outlawing of aggressive war as a great step forward in international law.

Today they are bending every effort to prevent the enforcement of the principle that Nuremberg announced to the world. They are giving every aid and comfort to the enemy that they can in the light of their limited numbers. They are encouraging Hanoi to believe that if it will only hang on, the U.S. will abandon its attempt to enforce the Nuremberg principle in Asia. They proclaim that America cannot and must not be a world policeman.

On the principle of international law that it is the duty of the U.S. as the richest and most powerful country in the world to enforce the law against aggressive war, it is my belief that the majority of American citizens of both parties believe in that principle. I think they have learned the lesson that—in our present age—it is the function of a dominant world power to take the lead in establishing world order and enforcing international law, and that a disorderly consensus of bickering lesser powers such as the UN cannot now do the job. This role imposes a costly burden in lives and money.

I am one of those who believe that if we had not taken our stand in Vietnam, then Korea, which we have built up as one of the few strong economies in the Orient, would have become disillusioned and felt itself in danger. I believe we saved Malaya and Thailand. I believe that the present disorder in China and the growing weakness of the Chinese, heretofore aggressive, would not have taken place had China's onward march through Asia not been stopped in Vietnam.

There is no reason why we cannot carry our international burden and at the same time promote economic progress at home. We must do both. Today there is no safety at home in a lawless world. If we allocate the tremendous power of productive expansion with which the modern scientific revolution has endowed us to these two ends, the international law of the 20th century will be the gift of the U.S. to the world.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for its intent to revise regulations governing observances of the Sabbath and other religious holidays. These rules form part of the "Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Religion" issued pursuant to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In the proposed regulation, the Commission interprets the ban against religious discrimination to include an obligation on the part of the employer to make reasonable accommodation to the religious needs of employees and prospective employees when this can be done without undue hardship to the employer's business. The burden of proving that accommodation to the employee's needs would be unreasonable would rest on the employer.

Revision of the guidelines became necessary because of numerous questions regarding the possibility of religious discrimination in cases where employers discharge or refuse to hire employees who observe Friday evening and Saturday, or some other day, as the Sabbath, or who observe certain special religious holidays during the year, and therefore do not work on such days.

The new regulations seem eminently reasonable and fair both to the employer and the employee. It assures the employer that his business will not suffer because of the special hours his worker must spend in the observance of his religious obligations, and it assures the employee or job applicant that his religious beliefs need not be a bar to employment.

Religious freedom is among the major cornerstones of our national heritage. A man's ability to have and hold a job is among his most vital possessions, and to abridge it because of his religion is a violation of that religious tolerance which so many of our citizens have sought on our shores since the days of the Pilgrims.

I have also introduced a bill today to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members. This bill would provide that Federal Government and District of Columbia employees would be given time off—without charge to any leave and without loss of pay—for their religious observances, provided that employees arrange with the agencies to make up the time on another day. Government flexibility would be retained by the provision that time off should be given to the extent compatible with the exigencies of the public business and the performance of essential services.

Government employees are now penalized for their religion through loss of vacation time for every special holiday they observe. This is practically a guarantee that Jewish employees, for example, will lose at least 3 days' vacation for Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur observances. Those required, but unable, to work on Saturday face an even more difficult situation. This seems neither reasonable nor necessary, and a change in the regulations along the flexible lines suggested would impose no undue hardship on the Government. I urge early consideration and passage of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I insert at the close of my remarks the text of the equal employment opportunity's proposed guide-

lines, which originally appeared in the Federal Register:

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION—GUIDELINES ON DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF RELIGION

[29 CFR Part 1605]

OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH AND OTHER RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is considering amending Part 1605 of its regulations, Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Religion, issued pursuant to section 713(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000e–12(b). The proposed amendment would delete § 1605.1 and substitute the following revised § 1605.1:

§ 1605.1 Observance of the Sabbath and other religious holidays.

(a) Several complaints filed with the Commission have raised the question whether it is discrimination on account of religion to discharge or refuse to hire employees who regularly observe Friday evening and Saturday, or some other day of the week, as the Sabbath or who observe certain special religious holidays during the year and, as a consequence, do not work on such days.

(b) The Commission believes that the duty not to discriminate on religious grounds, required by section 703(a)(1) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, includes an obligation on the part of the employer to make reasonable accommodation to the religious needs of employees and prospective employees where such an accommodation can be made without undue hardship on the conduct of the employer's business. Such undue hardship, for example, may exist where the employee's needed work cannot be performed by another employee of substantially similar qualifications during the period of absence of the Sabbath observer.

(c) Because of the particularly sensitive nature of discharging or refusing to hire an employee or applicant on account of his religious beliefs, the employer has the burden of proving that an undue hardship renders the required accommodation to the religious needs of the employee unreasonable.

(d) The Commission will review each case on an individual basis in an effort to seek an equitable application of these guidelines to the variety of situations which arise due to the varied religious practices of the American people.

All persons who desire to submit written data, views, or arguments for consideration in connection with the proposed amendment should file the same in duplicate, not later than 30 days after publication hereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER, with the Employment Opportunity Commission, Room 1234, 1800 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20506.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 5th day of May 1967.

STEPHEN N. SHULMAN,
Chairman.

[F.R. Doc. 67–5222; Filed May 9, 1967; 8:48 a.m.]

COLUMBIA, S.C., VA HOSPITAL

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for modernization of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Columbia, S.C. My bill for modernization includes the installation of air conditioning.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will carry out an agreement reached in Columbia, S.C., on November 17, 1960, at the annual South Carolina congressional delegation public hearing. This meeting was held in the senate chamber of the State capitol. The agreement reached on that date between officials of the Veterans' Administration and the South Carolina congressional delegation called for a new 500-bed VA hospital in Charleston and the modernization of the Columbia VA hospital with a 410-bed capacity.

South Carolina veterans at that time had fewer VA beds per capita available to them than any other State in the Union. The situation was urgent. As a member of the Veterans Affairs' Committee of the Congress I requested the Veterans' Administration to present a plan to our congressional delegation which would provide South Carolina with adequate VA hospital facilities. Veterans' Administration officials, the South Carolina delegation, and veterans' organizations all agreed that South Carolina needed 300 additional hospital beds to provide for modernization and the additional beds at the Columbia facility would cost approximately $15 to $17 million.

The availability of physicians and staffing for 900 beds at Columbia would be difficult; therefore, it was finally agreed that a $12 million VA hospital would be built at Charleston, near the South Carolina Medical College where staffing and the availability of research and physicians would greatly increase the efficiency and capacity of the new hospital. When the hospital at Charleston was completed and available to veterans, then the hospital in Columbia would be completely modernized with 410 beds making a grand total in the State of South Carolina of approximately 900 beds.

With modernization, the proposed 410 beds at Columbia could take care of as many veterans as the original 600-bed hospital without modernization. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is important to the veterans and to the people of South Carolina that we now proceed with the modernization in Columbia as originally agreed upon at the 410-bed level, with a Chapel, air conditioning, modern, up-to-date kitchen, dining facilities, and the most modern bath facilities.

The VA hospital in Charleston was dedicated last May 13 and is now in operation. All wards and beds at Charleston have not yet been activated and thus can be used while modernization at Columbia is in progress.

At no time was there any agreement or plan to have modernization and 500 beds at the Columbia hospital—the agreement was 410. Last year a 72-bed nursing care unit was established at the Columbia facility which also helped to prevent any crippling reduction in personnel.

The officials of the Veterans' Administration have been very cooperative. They want to see the Columbia Hospital completely modernized and updated.

The Honorable Bill Driver, Veterans Administrator, is rendering the veterans of our country outstanding service. He is completely dedicated to the service of our country and to our veterans. Mr. Driver is an expert on veterans affairs. Mr. Driver is returning tomorrow from Vietnam and will make further recommendations to the President and to the Congress on the needs of our men serving the cause of freedom throughout the world.

H.R. 10436

A bill to provide for the modernization of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, S.C.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall as expeditiously as possible undertake the modernization (including the installation of air conditioning) of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, South Carolina.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $7,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DEDICATION OF THE ALABAMA GREAT SEAL AT VALLEY FORGE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, May 28, the Alabama Great Seal in the Roof of the Republic at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania's Washington Memorial Chapel was dedicated. Our Governor, Hon. Lurleen Wallace, was unable to attend, but asked my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] to represent her and the people of Alabama. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. NICHOLS' remarks on this occasion in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CONGRESSMAN BILL NICHOLS TO COMMEMORATE ALABAMA STATE SEAL IN ROOF OF REPUBLIC, WASHINGTON MEMORIAL CHAPEL, VALLEY FORGE, PA., MAY 28, 1967

It is a great pleasure for me to be here today to bring greetings from Governor Lurleen Wallace and the people of the Great State of Alabama. Governor Wallace would have liked to have been here herself, but the State legislature is just beginning its regular session for this year. On behalf of our Governor and each Alabamian, let me say that we are deeply honored to be a part of this chapel by way of our State seal which is imprinted in the Roof of the Republic.

This is my first visit to historic Valley Forge. It is indeed hallowed ground, and makes every American feel closer to the heritage given us by those Americans who so bravely fought for our country here.

This is a magnificent edifice memorializing the first President of our great country as well as the brave men of the Continental Army who faced that terible winter of 1777. Let us who daily enjoy the freedoms and privileges and riches of this country remember in deepest reverence the hardships, the sacrifices, the trials, and the tribulations of that determined group of men, 3,000 of whom paid the supreme sacrifice through malnutrition, exposure and disease.

It is General George Washington and those brave men that the people of my State of Alabama honor in dedicating our seal in this memorial chapel.

The Christian's duty to his country and his duty to God go hand in hand. It is with nations as with individuals "seek ye first the rule of God and all other matters shall take their proper places."

A brief panorama of American history reminds one that Christian patriotism has always led the way to the highest hopes of humanity. From the beginning, America was founded on the Christian faith, inspired by Christian hope, guided by Christian truth, and nurtured by prayer.

On such an occasion as this, it is good to look into the past and remind ourselves of what our forefathers went through to give us the America we have. You who live here in Valley Forge are reminded every day as you pass the landmarks which were left by those who lived and died here. Just a few miles from here in Philadelphia we are reminded of those daring men who affixed their names to a unique and a singular document which every true American cherishes as his own Declaration of Independence. To these men, their action was at best a daring venture, a courageous hope, a noble dream, a bold act of faith. They well knew the odds of success weighed heavily against them, but their hatred of tyranny and their love of liberty were so strong that they felt compelled, for the sake of mankind, to wager the risk. They were convinced of one thing: They were on the same side with Almighty God.

During those difficult days of the constitutional convention, when agreement was next to impossible, it was Benjamin Franklin who stressed the necessity for prayer. He was an old man, and he urged that if the new Nation did not place and keep its trust in God, it could not long endure.

We must always remind ourselves of the past, because in that glorious past lies the fulfillment of our present freedom and culture, and the hope of our future.

There are some things we need to remind ourselves of, however, in which the hope of America's future does not lie.

It does not lie in her illustrious past, as eloquent and outstanding as all past achievements in America and her greatness have been. These things do not guarantee future hopes. America has well been called "the paradise of liberty" but like the Garden of Eden of a yesteryear, America could very well become a paradise of fools if she depended solely upon her past. We must look forward to those things that safeguard the future, as we remember conceit could well darken wisdom.

It does not lie in her politicians. It should be remembered that there is a line in the holy book which says, "Woe unto thee, O land, when thy king is a child.". It may be said of any land, "Woe unto thee, when thy statesmen become mere politicians". May our petition be:

"Give us men to match our mountains,
Give us men to match our plains
Men with empires in their bosoms,
Men with eras in their brains."

Only the statesman who puts the good of his country first, who will sacrifice his own good if necessary for the advancement of his morrow's record with those whose heroic country can match today's history and tospirits and lives out of the yesteryears. Let us continue to pray:

"God give us men
Men whom the lust of office does not kill:
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy.

It is the "Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog" of petty politics who are needed for troubled times such as envelop our world in this our finest hour. The liberties purchased by the blood of our fathers are threatened by political plunderers, term servers, and seekers of selfish advantage.

But if the skies are dark their are stars of hope to light them. May we have vision to see them. If America's hope be hid, it is hid to them to whom Christian patriotism is a relic of past ages, and to whom Stars and Stripes have lost their significance.

Our country's future does not lie in her great wealth and culture. Witness Egypt, Babylon, Greece, and Rome. All faded glories of the past. History tells a tragic story of nations once great in wealth sunken into decay and their greatness only a memory. Despite their wealth and their culture, the envy of all the rest of the world in their time could not save them from the work of the pallbearers of their generation.

America's real wealth is not in material things, her banks and skyscrapers and real estate and commerce and oil and cattle. Material wealth is easily swept away. Rather her imperishable wealth is in her glorious traditions, and incomparable history in her Bunker Hills and Gettysburgs and Santiagos and Chateau Thierrys and right here in Valley Forge where you and I stand this day. It is in her Christian ideals. It is in her godly institutions. It is in her freedom of conscience. It is in her untrammeled liberty. It is in her untarnished name. It is in her patriotism. It is in her youth of today and generations to follow, if they be endowed with Christian culture and principles that make for peace among men and the continuation of civilization upon earth. By these things nations live—without these things nations perish.

The hope of America lies in her moral purity. America has been victimized in many areas of time and space by a false teaching that morality is merely a matter of standards: That which is immoral a generation ago may be moral now: That which is below standard today may top the standards tomorrow: That vice in one age is virtue in another. Today there is a belittling of the standards. "To love your enemies. Do good to those who hate you." Rather, the standard seems to be to do as you like and live as you please. We must never subscribe to such philosophy. There is but one rule of peace and prosperity. Whether it be for individuals, communities, or nations, and that is "Whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them".

The hope of America lies in her political sanity. This calls for the supremecy of a constitution. If the Constitution becomes no more than a playing of politicians, then our freedom would soon be a thing of the past, and our manner of life subjected to the whims of political pranksters who might be in power.

Political sanity waits upon sane laws and law enforcement. It deplores our insane desire for the making of laws, and our unconcern for enforcing them. The Stars and Stripes are broad enough to float over every American, and all Americans, no matter who their ancestors, or from what country they come.

Political sanity calls for American idealism with its free schools, with its separation of church and state, and with its adjusted differences between capital, and labor. That every man's home is his castle, and that every man is his own priest before God—free to call upon Him and to worship as conscience alone dictates.

I could not conclude without a brief mention of Memorial Day, which is Tuesday. It would seem appropriate, here in the Washington Memorial Chapel, to remember those who died at Valley Forge and at Yorktown, at Gettysburg and Vicksburg, in the trenches and hedgerows of France, and Hurtsgen Forest and the Battle of the Bulge. More recently on Pork Chop Hill in Korea, and today in the filthy, disease infested jungles of Viet Nam, American patriots are still giving their lives for the cause in which they believe so strongly.

On this Memorial Day weekend, 1967, every American should resolve, as did Abraham Lincoln over 100 years ago, "that these dead shall not have died in vain".

TO EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced into the House of Representatives a bill designed to extend the provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965 and to increase the amount of Federal money available to plans both in progress and contemplated.

Too often in the past our Nation and its citizens have turned our backs on those productive and vital members of our society who have, merely through the passage of years, become regarded as unnecessary. Increased medical knowledge has stretched the life span; the Older Americans Act attempts to match this scientific advance with a corresponding social response. This act has already seen positive results and it is my hope that the extension and increased funding which I introduce today will carry forward and expand this exercise in fundamental human decency.

Specifically, my bill will extend the grant provisions of the act through 1972. In fiscal year 1968, $10,550,000 will be granted to the States for projects already begun and to allow for 240 to 300 new projects; $6,400,000 is authorized for research, demonstration, and training programs, with a particular emphasis on nutrition. Such sums as may prove necessary may be requested from the Congress for the next 4 years.

The provisions of my bill are in accordance with the bold and imaginative plans projected by President Johnson in his message on aid for the aged. I am pleased to associate myself with many distinguished specialists in the problems of longevity, whose knowledge and wisdom is only exceeded by their compassion. I feel that the extension of the Older Americans Act provided for by my bill, and the enlarging of its range and scope, is in keeping with the increased awareness that our social scientists have given us about aging and is a continuation of the noble tradition of allowing all Americans to enjoy the blessings of our unprecedented prosperity.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. REINECKE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. FOLEY (at the request of Mr. MEEDS), from May 31 through June 2, on account of official business.

Mr. MONAGAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. RUPPE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), on account of official business for Subcommittee on Coast Guard.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. FARBSTEIN), for May 31 and June 1, on account of official business.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CAHILL, for 60 minutes, on Monday, June 5; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 30 minutes, on June 1; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HALL.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. ROONEY of New York to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole on the bill H.R. 10345, and to include tables and other extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. REID of Illinois.

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. LATTA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in three instances.

Mr. VANIK.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6950. An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

785. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of intention to donate certain surplus property to the East Carolina Chapter, Inc., National Railway Historical Society, Greenville, N.C., pursuant to the provisions of section 7545 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

786. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facility project proposed to be undertaken for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–188; to the Committee on Armed Services.

787. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of work registration under Federal-State aid to dependent children of unemployed parents in the State of Ohio, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

788. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of selected procurements and of costs of dedication ceremonies in the Pacific region, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

789. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of determination relating to deferment of the 1967 and 1968 construction payments due the United States from the Foss Reservoir Master Conservancy District, Washita River Basin project, Oklahoma, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–308; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

790. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Council for Science and Technology, transmitting a copy of the annual progress report of the Committee on Water Resources Research, entitled "Federal Water Resources Research Program for Fiscal Year 1968," pursuant to the provisions of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (sec. 305); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

791. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Attorney General to admit to residential community treatment centers persons who are placed on probation, released on parole, or mandatorily released; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

792. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the collection of user charges, to permit any charges for customs services to be collected on a fixed rate of charge basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POOL: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 8. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Rept. No. 326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 10418. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lend obsolete or condemned rifles to local units of certain national veterans' organizations for use for ceremonial purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 10419. A bill to provide the Coast Guard with authority to conduct research and development for the purpose of dealing with the release of harmful fluids carried in vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10420. A bill to give the President authority to alleviate or to remove the threat to navigation, safety, marine resources, fish and wildlife, or the coastal economy posed by certain releases of fluids or other substances carried in oceangoing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10421. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 10422. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 10423. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 10424. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 10425. A bill to provide for the free entry of limestone imported to be used in the manufacture of chemical and industrial lime; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 10426. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 10427. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 10428. A bill to amend section 712 of title 38 of the United States Code for certain veterans holding national service life insurance who are totally disabled before their 71st birthday; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 10429. A bill relating to the conservation of natural resources upon lands of the United States and amending certain provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act and the Mineral Leasing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:
H.R. 10430. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:
H.R. 10431. A bill to provide for the return of unsolicited and personally offensive mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBISON:
H.R. 10432. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:
H.R. 10433. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize Federal grants under the open-space land program for the development and redevelopment of existing open-space land and for the acquisition of outdoor and indoor recreational buildings, centers, facilities, and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIS:
H.R. 10434. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WRIGHT:
H.R. 10435. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DORN:
H.R. 10436. A bill to provide for the modernization of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, S.C.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:
H.R. 10437. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that no grant may be made thereunder for a code enforcement program which includes or permits the inspection of one- or two-family homes without the consent of the owners or occupants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUDE:
H.R. 10438. A bill to create a commission to conduct a study with respect to cemeteries of the United States in which servicemen or veterans are or may be buried; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:
H.R. 10439. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:
H.R. 10440. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:
H.R. 10441. A bill to reduce crime and improve criminal procedures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:
H.R. 10442. A bill to facilitate exchanges of land under the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), for use for public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL (by request):
H.R. 10443. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 with respect to the determination of project cost and the Federal and non-Federal share thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:
H.R. 10444. A bill to amend section 27, Merchant Marine Act of 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 883); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NICHOLS:
H.R. 10445. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:
H.R. 10446. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:
H.J. Res. 596. Joint resolution concerning a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TENZER:
H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:
H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H. Con. Res. 365. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to aggression in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:
H. Con. Res. 366. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:
H. Con. Res. 367. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the crisis in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. MIZE, Mr. WINN, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. SKUBITZ):
H. Res. 495. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that certain social security and railroad retirement benefits shall not be made subject to Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

208. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the installation of prescribed fireproofing materials under and behind the driver's compartment of cab-over-engine commercial vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

209. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the expansion of the commercial fishing training program for Micronesian fisherman in Hawaii; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

210. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the use of foreign constructed vessels in Hawaii State ferry system; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

211. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to funds to be used in the reconstruction and maintenance of freeway access roads in the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Appropriations.

212. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the inclusion of funds in the harbors and rivers bill for the purpose of completing the plans and designs for the Waikiki Beach improvement project; to the Committee on Public Works.

213. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the unlawful burning and malicious damaging of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to reducing the import of mink pelts into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

215. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to the protection of interstate commuters from unfair multiple taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:
H.R. 10447. A bill for the relief of Michael Michalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:
H.R. 10448. A bill for the relief of John M. Toy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:
H.R. 10449. A bill for the relief of Camille Anita Dobson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:
H.R. 10450. A bill for the relief of Albert E. Jameson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:
H.R. 10451. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Tsouvales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:
H.R. 10452. A bill for the relief of Yehuda Ben Porat, Nehama Ben Porat, and Razya Ben Porat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:
H.R. 10453. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Riccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:
H.R. 10454. A bill for the relief of Andrea Caporrimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:
H.R. 10455. A bill for the relief of Idalina Vieira da Silva Cavaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:
H.R. 10456. A bill for the relief of Dr. George S. Ioannides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10457. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angela Zabarte Fandino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10458. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Zayas-Bazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:
H.R. 10459. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Guiang Fabrigar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 10460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amathine (Amentine) S. Hernandez and her children, Viviane Marie Nidaud and Jean Michel Arbonel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:
H.R. 10461. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Magdalena Widmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:
H.R. 10462. A bill for the relief of Comdr. John W. McCord; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:
H.R. 10463. A bill for the relief of Sabah Yagoub Atisha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

96. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to tax evasion, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the fourth calendar quarter of 1966 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,041.06. E. (9) $6,041.06.

A. Herbert F. Alfrey, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $395. E. (9) $19.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,851.20.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,827.66. E. (9) $3,827.66.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,135.52. E. (9) $1,135.52.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,798.37. E. (9) $4,798.37.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $333,254. E. (9) $5,444.79.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,395.73. E. (9) $10,395.73.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $15,211.52.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,272.26. E. (9) $1,272.26.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $37.47.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $64,052. E. (9) $500.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., 180 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $25.20.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Braniff Airways, Inc., Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $3,776.25. E. (9) $1.70.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $16,000. E. (9) $87.60.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated with the National Council of American Importers, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Margaret Lee Weil, 33 West 67th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $503.08.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Rockwell-Standard Corp., 300 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $14.85.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,374.61.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $230.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.
D. (6) $300.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $8,555.39. E. (9) $12,272.91.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,359.68. E. (9) $944.11.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.; and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Bird, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Joel D. Blackman, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,480. E. (9) $725.28.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $936.50. E. (9) $63.52.

A. Braniff Airways, Inc., Exchange Park, Dallas, Tex.
E. (9) $3,784.40.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,173.10.

A. Carl Bronn, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250.01.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,585.43.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, care of Mr. Chaco Chace, 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $105.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $512.43.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Moog Industries, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. George H. Buschmann, World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Psychoanalytic Society, 4925 MacArthur Boulevard NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the American Institute of Laundering, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.50.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dan L. Butler, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harold K. Howe, on behalf of the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe., London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $355.07.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. Seafarers International Union.
D. (6) $2,222.22. E (9) $710.60.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,756.59. E. (9) $17.74.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. South African Sugar Association, Post Office Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
D. (6) $14,740. E. (9) $3,599.51.

A. Central Scientific Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,275.93.

A. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,024.43. E. (9) $2,024.43.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,030.42. E. (9) $522.65.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $212.50.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $273. E. (9) $6.79.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $7,483.66.

A. Paul Conrad, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $110.25.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,531.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $292.41. E. (9) $292.41.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Boulevard, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,752.18. E. (9) $175.19.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States–Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $958. E. (9) $17.04.

A. Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward G. Sparrow, 1 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.60.

A. Franklin W. Denius, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex., and Texas Power & Light Co., Post Office Box 6331, Dallas, Tex.

A. Horace J. DePodwin Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $242.08.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $230.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $553.14.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $28.14.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $989.82.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $237.50. E. (9) $50.93.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.,
D. (6) $395. E. (9) $22.70.

A. Lawrence E. Ernest, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,068.

A. John W. Fitzgerald, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $290.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,325. E. (9) $33.39.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,189.95. E. (9) $33.66.

A. Neal P. Gillen, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Gladwin, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Massachusetts General Hospital, Fruit Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.

A. W. S. Goodkin, 112 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. George Gross, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $282.12.

A. Wilfred H. Hall, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Hamilton Associates, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $416.25. E. (9) $437.95.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000.02. E. (9) $230.69.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $143.05.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,917. E. (9) $126.58.

A. John T. Haughey, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,307.60. E. (9) $7.20.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW. Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $980.85.

A. Neel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Christopher O. Henderson, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $25.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $395. E. (9) $31.20.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas B. House.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., care of Norris E. Phillips, 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,285. E. (9) $1,344.40.

A. Humor Lobby of Humor Exchange Network, 5516 South Utah Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. Meryle V. Hutchison, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,424.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $787.85.

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, 715 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3.

A. Ralph K. James, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $41.55.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $18.70.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1120 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $250.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $270.83.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $31.31.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,752. E. (9) $930.99.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of ASCS County Office Employees, care of Clyde R. Payne, Jasper, Fla.
D. (6) $825. E (9) $125.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $125.

A. Richard M. Lauzier, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobber Magazine, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $225.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45.

A. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6,587.95.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,200. E. (9) $1,519.66.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,924.88. E. (9) $2,924.88.

A. John J. Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,249.99. E. (9) $837.22.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,241.98. E. (9) $685.43.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,625.00. E. (9) $16.80.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, State and Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308.48. E. (9) $703.26.

A. W. F. McKenna, 427 West Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Savings & Loan League.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,362. E. (9) $13.73.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,375.25. E. (9) $213.07.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $155. E. (9) $16.86.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Jos. R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $673.32.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,703.21.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $3,255. E. (9) $87.24.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $382. E. (9) $33.46.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,110. E. (9) $295.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Melvin, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $645.80. E. (9) $27.35.

A. Clinton R. Miller, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $750.

A. Luther L. Miller, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,307.60. E. (9) $2.90.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 486, Taos, N. Mex.
E. (9) $887.97.

A. Thomas F. Mitchell, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., Box 311, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $27.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,712.68.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Murden & Co., Inc., 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E.C. 3, England, and Norwegian Shipowners Association, Post Office Box 1452, Oslo, Norway.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $539.76.

A. Murden & Co., Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Informal Committee of 18 European and Other Foreign Cruise Ship Lines, in care of Mr. Vincent Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $987.91.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7278, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,585.43.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45,117.93. E. (9) $1,331.25.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,671.79. E. (9) $19,033.04.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $467,357.81. E. (9) $16,238.70.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32,621.46. E. (9) $20,386.81.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $800.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,325.35. E. (9) $9,325.35.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $588,026. E. (9) $5,896.45.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,928.17.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, care of Dr. A. B. Baker, Division of Neurology, University of Minnesota Hospital, Minneaplois, Minn.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Association, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,576.23.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,023.75. E. (9) $5,578.36.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $150.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Scientific Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $375.93.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $226.20.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60,051.60. E. (9) $4,244.70.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $113,787.17. E. (9) $9,886.27.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $107.11.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.05. E. (9) $1,949.45.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $716.40.

A. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,680.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,492.29.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,539.10.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,700. E. (9) $973.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,936. E. (9) $15,557.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,561.95. E. (9) $2,799.90.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $170.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $21,389. E. (9) $3,729.11.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $73.80.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Ben Paul Noble, Andrew McR. Barnes, and Allan M. Ephraim, 2022 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hallmark, Inc.; Westminster Time Corp.; Phoenix Industries, Inc.; Stratton Watch Co. (all watch assemblers of Agena, Guam).
D. (6) $3,090. E. (9) $288.60.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,225.02. E. (9) $363.42.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,017.77.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,770.15.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,281. E. (9) $1,917.11.

A. John A. Overholt, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md., and 1106 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,961.64.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $147.25.

A. Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, USA (Ret.), 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $3,313.38.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $4,731. E. (9) $3,238.67.

A. Albert Pike, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y. et al.
D. (6) $17,550.01. E. (9) $7,895.53.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $135.96.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 105, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Stimson Lumber Co., Post Office Box 68, Forest Grove, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $24.72.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Elisabeth von Oberndorff, 200 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5.50.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,875.04. E. (9) $206.90.

A. Stanley Rector, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6,000.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $304.80. E. (9) $551.31.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. $55.78.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $226.38.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Public Relations Co., Ltd. (N.Y.) d/b/a Japan Steel Information Center, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $125.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $152.

A. Rockwell-Standard Corp., 300 Sixth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $14.85.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $119.80.

A. John F. Rolph III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $385.52.

A. Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, 110 Bridge Street, Manchester, Mass.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $93.60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,070.35.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,253.31. E. (9) $486.51.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $97.64.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $398.74.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. A. Z. Shows, 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. WILMAC Corp., 1800 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $661.79.

A. Gerald A. Simmons, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,479. E. (9) $28.35.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform Lobby, 1629A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $108.40.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 19th Street South, Arlington, Va.
B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $185.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $225.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $225.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,575. E. (9) $137.68.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,989.63.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $25.

A. Richard L. Studley, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Post Office Box 19128. Washington, D.C.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $79.29.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $455.25. E. (9) $180.71.

A. C. M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,884.80. E. (9) $115.13.

A. Craig L. Thomas, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,754. E. (9) $29.35.

A. Evert S. Thomas, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $579. E. (9) $74.04.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,846.52.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $703.49.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $7,880.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,021. E. (9) $15.18.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $263.20. E. (9) $1,655.91.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,194.04.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $35,525. E. (9) $6,750.33.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $348.18. E. (9) $38.13.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth Williamson, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,561.53. E. (9) $439.76.

A. Morton M. Winston.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,153.86. E. (9) $337.40.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1967:

(NOTE.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ◀

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	("Period" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $34.92.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,030. E. (9) $3,030.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5847.82. E. (9) $5,847.82.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., Suite 409, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,675.91. E. (9) $3,675.91.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, Post Office Box 5800, Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert F. Alfrey, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $394. E. (9) $19.50.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $1,677.45.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62.50. E. (9) $10.58.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Americman Beekeeping Federation, Minco, Okla.
D. (6) $3,815.40. E. (9) $5,363.14.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8,561.95.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 3505 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $310. E. (9) $708.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,759.96. E. (9) $4,759.96.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, General Offices: Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.; Washington Offices: 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30,531. E. (9) $30,531.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $43,796.79.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washingon, D.C.
D. (6) $4,539.60. E. (9) $4,489.72.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $344,810.80. E. (9) $5,497.86.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 South Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,950.

A. American Israel Pulbic Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Suite 720, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,857.02. E. (9) $6,531.06.

A. American Justice Association, Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $83,989.67. E. (9) $36,686.22.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,153.51. E. (9) $15,932.39.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $571.10. E. (9) $23.05.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $15,364.66.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,432.61. E. (9) $10,432.61.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $6,712.49. E. (9) $6,712.49.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $318.20. E. (9) $782.35.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,315.13. E. (9) $662.86.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $14,719. E. (9) $8,151.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,490.34.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,493.80. E. (9) $1,493.80.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $12,751.94. E. (9) $12,751.94.

A. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $14,166.

A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $17,825.31.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,256.60. E. (9) $3,256.60.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,302. E. (9) $26.15.

A. Mrs. Erma Angevine, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arkansas Railroad Association, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class one railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,190.34.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,348.01.

A. The Associated General Contractors, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Railroad Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,468.18. E. (9) $3,469.18.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,997.04. E. (9) $4,997.04.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $113.53. E. (9) $69.78.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW.. Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $215.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,005.50.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $10,075. E. (9) $8,092.32.

A. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $72.50.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,181.25. E. (9) $1,027.08.

A. Baker & McKenzie, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Clark Equipment Co., Buchanan, Mich.
D. (6) $3,244.

A. Baker & McKenzie, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Celia Margulis, 50 Belmont Avenue, Sutton Terrace, Bala Cynwyd, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $70,000.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Great Northern Railway Co., St. Paul, Minn., and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $300.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $12.96.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $10,629.62. E. (9) $12,536.81.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Company of North America and Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $488.50. E. (9) $262.54.

A. Eugene T. Bartkowiak, 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Roy Battles, 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

A. (Mrs.) Dita Davis Beard, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $3,100.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,815.44. E. (9) $992.75.

A. John H. Beidler,
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,491. E. (9) $267.39.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $5.31.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,886.45.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,578. E. (9) $308.25.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenues of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $670.

A. Robert W. Blair.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $876.55.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,654.31.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,840. E. (9) $578.44.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Diamond & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $11.60.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lyle M. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $238.56.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $34.88.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,272.81. E. (9) $370.38.

A. Colonel A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 122 Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.
E. (9) $465.50.

A. Thomas C. Brickle, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Fred T. Bridges Associates, 406–10 Southern Building NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coopers International Union, 429 West Walnut Street, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Wally Briscoe.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $16.50.

A. David A. Brody, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $70.

A. Derek Brooks, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $729.45.

A. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,992.69. E. (9) $7,992.69.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,166.66. E. (9) $1,086,63.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $303.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $612. E. (9) $619.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, 2725 Avenue E, Riviera Beach, Fla.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, care of Chaco Chace, 2 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $30.53.

A. George S. Bullen.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $114.50.

A. George J. Burger.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Burke, Finlen Hotel, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Drawer 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $400.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $13,223.90. E. (9) $602.04.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.
E. (9) $318.36.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67.50.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $68.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1514 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $95.81.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $80.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carl Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $83.08.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Roscelle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $2,589.71. E. (9) $576.82.

A. Marvin Caplan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,704.50. E. (9) $94.20.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Kirlin, Campbell & Keating, Room 505, the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,966.76.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. Seafarers International Union.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,150.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $192.15.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Richard M. Carrigan, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,816.88. E. (9) $230.28.

A. Blue A. Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,298.96. E. (9) $137.26.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $20.

A. Ralph E. Casey, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,380. E. (9) $155.30.

A. E. Michael Cassady, 225 South Meramec, Suite 1032T, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, Suite 1032T, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $25,040. E. (9) $21,893.84.

A. Col. Joseph L. Chabot, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $20.86.

A. Chapman, DiSalle, and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
E. (9) $1,078.10.

A. Chapman, DiSalle, and Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7.10.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $75.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,429.09. E. (9) $3,850.26.

A. Edwin Christianson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $31,134.85.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,557.90.

A. William F. Claire, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $45.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, P.O. Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $272.77.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 917 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris, Inc.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. David Cohen, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,572. E. (9) $70.76.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for a Reasonable World Trade Center, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,150.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $13.80.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
(D. (6) $750.

A. Richard G. Cohen, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Universal Consolidated Industries, 1 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $231.25.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $579.26. E. (9) $579.26.

A. Harrison Combs, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,289.98.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,150.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $232.15.

A. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Group consisting of New Process Company (Warren, Pa.) and Columbia Broadcasting Company (51 West 52d Street, New York, N.Y.).

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $66,225. E. (9) $1,818.85.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $93.80.

A. Howard M. Conner, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $583.50. E. (9) $484.27.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $240.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $19.75.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $44.30.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 506, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,332.90.

A. Darrell Coover, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $203.30.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,595.47. E. (9) $18,679.86.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mortgage Insurance Cos., Post Office Box 2976, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $1,962.50. E. (9) $81.75.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $21.09.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. Steele Culbertson, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Fish Meal & Oil Association, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $41.50.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,984.14. E. (9) $500.28.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $2,023.13.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railroads of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Bereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $34.56.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $343.75 E. (9) $282.04.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $5.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $127.62.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Union Tank Car Co., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago Ill.
D. (6) $833.25. E. (9) $8.25.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $172.60. E. (9) $172.60.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Admiral Time, Inc., Belair Time Corp., and Unitime Corp., St. Croix, V.I., Bulti-Jewell Corp., St. Thomas, V.I.
D. (6) $13,125. E. (9) $72.03.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,200.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $12,928.50.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Export Agency Division, Calcutta, India.
D. (6) $20,000.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., and Equitable Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $94.60.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Responsive Environments Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $198.75.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John deLaittre, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,600. E. (9) $6,283.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Ronald W. DeLucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $100.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Lloyd J. Derrickson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,100.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,762.50. E. (9) $215.15.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62.28. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 388, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,169.22. E. (9) $144.22.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Post Office Box 15830, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,105.01. E. (9) $55.01.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Yuba County Water Agency, Marysville, Calif.
D. (6) $1,213,75. E. (9) $13.75.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $11,375. E. (9) $1,767.47.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $7.50.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,856.30. E. (9) $561.08.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $190.30.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,397.78.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Mortimer B. Doyle, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Franklin B. Dryden, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,715.44. E. (9) $1,995.57.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,597.50. E. (9) $160.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $215.

A. Robert G. Dwyer, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8. E. (9) $26.73.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,512.50. E. (9) $1,685.21.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $247.75.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md.
D. (6) $4,736.80. E. (9) $2,586.90.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $478.98. E. (9) $34.28.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centre, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,226.75.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $394. E. (9) $27.

A. Myles W. English, 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 202 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $672. E. (9) $69.60.

A. Ethyle Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $751.50.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,174. E. (9) $18.

A. William J. Fannin, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89,049.49. E. (9) $19,821.77.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Arthur Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue., Chicago Ill.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Joe G. Fender, 802 Houston First Savings Building, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $1,714.41.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Footwear Association, Inc., 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $28.59.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C.
D. (6) $7,125. E. (9) $135.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $80.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $24.29.

A. Floyd O. Flom, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,200.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, 2725 Avenue E, Riviera Beach, Fla.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $27.33.

A. Frederick W. Ford.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $417. E. (9) $18.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago. Ill.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $128.44.

A. Charles E. Foster, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.75. E. (9) $250.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $70.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $172.64.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $120.53. E. (9) $98.60.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph Freni, Jr., 1619 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50,077. E. (9) $8,911.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $611.

A. John Baxter Funderburk, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $80.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170. E. (9) $125.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,243.28. E. (9) $31.38.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $2.48.

A. Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $53.51.

A. Glenn F. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Government Employees' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,602.71. E. (9) $3,712.84.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $48.33.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $16,961.94. E. (9) $16,961.94.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George O. Gray, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,600.66.

A. James A. Grey, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $38.25.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. John G. Griner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,923.10. E. (9) $692.31.

A. George Gross, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $909.10. E. (9) $55.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association and American Zinc Co.
D. (6) $4,100. E. (9) $2,300.

A. Jerome R. Gulan.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $428.75.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,294. E. (9) $129.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $625.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,346.14.

A. Norman S. Halliday, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $5.04.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tejon Ranch Co., Post Office Box 1560, Bakersfield, Calif.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $114.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dale W. Hardin, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $119.03.

A. William E. Hardman, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Proctor & Gamble Mfg. Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $28.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $403.30.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 W Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $50.30.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperative, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,200. E. (9) $186.39.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 58 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.
E. (9) $321.87.

A. John T. Haughey, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,692.20. E. (9) $8.60.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $4.31.

A. Eugene B. Hayden, Jr., 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays & Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $11.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $40.65.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $198.69. E. (9) $198.69.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $17.25.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,441.95.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $150.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $466.90.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,149.42.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.
D. (6) $4,583.50. E. (9) 93.05.

A. Hester & Stone, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $69.45.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington. D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $394. E. (9) $45.

A. William Bentley Hitchcock II, 2413 Enfield Road, Austin, Tex.
B. International Public Relations, Inc., 315 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

A. Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $107.35.

A. Lawrence Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticue Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $61.80.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas B. House.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,607.47.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $352.50.

A. Robert R. Humphreys, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $96.30.

A. Meryle V. Hutchison, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,828.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $75.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Miss Alice M. Hebing, Rochester, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $1. E. (9) $414.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,227.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,545.45. E. (9) $8,545.45.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $3.50.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6,695.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21,243.24.

A. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,474.98.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $2,975. E. (9) $4.87.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1000 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $26,894.75. E. (9) $9,183.56.

A. Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $314.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnson Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $264.95.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.51. E. (9) $43.10.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stockyards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $423.80. E. (9) $2.20.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,461.38. E. (9) $126.07.

A. Spencer A. Johnson, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Stuart H. Johnson, Jr., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $22.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $165.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $49.30.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $217.85.

A. Allan M. Kearney, 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Electric Co., 1001 Broad Street, Johnstown, Pa.
D. (6) $619.27. E. (9) $269.50.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. William J. Keating, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Eugene Adams Keeney, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rookwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
E. (9) $675.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mayonnaise & Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Thomas A. Kelly, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180.

A. Cornelius B. Kennedy, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $77.80

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $635.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,500. E. (9) $550.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $60.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Reuben H. Donnelley Corp., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $75.

A. J. Don Kerlin, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Time, Inc., Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $150.

A. William J. Kerwin, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $270.83.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $633.65. E. (9) $25.35.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $1,720.34.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $19.42.

A. Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz & Masters, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $690. E. (9) $72.56.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
D. (6) $158.03. E. (9) $154.65.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $11.50.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 430 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $51.66.

A. James F. Kmets, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,790.

A. George J. Knaly, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.06.

A. George W. Koch, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $40.25.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $213.20.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,124.83.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,872. E. (9) $1,001.72.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,397.63.

A. Laborers' Political Action League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,672.21. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,292. E. (9) $6,866.

A. Julian J. Landau, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $55.50.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Morton Langstaff, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $52.41.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. Edward Lashman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.
D. (6) $3,913. E. (9) $662.43.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $156.30.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $66.46.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $472.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.25. E. (9) $108.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $144.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,600.66.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $58.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,249.96.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,299.99.

A. Roy T. Lester, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $25.65.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,028.14.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,295. E. (9) $16,763.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,076.59. E. (9)$5,076.59.

A. Lightweight Aggregate Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.
D. (6) $8,094.82. E. (9) $5,361.34.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8.

A. John J. Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $738.60. E. (9) $188.75.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,511.74.

A. Zel E. Libsen, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, AFL–CIO, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,575.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washintgon, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $17.33.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tennessee.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $70.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $30.90.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $293.50.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Robert W. Johnson, Jr., Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, N.J.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Home Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William R. Lucas, Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.
B. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) $130.

A. Dr. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,388.10. E. (9) $527.84.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John M. Lynham, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles and Katrushka J. Parsons, 310 Park Avenue, Pasay City, Manila, Philippines.
E. (9) $313.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,687. E. (9) $62.21.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $3,437.49. E. (9) $810.28.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Robert C. McCandless.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $104.90.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employees' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,019.22.

A. E. L. McCulloch, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $284.60. E. (9) $81.50.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington. D.C.
D. (6) $3,277.06. E. (9) $210.14.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $504.76.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308.48. E. (9) $185.

A. Barbara D. McCarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington D.C. and its subcommittee, Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul J. McGowan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Legislature, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V.I.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $856.15.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $140.56.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,049.50.

A. Clarence H. McIntosh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,361.50. E. (9) $74.12.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $226.02.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,387. E. (9) $60.25.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,375.25. E. (9) $125.66.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $224.15.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $361.93. E. (9) $25.76.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. John G. MacFarlan, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,290. E. (9) $315.50.

A. Joseph R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Mountain Fir Lumber Co., Independence, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $247.98.

A. Joseph R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Potlatch Forests Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $515.37.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $28.40.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,272.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $5.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $180.46.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margolis, 924 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,296.20. E. (9) $136.21.

A. James Herk, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,790.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. David M. Marsh, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $38.10.

A. Michael Marsh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.36.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $199.06. E. (9) $312.42.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoko, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW. Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,192.23. E. (9) $980.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $908.01.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $541.24. E. (9) $855.81.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $137.61.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,820. E. (9) $132.06.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,120. E. (9) $225.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mayonnaise and Salad Dressings Institute, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,291. E. (9) $32.50.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8,800.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,186. E. (9) $354.03.

A. Donald Melvin, 20 East Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $702.14. E. (9) $265.81.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,545.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $154.93.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $20.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Telephone Answering Exchange, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Music Publishers' Association, Inc., 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $368.31.

A. Clinton R. Miller, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $750.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1815 Capitol Plaza, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Plaza, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $236.18.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $357.12.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $588.89.

A. Luther L. Miller, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,692.20. E. (9) $12.45.

A. Jim M. Milligan, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Water Co. Conference, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $116.43.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,004.12.

A. Carl A. Modecki, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 525 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40.66. E. (9) $155.68.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Morison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Curtis Morris, Premier Building, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $900.

A. John J. Murphy, Wilelinor Estates, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association, Wilelinor Estates, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,833.32. E. (9) $369.25.

A. Micah H. Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ethyl Corp., 611 Madison Office Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,533.75. E. (9) $1,011.69.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $14.33.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $61,807.14. E. (9) $10,504.20.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $64,325.66. E. (9) $1,298.40.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $609,905.86. E. (9) $17,443.06.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,368.14. E. (9) $3,368.14.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $256.69. E. (9) $256.69.

A. The National Association of Polish Americans, Inc., 3829 W Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30,000. E. (9) $6,957.41.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42,111.82. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
E. (9) $845.56.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,180.01. E. (9) $10,180.01.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $387,153.32. E. (9) $10,220.88.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee to Abolish HUAC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,677.45. E. (9) $1,677.45.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $586.50. E. (9) $586.50.

A. National Conference of Nonprofit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,575.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,363.13. E. (9) $2,363.13.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4.838.75. E. (9) $8,860.60.

A. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $250.60.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $578.66. E. (9) $651.71.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cenco Instruments Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $126.24.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $112.01.

A. Federal Relations Division (NEA), National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16,664.87.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Farmers Organization, 720 Davis Avenue, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $6,701.70.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,785.51. E. (9) $23,785.51.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $815.23. E. (9) $955.84.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $52,356.46. E. (9) $31,158.14.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $240.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.05. E. (9) $1,924.45.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $418,204. E. (9) $577.17.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350.60. E. (9) $1,350.60.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,787.10. E (9) $4,787.10.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $698.68.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,866. E. (9) $1,034.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,587.25.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,262.34.

A. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,750.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $779. E. (9) $4,949.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $365,065. E. (9) $2,332.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,980.69. E. (9) $38,730.04.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $972.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.16.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,073.60.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,950. E. (9) $2,742.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $735.25.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $38.30.

A. New England Footwear Association, Inc., 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $428.59. E. (9) $428.59.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,615.38. E. (9) $1,012.28.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 29 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) $130.

A. Charles M. Noone, 410 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $190.60.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $5.62.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,450. E. (9) $3,508.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $249.15.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $250.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,508.34. E. (9) $179.57.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,166. E. (9) $55.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $53.16.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economic Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $23,405.61.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $407.08.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,490.72.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 501 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 500 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.10.

A. Susanne Lois Orrin, 1126 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee on Africa, 211 East 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $432.86.

A. Morris E. Osborn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $185.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $81.14. E. (9) $39.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 200 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Michael Pasternak, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,474.98.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $197.75.

A. E. George Pazianos, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,316.38.

A. D. V. Pensabene, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $25.

A. J. Carter Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, USA (Ret.), 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $125.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $4,871.23.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $250.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph D. Phelan, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Colorado River Association, 417 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John P. Philbin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $167.91.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $145.11.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $80.14.

A. Albert Pike, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bruce O. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $510.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $77.20.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,460.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $90,141.70. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhause, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph M. Pollard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County of Los Angeles, State of California, Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $1,050.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $263.17.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $212.37.

A. Ramsey D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Saving & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $219.68.

A. William H. Press, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,000.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $2.

A. Earle W. Putman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16.21. E. (9) $8.10.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $9,049.98. E. (9) $8,740.16.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $202.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Raleigh, Jr., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,125.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $73.03.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,008.36. E. (9) $241.75.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Railroads.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $154.71.

A. Robert E. Reiser, 6649 Holland Street, McLean, Va.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Reserve Officers Association of United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $158,405.19.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Post Office Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $355. E. (9) $2,033.89.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $823.70. E. (9) $7,284.75.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $8.16.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana Railroads.
D. (6) $57.50. E. (9) $90.31.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $170.

A. William Neale Roach, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Armament Corp. (Interarmco), 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent National Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, care of Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Stephen Philip Robin, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Public Relations Co., Ltd. (N.Y.), d/b/a Japan Steel Information Center, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $146.96. E. (9) $125.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $183.

A. Howard O. Robinson, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $249.50.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $155. E. (9) $3.82.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $526.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Realty & Petroleum Corp., 16 West 61st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Power Authority of the State of New York, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $47.41.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Harland J. Rue.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
E. (9) $348.22.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $171. E. (9) $165.83.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $469.16.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $384.87.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Leslie J. Schmidt Associates, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $200.

A. Scribner, Hall & Casey, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for an Interstate Taxation Act, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th St. NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308.48. E. (9) $214.12.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $237.65.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $310.

A. David C. Sharman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $684.09.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $879.33.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $474.99.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $950.46.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Alvin V. Shoemaker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $287.50

A. Robert L. Shortle, 1147 International Trade Mart Tower, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. George Shuff, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,416. E. (9) $1,951.66.

A. Gerald A. Simmons, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,042. E. (9) $43.87.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $16,350. E. (9) $4,226.25.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 19th Street South, Arlington, Va.
B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 996 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $59.05.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $15.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,021.84.

A. Donald E. Smiley, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $965.68.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $29.40.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) $13.50.

A. James E. Smith, 315 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $390.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Smith, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Robert William Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,975. E. (9) $278.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,430. E. (9) $305.50.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $95.51. E. (9) $52.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $227.04.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,160.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,816.50. E. (9) $3,303.72.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $30.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $129.12.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $61,344.40. E. (9) $5,781.11.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $1.53.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Lynn E. Stalbaum, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Newton I. Steers, Jr., 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md.

A. Mrs. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co., Lancaster, Pa.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $75.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Unione Industriale Pratese, Prato, Italy; American Textile Importers Association, 200 West 34th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S.
D. (6) $4,350. E. (9) $195.35.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Box 168, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907–X, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 231, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,675.98. E. (9) $803.72.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $41.47.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. Mr. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $57.69. E. (9) $9.78.

A. Gary Tabak, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Ralph L. Tabor, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365.60. E. (9) $517.33.

A. Warren G. Taylor, 604–605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee, 604–605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

A. Craig L. Thomas, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,837. E. (9) $61.17.

A. Evert S. Thomas, 20 E. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $962. E. (9) $196.17.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $163.39. E. (9) $126.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,236. E. (9) $730.08.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $147.50. E. (9) $118.72.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,418.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $195.70.

A. Frank A. Todd, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $405.

A. David R. Toll, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $301.82.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $36.85.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington D.C.
E. (9) $144.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,062. E. (9) $39.20.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $87.

A. G. D. Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,383.53. E. (9) $1,681.87.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $150.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $86.95.

A. David G. Unger, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $1,129.61.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $497.79.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $569,186.33. E. (9) $60,635.73.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $178.04.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $30,466.31.

A. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $76.50. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $480.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $97. E. (9) $20.85.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 44 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $150.

A. The Voice of the People in Action (The Society of the People, Inc.), 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
E. (9) $24.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $8,318.21.

A. E. R. Wagner, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $161.55. E. (9) $16.88.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John S. Walker, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $712.50. E. (9) $46.69.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,525.01. E. (9) $785.06.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,848.08. E. (9) $898.25.

A. William A. Walton, Garlinghouse Building, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, Garlinghouse Building, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,159.50. E. (9) $2,790.77.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $420.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 1750 Brentwood Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,451.88.

A. E. Jerome Webster, Jr.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,000.

A. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $956.25. E. (9) $126.90.

A. Donald F. White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $70.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $200.05.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Douglas Whitlock III, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8.95.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
E. (9) $14.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. KSL, Inc., 145 Social Hall Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $1.80.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 156 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill., 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $203.76.

A. E. Raybond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,440.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $529.61.

A. Robert Winter-Berger, 123 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,850.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $579.26. E. (9) $579.26.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation-Communication Employees Union, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Football League, 280 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $10.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Holy Corp., 1111 West Foothill Boulevard, Azusa, Calif.; General Development Corp., 2828 Coral Way, Miami, Fla.; and Cherokee Village Development Corp., Cherokee Village, Ark.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $418.30.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Business Development Corp., 45 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $10.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $216.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,001.20. E. (9) $370.05.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,049.56.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1967:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William N. Albus, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Life Underwriters, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. Blaine Bailey, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank Blake, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rev. Eugene L. Boutilier, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Campaign for Agricultural Democracy, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Bridges Associates, 406–10 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coopers International Union, 401 Republic Building, Louisville, Ky.

A. Lydston D. C. Cady, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Central Scientific Co., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. Chapman, DiSalle & Friedman, 932 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. David Cohen.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Howard M. Conner, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Thomas L. Copas, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Eugene Meyer III, Katharine Graham, Frederick S. Beebe, and American Security & Trust Co., as trustees under an agreement, dated April 25, 1963, between them and Agnes E. Meyer.

A. Louis R. Damiani, 4619 Conshohocken Avenue, Philadelphia Pa.
B. National Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police, Alms Hotel, Victory Parkway at Taft Road, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Larry C. Davenport, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago & North Western Railway Co., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Horace J. DePodwin Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. Lloyd J. Derrickson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Mortimer B. Doyle, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert G. Dwyer, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Elliott & Naftalin, 1330 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Business Schools Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Verne H. Evans, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Vernon LeRoy Ferwerda, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 117 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Canada.

A. Walter L. Frankland, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gadsby, Maguire & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brazilian Embassy, 3007 Whitehaven Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George Grant, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman S. Halliday, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Hamilton Associates, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. F. Donald Hart, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Haughey, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Heiney, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Philip D. Helmig, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Richfield Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ceramic Tile Manufacturers of the United States, Inc., 643 Main Street, Olean, N.Y.

A. Fred A. Hufnagel, Jr., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. E. Iisenburg, 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. Ives, Whitehead & Co., Inc., 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul Jennings, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gene Johnson, 720 Fleming Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian J. Landau, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Morton Langstaff, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Edward B. Lockett, 4407 Klingle Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Statehood Republican Party, Apartado 1207, San Juan, P.R.

A. Al Loewenthal, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trinity Industries, Inc., 4001 Irving Boulevard, Dallas, Tex.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Luther L. Miller, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jack Mills, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute.

A. Charles B. Murray, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 168 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Campaign for Agricultural Democracy, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 202 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Oliver, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Susanne Lois Orrin, in care of UAW, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee on Africa, 211 East 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David J. Pattison, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Life Underwriters, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. George Pazianos, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Howard O. Robinson, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Realty & Petroleum Corp., 16 West 61st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Committee for the Recording Arts, 9300 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert Wm. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Mr. Stanley L. Sommer, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles L. Stewart, Jr., 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Encyclopaedia Britannica Educational Corp., 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Industries Machinery Tariffs, 404 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Industriale Prato, Prato, Italy; American Textile Importers Association, 200 West 34th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Sutherland, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. World Airways, Inc., Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif.

A. Evert S. Thomas, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. CUNA International, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Clark W. Thompson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Independent Telephone Association.

A. Phillip Tocker, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Tucker, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United Business Schools Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Rein J. Vander Zee, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Installment Land Sales & Development Association of Florida, Inc., 420 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Robert H. Voight, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. Walker, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Charles A. Webb, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, Association of Intercity Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert N. Winter-Berger, 123 East 75th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lewis F. Wood, 1900 West 29th Street, Pine Bluff, Ark.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Development Corp., 2828 Coral way, Miami, Fla., Holly Corp., 1111 West Foothill Boulevard, Azusa, Calif., Cherokee Village in care of John Mack Smith, Post Office Box 830, West Memphis, Ark.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us.

To Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite hearts.

Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be servants of all.

Wilt Thou crown our deliberations with Thy wisdom and with spacious thinking to fit these epic days.

As heralds of Thy love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts, as a holy sacrament, the bread of human kindness and the red wine of willing sacrifice.

Make real to us that kingdom whose radiant verities are its faith, its ideals, its visions which shine on the far horizons and its aspirations that lay hold of God and goodness without alloy.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday,

May 25, and Monday, May 29, 1967, was dispensed with.

REPORT ON SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Fourth Annual Report on Special International Exhibitions conducted during fiscal year 1966 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

The primary purpose of the program—in which the Nation's economic, social, and cultural achievements are exhibited in international fairs and expositions—is to build bridges of understanding between the United States and other countries of the world. Each exhibit is designed to show how our accomplishments relate to the capabilities and aspirations of the different countries. Because the exhibitions feature the products of American industries, they also contribute to mutually profitable trade relationships.

Since the program began in 1954, more than 100 million people—primarily in Eastern Europe and the developing countries—have witnessed 176 exhibits designed to help them understand, appreciate, and benefit from American progress and experience.

During fiscal year 1966, the United States participated in a broad range of international events:

Trade fair exhibitions in Algeria, Ethiopia, Hungary, Iran, Poland, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia: These exhibitions dramatized our progress in mechanical equipment for farm and industry, educational techniques, electronics, and space.

Expo 67: During the year, plans were laid for our participation in the World's Fair which opened in Montreal, Canada, in April 1967. "Creative America" was chosen as the theme of this country's exhibit, which pictures American achievements in the arts and space technology.

Labor exhibits at trade fairs in Ethiopia, Hungary, Iraq, Poland, and Yugoslavia: The purpose of these exhibits was to project the true image of the American worker and the role he plays in the affairs of this Nation.

Special-purpose East-West exhibits in the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia: More than 2 million persons attended these exhibits, which featured the machinery of American industry, American architecture, and the graphic arts.

As in past years, the program's effectiveness was the result not only of Government efforts, but also of the contribution of materials, time, and talent by hundreds of private firms.

All Americans are indebted to them for their efforts to help carry America's message to the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1967.*

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for fiscal year 1966.

For three decades the insurance system administered by the Board has been protecting railroad workers and their families against the economic hazards which accompany unemployment, sickness, old age, and death.

During the period covered by this report, more than 1 million individuals received $1.2 billion in retirement and survivor benefits—an increase of $82 million over the preceding year. These payments brought to $14.5 billion the total amount paid to retired employees, wives, and survivors of deceased employees since the program began in 1936.

In fiscal 1966 payments for unemployment and sickness dropped below the $100 million mark—to $88.1 million—for the first time in 13 years. This reduction reflects the unprecedented economic expansion which this country has enjoyed during the last 6 years. In each, unemployment among railroad workers showed a significant decline.

The increases in retirement and survivor benefits reported here represented increased comfort and security in the retirement years of many worthy citizens. But even greater comfort and protection would come with congressional enactment of the social security amendments which I have proposed this year. The proposed 20-percent increase would in the first year alone bring $65 million in added benefits to some 385,000 railroad workers and their families.

I again urge the Congress to take this vital step toward our goal of providing every elderly citizen an adequate income and a meaningful retirement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1967.*

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On May 26, 1967:

S. 1161. An act to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On May 25, 1967:

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act, and other laws relating to housing and urban development, to correct certain obsolete references.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 24, 1967,

The Secretary of the Senate, on May 26, 1967, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5357) to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89–487.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 399. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain real property to the city of Batavia, N.Y.;

H.R. 4374. An act to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson;

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89–487;

H.R. 7965. An act to transfer title to tribal land on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill and asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RIVERS, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. BATES, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. O'KONSKI were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution

(S.J. Res. 26) designating February of each year as "American History Month," with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) to declare the week of June 18 "National Coal Week."

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7819. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 204) marking the 175th anniversary of the admission of Kentucky to the Union, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 7819. An act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicate:

REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INSURANCE AND GUARANTEES ISSUED TO YUGOSLAVIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of April 1967, not previously reported, totaled $942; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON RECEIPTS FOR MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarterly period ended March 31, 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July 1966–March 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

H. RES. 230

Whereas, the following bills have been introduced in the 90th Congress:

1. Employee-management relations: H.R. 460, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ), and S. 341, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md). These bills seek to improve employee-management relations in the federal governmental structure.

2. Higher salary levels: H.R. 5407, introduced by Representative Arnold Olsen (D-Mont), and S. 854, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md). These bills seek to raise Levels 1–5 postal employees to Levels 2–6, with a "saved rate" factor for those persons in steps 11 and 12 of each level at the time of enactment.

3. Basic Monday–Friday workweeks: H.R. 5407, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). This bill would establish a basic Monday through Friday workweek in the postal service with employees to be paid at the rate of time and one-half for work on Saturdays and double time on Sundays and Holidays.

4. Life insurance: S. 271, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md), and H.R. 464, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would improve life insurance benefits for all federal employees.

5. Sick leave credits: S. 759, introduced by Senator Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex), and H.R. 464, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would give an employee at the time of his retirement the option of being paid one-half the cash value of accumulated sick leave, or have the total number of days credited for retirement purposes.

6. Health benefits: S. 1065, introduced by Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md) and H.R. 6351, introduced by Representative Dominick V. Daniels (D-NJ). These bills would require the federal government to pay the entire cost of the employee Health Benefits Program.

7. 30-year optional retirement: S. 104, introduced by Senator Hiram L. Fong (R-Haw), and H.R. 1186, introduced by Representative Byron G. Rogers (D-Col). These bills would permit an employee to retire after 30 years of service, regardless of age and without reduction in annuity.

8. Prohibit work measurement: H.R. 766, introduced by Representative Edna F. Kelly (D-NY). This bill would prohibit the use of measuring devices or methods for determining the efficiency of postal clerks.

9. Postal substitute overtime: H.R. 1023, introduced by Representative Richard L. Ottinger (D-NY). This bill would provide overtime pay for substitute postal employees for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a single day.

10. Invasion of privacy: S. 1035, introduced by Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D-NC), and sixty other Senators; H.R. 6390, introduced by Representative Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis). These bills would prevent unwarranted government invasions of the privacy of federal employees.

11. 35-hour workweek: H.R. 7346, introduced by Representative Arnold Olsen (D-Mont). This bill would establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for federal employees.

Whereas, these bills would materially improve the working conditions of federal employees, increase their employment benefits and increase their efficiency; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1967, that it request the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the above mentioned bills introduced in the 90th Congress; and

Be it further resolved that duly authenticated copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF IOWA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two concurrent resolutions from the Iowa State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution 40 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 43 and ask that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolutions were referred to the appropriate committees, as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

[From the General Assembly of the State of Iowa]

S. CON. RES. 40

Whereas, Iowans wish to honor Herbert Hoover, the 31st President of the United States, and the only Iowan ever to be elected President of the United States, and

Whereas, the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site at West Branch, Iowa, is of national interest, attracting more than 750,000 visitors since 1962, and

Whereas, this site includes the Presidential library and museum, and the grounds are the location of the former President's birthplace cottage and the gravesites of President and Mrs. Hoover, and

Whereas, the present site is incomplete and inadequate and part of it is in an unfinished and unsightly condition, Now Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the Congress of the United States to approve the President's $470,000 appropriation request which was included in the Interior Department's appropriation bill for land and building acquisition and development at the Herbert Hoover National Historic Site.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this

Resolution be forwarded to each of the members of the Iowa delegation in Congress.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

[From the General Assembly of the State of Iowa]

S. CON. RES. 43

Whereas, United States Department of Defense statistics for fiscal year 1966 reveal that 873 of the 4,873 servicemen killed in Vietnam fighting for freedom were interred in national cemeteries; and

Whereas, many more of the servicemen who have lost their lives would probably also have been buried in a national cemetery had there been space available near the home of the next of kin; and

Whereas, there are those in governmental authority who are against expanding the national cemetery system or providing additional space in those national cemeteries already existing; and

Whereas, the burial allowances of the Veterans Administration and those allowances provided under Federal Social Security are far too meager in many instances to provide for the last rites of many veterans and servicemen; and

Whereas, world unrest is again exposing and committing large numbers of persons to military service and battle; and

Whereas, this is not a proper time for limiting or closing the national cemetery system to those presently serving or expecting to serve in the uniform of our country; now therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House concurring, that the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to take such action as is necessary to direct the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and other appropriate governmental agencies to establish and maintain an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to provide burial space for all United States military servicemen or women so entitled and who wish to be so interred; and

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate forward copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, United States Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Iowa delegation serving in the United States Congress.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
AL MEACHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.
MAURICE E. BARINGER,
Speaker of the House.
WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
Chief Clerk of the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1882. A bill to provide for deductions of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1883. A bill to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and myself, a bill designed to provide for deduction from taxable income of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees.

Under this bill extra deductions of $100 would be allowed to each individual who contributes to the party or the candidate of his choice. The Corrupt Practices Act would be amended to provide full disclosure by all political committees, whether operating in a single State or otherwise. Second, the bill would provide that the Corrupt Practices Act be amended to cover primaries as well as general elections. Third, the law as amended would place a complete prohibition against any solicitation of Government employees, either by other Government employees or by any political committee on their behalf, for campaign contributions.

I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1882) to provide for deductions of political contributions, to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and to prohibit solicitation of Federal employees by political committees, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. MORTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SENATORS WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE AND RANDOLPH AGREE ELECTION CAMPAIGNS SHOULD BE SHORTENED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I compliment the Senator from Delaware on his giving continuous close study to the problems connected with election of Members of the Congress and of the President and Vice President of the United States.

While I in no wise would wish to claim that I anticipated what the Senator was thinking and recently stated in reference to the compression of long political campaigns into a period of 5 or 6 weeks, the record will disclose—and it is not important for me to document it here today—that several years ago I advocated the shortening of presidential campaigns in this country, and also the campaigns for membership in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I was drawing, as the able Senator from Delaware perhaps has drawn, on the experience with shorter campaigns in Great Britain. The parallel between the situations in Great Britain and the United States is not perfect, of course, because of the greater population density and the smaller size of that country. But, with present-day improved methods of transportation and communication in this country, it seems to me to be highly important that the proposal now made by the Senator from Delaware for the shortening of election campaigns for the offices of President and Vice President be given very careful consideration. He bases his argument, in part, for shorter campaigns on the financial drain on the parties which the present lengthy campaigns entail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for such additional time as completion of the colloquy may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The drain on the treasuries of the parties is an important consideration. But certainly there is a drain also on the resources of the candidates themselves and, in many instances, those of their friends who wish to properly assist them in seeking public office.

I think it is important that we realize that the people of the United States will no longer suffer from a lack of information by reducing the length of campaigns to the shorter period contemplated by the proposal of the Senator from Delaware. With our present media of communication and methods and modes for exchange of opinions and information, the American people can and will be made aware of essential campaign facts and candidate positions and will be able to respond to them within the contemplated 5 or 6 weeks. It is no longer necessary that campaigns run 3 or 4 months.

I believe the proposal is very timely, and that we would do well to consider this matter of campaign limitations in connection with the other proposals presented by the Senator from Delaware and other Senators, having to do with expenditures, the filing of reports, and the general subject matter of election campaigns.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator, and I add that the shortening of campaign is an important part of the proposed program.

I understand that it would not require a change in the Federal law to shorten political campaigns but that it would require action by many of the State legislatures which have designated deadlines before which candidates must file. In my own State, for example, the deadline is early in September.

I have discussed this issue with various officials of the national committees of both major parties and have corresponded with the chairmen of the two committees. I shall ask them to present their views on the length of campaigns when this measure is before our committee on the question of financing.

I would say further that I have received much support from many people, not only those who have had experience in campaigns at the presidential level but also many Members of Congress who feel that the shortening of the campaigns would be a constructive step.

I have suggested that the national

committees get together and arrange for the national conventions to take place early in September after Labor Day to be followed automatically by the State conventions in September. By late September we could have all the conventions out of the way, and in the 5 or 6 weeks which follow there would be ample time for a concentrated campaign. There would be adequate time to place the issues before the American people and could be done in a far more intelligent manner than through the long-drawn-out campaign as at present, with so much repetition.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his support.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not feel that the prospective situations in any of the years just ahead, are in anywise similar to the situation in 1896 when William Jennings Bryan was running for the Presidency against William McKinley. There are those who say, whether correctly or not, that had Mr. Bryan had a few more weeks in which to campaign, he could have been elected.

I shall not discuss that point except to say that in those days the candidate in question had to carry on his campaign without the present comprehensive nationwide coverage in the daily press, entirely without the media of radio and television, and also without a mobile American population. People then were more or less confined to one area. But our modes and methods of transportation and communication today are another element which helps make unnecessary the long campaigns of the days of William Jennings Bryan and William McKinley.

I wish that Mr. Bryan might have been elected President of the United States, of course, but it is not the situation which prevailed in 1896. In that year there were campaigning handicaps which are not present in this era. It is the situation which prevails today that we are attempting to meet and campaigning ground rules might logically be modernized.

For that reason, I think the shortening of the presidential campaign is a timely and valid suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. There is no question that extended campaigns were essential in the days prior to the television, radio, and the widespread distribution of our daily press. In recent years, however, general communication and travel have advanced. We are living in a new age, and certainly we should move our campaigns out of the horse and buggy stage.

I thank the Senator.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL JURY SELECTION BILLS (S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, S. 1319)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a change in the Federal jury selection hearings for June.

It was previously announced the hearings would be held at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 6, Wednesday, June 14, and Wednesday, June 28, 1967, in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, 6226, New Senate Office Building. I wish to announce one change: the hearing on June 14 will now be held on Tuesday, June 20, at the same time and in the same room as previously scheduled.

NOTICE OF NEW DATES FOR HEARINGS ON RETIREMENT AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last month I announced that the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual of the Senate Special Committee on Aging would conduct its first hearings on May 22 and 23. However due to a conflict with other business of the Senate, these hearings had to be postponed. I am pleased today to announce that the hearings have now been rescheduled and will be held June 7 and 8. These will be general survey hearings and from all indications they will yield helpful testimony from many experts.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal Aviation Administration wants Congress to dip once more into the public coffers—this time for $198 million—so that it can carry on with the development of a gigantic, probably useless, and potentially menacing development: the supersonic transport.

Congress has already appropriated $531 million for the SST. If we approve this new request, the total will be $729 million. By the time the SST prototypes are built and tested, the Government will have poured nearly $1.3 billion into a venture of questionable value. And that is not likely to be the end of Government financial participation, despite FAA protests to the contrary. If the manufacturers get their way, the total Government investment could go as high as $4 billion.

What do we get for this huge investment of public money? We get a plane that cuts time in the air between New York and Paris from 6 hours to 2½. That is an important accomplishment. To perhaps 1 or 2 percent of the population—the high-powered international businessmen, the impatient jet set playboys and the like—it is pleasant and it is fun. But is it more important than finding a cure for air and water pollution? Is it more important than attacking the roots of poverty? Is it more important than eliminating unemployment by training the unskilled? Is it more important than building an educational system throughout the land that will provide every child, whatever his race or origin, with the opportunity to fully develop his potential?

These are the choices. We do not have the money to do everything. In a period of rapidly spiraling war costs and mounting budget deficits, deciding what stands at the top of our list of national priorities is more difficult than usual. The House made a choice the other day. It decided to kill the rent supplements program which would cost us a relatively small amount in the coming fiscal year and would do immeasurable good. Is this how we are going to order our priorities?

I am sure it will be of great interest to the young tradesman in Kenosha with a family of five to support, or to the struggling middle-aged businessman in Dubuque trying to put two children through college, or to the family of 10 in Harlem living on a subsistence income, to know how their Federal Government arranges its priorities. They are likely to wonder a bit—to put it mildly—about a standard of values that puts a gigantic frill like the SST ahead of a countless number of vitally necessary projects.

Speed is not the ultimate value. Even strong advocates of the SST do not dwell very long on the speed of this plane when they are defending it. Surely, they, too, have been struck by the irony of a world increasingly knotted and twisted in endless traffic jams, where terrific speed in the air is canceled out by long periods in holding patterns, waiting for clearance to land, and by long frustrating trips on the ground to and from the airport. Surely, they see that speed, too, is subject to the law of diminishing returns. I have no doubt that we may soon have the technical capacity to build a passenger missile that could travel at 10 and 20 times the speed of sound and shoot a man from New York to Sydney in an hour. A man, of course, would arrive at his destination in a condition roughly comparable to that of a jellyfish.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The comments of the Senator make it possible to draw the conclusion that because of the difficulty of landing, the plane might turn around and return to London before it could land.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator raises an excellent point. I believe that all of us who have flown in this country—the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Wisconsin have flown—know how frequently this kind of situation occurs.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

I agree with Bo K. O. Lundberg, Director General of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden, who observed that most prospective missile passengers not specifically trained as astronauts would probably find it pointless to save even a whole day of travel if they then needed perhaps a week to recover from the excitement of having been shot as part of a bullet or meteor. But, it might be an efficient substitute for narcotics.

So we do not hear much about the need for tripling the speed of commercial air travel from the SST advocates. What

we hear instead is this: We are told the SST will prevent our aircraft industry from losing its worldwide superiority to the Anglo-French consortium, which is 3 years ahead of us in the supersonic race. We are told it will provide work for thousands. We are assured the project will result in an immense technological fallout. And, finally, we are assured by FAA and the manufacturers that it will have a highly favorable effect on the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

These are important considerations. But prudent people do not buy an expensive car just to decorate the driveway in front of their house. They buy it so they can drive from point A to point B. If they do buy it solely for decoration, then most of us, I think, would agree that they are being wastful. But, if they can afford it, if it is not going to take food out of the mouths of their children, it is charged off to extravagance or eccentricity and forgotten. I think the analogy applies to the SST. This project is being sold to us not on the grounds that we have a vital need for a plane that would cut in half the length of the flight from New York to Paris. That is what we are paying for. But that is not the way it is being sold to us. Instead, we are told we need to build the SST to keep our aircraft industry in the peak of health. Does that mean the Government should take $4 billion out of the taxpayers' pockets to build a nuisance machine that would criss-cross the country with 50-mile-wide carpets of sonic booms, a machine that would transform the world into a huge drop-forge foundry?

The Federal Government is gearing up to do just that in order to protect an industry which does not need the protection at all, if it has the superiority it claims. The trouble is the SST may turn out to be the scourge of the industry rather than a boon to it. Karl M. Ruppenthal, director of the transportation management program at Stanford University, writing in the May 22, 1967, issue of the Nation, said:

> It is safe to predict that because of the sheer magnitude of the dollars involved, the advent of the supersonic transport will inevitably result in a much smaller number of airlines in the United States, and much greater consternation in the (aircraft) industry.

The SST gives Boeing and General Electric a supersonic monopoly and leaves other companies standing at the post.

The Government is preparing, in effect, to conduct a giant public works project to employ highly skilled workers who do not need the help.

And it is doing these things partly because of a claim—which has been disputed by the FAA's own economic consultants—that this venture will save us from a disastrous decline in our balance-of-payments position. The decline, we are told, would occur if the Anglo-French consortium produced a successful supersonic transport and our airlines bought a large number of them. But, the FAA consultants—the Institute for Defense Analyses—concluded that gains from foreign sales of an American SST could be more than offset by a big increase in American tourist spending abroad and also by a reduction in the sales of American subsonic aircraft. The so-called alleged gains in the balance of payments are not there, and competent, objective, and expert advice indicates that this is the case.

I am convinced that if the sonic boom problem is not solved and if a solution to airport congestion is not found, the supersonic transport—whether produced by the United States or by the consortium—will have little chance of being commercially successful. Switzerland, Sweden, and West Germany have already declared that they would prohibit overflights of supersonic planes if they produce disturbing sonic booms. The Swedes have said they would consider a boom disturbing if it could awaken a light sleeper—a pretty stringent limit. The West Germans have said the booms would be unacceptable if it were proven they damaged human health. Other countries are very likely to follow the Swedish, West German, and Swiss lead when they have been subjected to the booms and discover how disturbing they can be when they occur with maddening regularity.

Mr. President, we had a little experience with this problem in Wisconsin when the Air Force picked Milwaukee as a city over which they would fly B–58's. The avalanche of mail which I received from Wisconsin constituents during that period of time indicated that they were all critical and deeply concerned, and that they only accepted it because it was a military effort and in the interest of national defense. This shows how adverse the reaction would be if these were commercial flights.

The occasional super-booms of two and three times normal intensity that would inevitably be produced by nearly every SST flight might be enough to ban the SST's from flying over heavily traveled sealanes as well. If this happened, the SST would be so restricted it probably would not carry enough payload to buy the chewing gum stewardesses hand out before takeoff. SST advocates who admit the sonic boom effect would prevent flights over populated land areas have been arguing that SST ocean flights would be enough to make the plane a commercial success. The FAA has said that even with boom restrictions on overland flights, 500 SST's would be sold by 1990. They seem to discount any possibility of sealane restrictions. But, if the sonic boom can cause severe damage on land, then it can cause damage at sea, too. The shipping and fishing industry is not likely to accept incessant destructive booming without protest. And they by no means lack political clout.

Thus, far from representing a big gain, the SST could as easily spell economic disaster for the aviation industry, even with heavy Government participation. The sonic boom is only one of the countless technological dilemmas the SST developers must overcome, although it is the one for which prospects of finding a solution are dimmest. The other problems are almost as difficult because supersonic flight is really a completely different quantity from subsonic flight. As one writer has put it, flying beyond the speed of sound is like flying in a totally new medium. The difference between a subsonic plane and a supersonic plane is like the difference between a surface ship and a submarine. Building a successful SST demands a quantum jump in technology. The heat generated by air friction becomes a particularly critical problem at supersonic speeds. The high altitudes at which an SST must fly to reduce the sonic boom effect raises the problem of cosmic radiation and its effect on the crew after repeated exposures. Occasional solar flares would pose a threat to passengers as well because of the much higher intensity of radiation during such periods. The maneuverability and balance of a plane at supersonic speeds are less predictable. I have great respect for the capability of our scientists and engineers, however. They may find the answer to all of these problems in the laboratory tomorrow, or next week, or next month. But, until then we can not bury our heads in the sand. We have to recognize that the obstacles we are confonted with are enormous. We cannot base national policy on wishful thinking alone.

Mr. President, I might point out that the research is going to continue whether we invest this enormous amount of money or not. It is going to continue in the space program and in the defense effort. The Defense Department has said that it has no military value at all.

The SST, if we built it, would be the first commercial plane ever developed without substantial prior military experience. Of course, military planes have been flying at supersonic speeds for years. But almost all of them have been small planes compared to this flying football field we propose to build. There is almost no experience with planes the size of the SST at supersonic speeds. The SST would be a Mach 2.7 plane. And there is no experience whatever with flight beyond Mach 2 with any planes, small or large, for the sustained periods the SST would have to fly to turn a profit. In a report to President Johnson in December 1963, on the SST, Eugene R. Black and Stanley de J. Osborne observed that the experience of the Air Force in innovating new systems had been that if 25 percent of the vehicle was new, it would take up to 5 years of development. If as much as 50 percent was new, it would take 10 years. Almost all of the SST is new—radically new. Its airframe would be made of a new alloy—titanium. Perhaps the only component of the plane whose properties during supersonic flight we have some familiarity with is the pilot. And even he may act differently than we expect under the pressures of having to fly this golden goose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the SST advocates will answer that our lack of experience with this kind of plane is the most persuasive argument there is for building the prototypes so that we can gain that experience. But we all

know that once the prototypes are built, there will be no turning back. After more than a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money had been poured into this boondoggle, the pressure would be immense to go into the production stage whether the sonic boom had been muffled or not, and whether or not the safety of the plane had been proven beyond doubt.

What I find most serious is that the FAA is already hedging its bets on the success of the SST, diluting standards—in short, selling the public down the river.

The Government contract with Boeing, the airframe contractor, made public only a few days ago provides for only 100 hours of flight testing of the two prototypes over a 6-month period. The Black-Osborne report recommended a full year of flight testing as a minimum and the tenor of the report suggested that far more than that would be desirable.

But, what is even worse, the FAA has apparently decided to forget about the sonic boom problem. They seem to have adopted the philosophy that if they cannot beat the boom, they will ignore it.

The contracts for phase II—the design stage—of the SST program specified that the sonic boom effect produced by the plane while cruising at 60,000 to 90,000 feet should not exceed an average intensity of 1.5 pounds per square foot. The top limit during the SST's acceleration and climb was set at 2 pounds per square foot. Even those limits were considered too high by a number of experts on the sonic boom—chief among them Bo Lundberg, who has been studying sonic boom effects for 7 years. The contract limits referred to the average boom intensity produced in the wake of an SST. But atmospheric conditions and deviations from a straight and steady course, Lundberg pointed out, could produce grossly magnified booms three and four times the average intensity in the 50-mile-wide carpet of sonic booms trailing every supersonic flight. These superbooms—as Lundberg labeled them—are the ones that can do severe damage to property and can even affect personal health. The reflection from walls of the boom shock wave can result in even further magnification—often by as much as 100 percent.

During the extensive sonic boom tests over Oklahoma City 3 years ago, the average boom intensity reached during any of the 1,253 supersonic flight runs over the city never exceeded 1.6 pounds per square foot, and most of the time not more than 1.2 pounds per square foot. Yet the FAA, which conducted the tests, received nearly 5,000 formal damage claims and a total of more than 15,000 complaints of all kinds. The FAA said that in an opinion survey it did at the time, 27 percent of the residents polled said the booms were intolerable and that they could never learn to live with them. That 27 percent should be compared with the fact that only 22 percent of our people on the basis of our estimates will use the SST.

But, now, I find that the FAA has had the audacity to draw up a contract with no sonic boom limits whatsoever. All the phase III contract requires is that Boeing "develop an airplane design to reduce the sonic boom effect." There is not a word about how far it should be reduced, or to what level. The contract requires Boeing to study boom characteristics but it does not require it to hit any target. It sets no meaningful goal. For all practical purposes, it leaves Boeing free to ignore the boom effect.

But that is not all. The FAA has admitted, I just learned, that the airframe design contracted for in phase II would produce an average sonic boom intensity above the limits set by the phase II contract. The sonic boom effect produced by the air frame design to which we are now committed would have an average intensity of 2.38 pounds per square foot during acceleration and climb, and 2 pounds per square foot during cruise—far more—in fact, almost double—the Oklahoma City experience where, as I said, more than one-quarter of the people there, at least, declared they could not live with the intolerable effects of the sonic boom.

So we have what amounts to a failure to meet specifications of the phase II contract. Yet the FAA insists on bulling ahead into phase III anyway.

The FAA has apparently concluded either, first, that the task of muffling the boom is impossible; or second, that it is content to build a plane that would be limited to ocean flights, which drastically reduces chances that the plane would be a commercial success—and I remind Senators that if it is not a commercial success, the Government could be out as much as $4 billion—or, third, that the public is just going to have to learn to live with the boom no matter how destructive or disturbing it may be.

I have a feeling, judging from past FAA pronouncements, that it is probably the latter. The following statement from a recent FAA brochure gives that feeling added credence:

> Individuals tend to accommodate themselves to an initially disturbing noise once it becomes a pattern of daily life. There are noises today in cities and in small towns that are taken for granted which, if they were introduced as new noises, would cause disturbances for an initial period of time.

The FAA refuses to recognize that there is just no parallel between the loud din of everyday life in the 20th century and the destructive menace of the sonic boom. Unsound buildings in every city would crumble to the ground like the "one-hoss shay" after repeated boomings. Ancient monuments and historic shrines like this honored building would be particularly susceptible. The west front of the Capitol, we have been told by the Architect, is so unstable that it could be demolished by the impact of a crash at National Airport. Imagine what the effort of 10 or 20 loud sonic booms every day, week in and week out, might be. This is not science fiction. Much damage has already been done by military supersonic flights, yet the planes involved were comparatively small and the areas subjected to the booms sparsely populated. The size and weight of the plane are the primary variables in determining the size of the boom. The prehistoric cliff dwellings in Mesa Verde National Park, as one example, have been seriously damaged by sonic booms, the Interior Department disclosed not long ago. To prevent this mass destruction of property, boom restrictions will inevitably be imposed, as I stated earlier; and if they are, we will be able to kiss our investment in the SST goodby.

The Institute for Defense Analyses, which conducted a demand analysis study for the FAA, predicted that only 279 SST's would be sold by 1990 in a boom-restricted market if the planes sold at $40 million apiece. That may even be an overestimate because the price per plane could run as high as $50 or $60 million. The Government, according to the financial plan in the phase III contract, would not recoup its investment until 300 planes have been sold.

The FAA, in its execution of the SST contract, has abdicated its responsibility to the public. It has failed to protect the interests of the Government.

The absence of sonic boom specifications is only one example. In another serious oversight, the definition of what will constitute a "royalty-bearing airframe" for purposes of recouping the Government investment when and if the SST's go on the market is so worded that the Government might have to write off most of its investment even if the SST is successful.

The SST airframe is defined for purposes of recoupment as one "principally of titanium structure and that achieves or is designed to achieve a maximum safe cruising speed of not less than mach 2.2 nor more than mach 3.1."

Remember, this section of the contract—entitled "Financial Plan for Future Phases of the SST Development Program"—is directed 10 and 15 years into the future. Suppose another metal is developed with properties making it superior to titanium. In fact, a better alloy may already have been found. The Air Force has been conducting extensive experiments with boron filament. What is to prevent Boeing from abandoning titanium in favor of boro filament, if that proves superior, 1 or 2 years after the production stage of the SST program had been launched? Similarly, what is to prevent them from trimming here or adding there in order to push the top safe cruising speed a hair above the mach 3.1 specified in the contract? The airframe definition represents an outrageous blunder on the part of the FAA. It can have nothing but unfortunate consequences. It will result in one of two things: preventing the contractor from adopting desirable major changes to improve the plane's performance, or bringing about the complete nullification of the royalty plan for repaying the Government investment because the production model airframe is not covered by the narrow definition in the contract.

The FAA's handling of the SST program so far is eloquent testimony to the wisdom of the Black-Osborne recommendation that a new independent authority be created to manage this venture.

The FAA has been exerting far too much of its energy selling the SST and

too little protecting the public interest. As Fred L. Zimmerman of the Wall Street Journal wrote recently:

If propaganda could power a plane, America's supersonic airliner probably would be flying by now.

We have all been subjected to a supersonic snow job. It is time for us now to take a hard look at the other side of the issue. We may be on the verge of building the brontosaurus of the air age—a mechanical monster with an immense capacity for speed that may well be irrelevant to the real needs of our day. I do not think the American people should be asked to finance the development of this monstrosity.

In subsequent speeches during the weeks ahead, Mr. President, I intend to deal in greater detail with some of the questions I have only touched on lightly here today. I will have more to say on the menace of the sonic boom, on the economic arguments being used to defend this venture and on some of the many technological obstacles, aside from the sonic boom, which must be hurdled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles published in the two most recent editions of the Nation by Karl M. Ruppenthal be printed in the RECORD, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues; also a recent New York Times editorial on the SST.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

[From the Nation, May 22, 1967]

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT—BILLION DOLLAR DILEMMA

(NOTE.—This is the first of a series of three articles on the supersonic transport. Succeeding articles will deal with several of the technical problems involved in the design, manufacture and operation of the aircraft, and with some broad social and economic problems. Mr. Ruppenthal has been a contributor to The Nation for several years. An active airline pilot for twenty-five years, and an attorney, he is director of the Transportation Management Program at Stanford University.)

(By Karl M. Ruppenthal)

With a stroke of the pen in 1963, Juan Trippe declared war on the Boeing 707, the Douglas DC–8, and all other subsonic transports that now fill the air. Placing an order for six Concordes, the chairman of the board of Pan American World Airways relit the fuse on a bomb that had been quiescent since an Anglo-French combination, with the financial backing of their respective governments, announced that they would develop a plane to fly at Mach 2—or twice the speed of sound and appreciably more than twice the speed of presently operating commercial jets.

The first important reaction to Trippe's decision came from the President of the United States. Just one week after Pan American announced the placing of its order, John F. Kennedy authorized a major study of the supersonic transport (SST). And from this there followed a series of revolutionary events, the full effect of which will not be felt for years to come.

The SST will present all of the airlines with gigantic economic problems. In some cases the problems will be so severe that the airlines will forget their pride, together with their touted free-enterprise philosophy, and ask unabashedly for government subsidy. Other airlines will reluctantly merge or sell out; still others may simply go broke.

The revolution will force the Federal Aviation Agency to make new expenditures aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars, and the sheer volume of money required will increase the federal role in all phases of aviation. The government will be called upon to pay for most of the research and development required for the SST itself. It will also be required to develop and install new and complex navigation systems. It will be called upon to provide funds for new airports, new terminal facilities and for new safety devices. It may be asked to train pilots, to control traffic, to underwrite insurance, and to finance dozens of other ancillary projects. So great will be the demand for federal funds, and so great the government participation in all aspects of the supersonic project, that the aviation industry as a whole will need to develop some remarkable corporate agility if any aspect of private enterprise whatsoever is to be maintained.

The supersonic revolution will have an important impact on the United States in a host of other ways. It will add measurably to the balance of payments controversy; it will be a disquieting influence on living patterns; it will become the center of another controversy with Britain, France and many of the other nations of the world. It may be an important factor in determining whether there shall be continuing boom, widespread land speculation or large-scale unemployment in Los Angeles, Seattle and Hartford. Although the Federal Aviation Agency has indicated that Boeing will receive the prime contract for the air frame, and General Electric will build the engines, component parts will be made by subcontractors. Boeing's decision to subcontract certain systems and components will depend, in part, on its own ability to produce them. If the SST timetable indicates urgency, Boeing will be forced to subcontract large systems because of the shortage of labor and engineering talent in the Seattle area.

Should Johnson assign the program an urgent priority, he might well give Ronald Reagan the biggest boost he could possibly get. Boeing's subcontracting could add new jobs to an already swollen economy in Southern California. It could stimulate the real estate market, bringing higher prices, additional commissions and more sales. Reagan could claim credit for the increased level of business in the state, leaving post-boom problems for another administration to face.

The pending supersonic step in the evolution of aircraft is so large that physicists would term it a quantum jump. This leap through the sound barrier will shatter much of the aircraft industry, several of the airlines and the peace and quiet of much of the world.

Always before in the progress of aviation, measurable alternatives have been available to the airline industry. When the DC-3 was obsolescent, the manufacturers and the airline industry could make rational decisions concerning the planes that were proposed. A rather simple, basic issue was involved: would the airlines be justified in buying planes that were larger, faster and more productive? Was there a reasonable prospect that increased capital expenditures could be amortized through additional speed, additional lift and related economies? Could the greater capacity be absorbed? What new-plane problems could be anticipated, and what would be the probable cost of their solution? In short, the question was resolved by balancing the costs of designing, building and operating a projected new plane against the revenues that could reasonably be anticipated from improvements in comfort, economy and speed.

Thus the decision to graduate from the DC-3 to the DC-4 was relatively easy to make. While the later plane required a larger capital investment for each ship purchased, it offered considerably lower seat-mile costs. It was a more efficient plane. The same basic factors operated in the decision to drop the DC-4 in favor of the faster, more efficient DC-6 (and its competing plane, the Lockheed Constellation).

In the pre-jet days, the relationship between speed and initial cost was almost linear. Thus an airline could decide whether to increase its investment in aircraft, say, 10 per cent, in order to achieve a 5 per cent increase in speed. But when we enter the supersonic age, the old cost-speed equation will no longer apply. It will become entangled in a variety of complex physical laws and the airline industry will have much more difficult choices to make.

Basic to the problem is the fact that present jets now cruise at speeds slightly less than the speed of sound—usually in the range between Mach .80 and Mach .86. Because of the nature of the turbulene (and other phenomena) associated with flying at and near the speed of Mach 1, it is not practical to think in terms of small increases in speed. And since it is similarly impractical to think in terms of Mach 1.2 or Mach 1.5, the only real question is whether the next generation of jets should cruise at speeds on the order of Mach 2 or Mach 3—that is, at twice or three times the speed of sound.

In 1963 when it was first seriously proposed that the United States taxpayers might underwrite the cost of developing a supersonic transport, it was often stated that the development cost of the aircraft would approximate $1 billion. After some behind-the-scenes fencing, the SST project was taken from the Federal Aviation Agency and placed in the hands of the Defense Department. Subsequent meetings of the SST study committee were held in secret, and all that transpired is not a matter of public record. However, James P. Mitchell, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, who had served on an earlier study committee, indicated in 1964 that the $1 billion research and development figure was about right. Another member of that committee was reported in *The New York Times* as saying that the development cost would be from $600 million to $1.2 billion.

In those days, spokesmen for the Kennedy administration suggested that the federal government might be willing to finance 75 per cent of the project, but that notion brought forth anguished cries from the aircraft manufacturers. They pointed out that if the industry were to invest all of its profits for a decade, it would still be unable to come up with that amount of cash. There was some public debate and a good bit of private maneuvering. Eventually the government proposed that the taxpayer finance 90 per cent of the preliminary costs (in practice, it would come to higher than this, since the aircraft industry, as long as it was making a profit in other areas, could deduct its 10 per cent share of the R&D costs from gross taxable income). The public was assured at the same time that the SST was certain to be a sound investment and that their tax money would be returned to them—with handsome interest to boot.

Evidently the financial community is not so sure. Although many investors eagerly seek situations in which a good bit of risk is coupled with quite high returns, no investment banker has yet suggested forming a consortium for the private financing of the supersonic plane. Indeed, one reputable investment banker has stated that without the underpinning of a government guarantee, such securities would have virtually no investment standing.

That judgment is supported by the fact that though development costs of earlier planes were minuscule compared with estimates for the SST, Lockheed was reported to have lost some $90 million on its executive jet, the Jet Star, in 1966 alone. It lost some $50 million on the Electra, although it is a very efficient craft and 188 of them were sold. And General Dynamics lost some $400 mil-

lion on its 880s and 990s—the only commercial jets that company has yet produced.

Meanwhile the estimate for SST research and development costs has increased. The $1 billion figure most commonly quoted in 1963 (when the aircraft manufacturers indicated that they could not possibly finance 25 per cent of the costs) was soon doubled. In January, 1967, both *The Wall Street Journal* and the Transportation Association of America were talking of $4.5 billion. The magnitude of this figure can be appreciated when one considers that it is twice the New York Stock Exchange value of all the shares of Lockheed and Boeing combined. It is eighty times the highest net profit ever reported by any airline in a single year, and something like twenty times Boeing's total corporate debt.

While $2 billion or $3 billion or $4 billion may cover the research and development costs of the project it will not provide the airlines with planes. And some financial analysts question whether even the $4 billion R&D figure will really be enough. Government-financed projects are notorious for exceeding their estimates, and projects that venture into new and relatively unknown areas are subject to wider errors of estimate than are projects in more traveled fields.

But suppose, to be very optimistic, that the research and development costs of the supersonic transport can be held to about $2 billion, as some of its proponents now believe. Under one system of accounting it might be presumed that such costs should be spread over the total time span in which this particular plane may be produced—say the next ten years. That would mean that each supersonic transport built in the United States over the next decade would be charged with a portion of the costs of research and development. If, for instance, only 100 such transports were built, each of them would be charged with $20 million in research costs, in addition to the cost of manufacturing each plane. If 1,000 planes could be sold, the R&D costs assigned to each plane would be but $2 million. This means that to set a realistic price on the planes, one must know not only the probable cost of manufacture and the total cost of research and development but also the number of planes likely to be sold.

There is considerable variation of opinion about the potential market. One aircraft executive estimated that some 900 SSTs could be sold by 1985, but other estimates are much more pessimistic. An important—and as yet undecided—factor is whether or not supersonic flights will be permitted over land. If they are restricted to over-water routes, the market for the plane will be sharply reduced. Another aircraft executive indicated on a C.B.S. broadcast that if the plane were restricted to over-water routes, the market would be reduced to some 585 craft. That would almost double the amount of research and development costs to be allocated to each plane and, of course, there is no guarantee that even this estimate of the market is correct.

It is worth noting that the aircraft industry has on occasion been too enthusiastic in its sales forecasts and too conservative in its cost estimates. Probably the most spectacular example of this wishful tendency was demonstrated by General Dynamics. According to an article in *Fortune*, the company produced its 880 jets in the face of its own studies indicating that the market was too small to return a profit. The result was a staggering loss, a change of management and near bankruptcy.

Even the majestic Douglas Aircraft Company, once undisputed world leader in the field of transport aircraft, has had its problems. Although Douglas had a respectable backlog of orders for its DC–8 and DC–9 jets, the company recently faced severe financial problems, and there were alarming indications that it might be unable to make good on its delivery commitments to the armed forces without a substantial infusion of government money. For a time it appeared that it might be necessary for the government, in effect, to co-sign Douglas' note at the bank. Only the rescue operations performed by McDonnell Aircraft made that government guarantee unnecessary.

But that crisis made an effective point: once the government has invested billions of taxpayers' money in a given project, it is not likely to pull out merely because preliminary cost estimates were too low. Someone in Congress will always raise the cry that since so much money already has been invested, additional funds must be spent.

It is true that SST advocates forecast that the taxpayers will recover the funds invested on the research and development of the supersonic transport. Some propose that these costs be charged directly against the planes, the tag to be set accordingly. Others feel that since the cost of manufacture will in itself be exceedingly high, it might not be prudent to increase the selling price of each aircraft by such a substantial amount. Too high a price would surely shrink the total market for the planes and thus make them even more difficult to sell. These people would prefer that the government recover its research and development expenditures through a monthly royalty charged against the operations of the planes.

But slice it as you will, there is no doubt that the taxpayers would bear the financial risks of the project. They will be called upon to pick up the tab if the market estimates are overly optimistic, if an airline is unable to make its royalty payments, or if the aircraft manufacturer falls upon evil days. That is the history of government guarantees in almost every field of endeavor.

While a monthly royalty device for recouping the taxpayers' investment has certain appeal (after all, much of the U.S. economy is based on the idea of buy now, pay later), it raises the problem of the value of money itself. If the taxpayers invest a dollar in a project today, it cannot be fairly said that they have made a sound investment if but a single dollar is returned to them a decade hence. If that same dollar were deposited in a reputable savings and loan association, it would double in a decade. And if it were prudently invested in the electronics industry, the chemical industry—or, indeed, in airline stocks—there is a high probability that its value would be a good bit more.

Their economic studies challenged by a number of economists (allegedly including some from the Bureau of the Budget), most SST proponents will no longer say precisely how the taxpayers will be repaid. Recent statements indicate that the repayment may not be in dollars channeled directly from the project into the treasury, but that much of the repayment may come indirectly because the project will stimulate employment, and increased employment will increase the flow of income tax dollars.

Of course this economic argument is not new. It was made by Lord Keynes a good many years ago when he pointed out that government spending could stimulate economic activity. The real question to be decided is which vehicles for government spending are most efficient in this respect, and there is reason to believe that other government-financed projects could be used at least equally well to stimulate economic activity and thus the flow of tax dollars.

The magnitude of the cost of the SST program comes into better perspective when one considers costs from the viewpoint of the carriers. Just twenty-five years ago an airline could buy a DC–3 for $125,000; today, a single spare engine for a subsonic jet costs at least twice that amount. With the advent of the jet age less than a decade ago, the airlines fell under severe financial pressure. So great were the problems surrounding the introduction of the jets that it was not at all certain that several of the major airlines could afford the price. Virtually every one of the major European carriers incurred substantial losses. In more than one instance the prospect of recovering the losses was so slim that they were simply written off by the government that was the principal (or sole) stockholder in the line.

In the United States the financial picture was so bleak that four major airlines—American, Eastern, Pan American and TWA—publicly announced merger plans. Almost every other U.S. airline made serious merger studies, although many of these activities were never revealed to the press. It was not until the general level of business activity rose to new heights that the U.S. airlines moved out of real danger. Had the business boom been delayed for another year or two, several airlines would have ceased to exist—at least in their present form.

The stakes will be much higher, and the ante far greater, when the airlines begin to play the supersonic game. At the present time it is estimated that a single Supersonic plane may cost on the order of $45 million. This is just a little less than the entire after-tax profits that any airline has ever reported in its most profitable year. Of course airline revenues have been increasing at a rapid rate and are still rising. But even if the present growth rate continues, gigantic problems must be surmounted before an airline can equip itself with a fleet of supersonic transports. Any major U.S. airline will have to dedicate its entire net profits for at least a decade to the purchase of supersonic transports, unless profit margins can be improved, the tax burden reduced, or substantial funds made available from other sources. If total airline earnings are dedicated to SST purchases, the stockholders may become starved of dividends in order to provide the public with an exceedingly fast ride.

While the financing problems for the major airlines will be severe when the supersonic transports begin to arrive, they will seem trivial by comparison with what the smaller U.S. carriers will face. Consider an aggressive, highly profitable trunk line like Continental. Its growth rate has been spectacular, its profits increasing at a prodigious rate. But in the most profitable year in all its history, its after-tax profits were on the order of $10 million—about one-fourth the probable cost of a single supersonic transport.

Most of these smaller carriers compete with at least one of the Big Four over important route segments. If the big carriers do indeed operate supersonic transports over the highly competitive routes, the middle-sized subsonic carriers may well be left standing at the post. If the proponents of the SST are correct in their assumption that the public will flock to the faster planes, those lines that do not have an extensive route structure, or the requisite financial resources to purchase supersonic equipment, will have severe competitive problems the like of which they have not yet experienced.

For survival they may attempt to merge with other troubled carriers. Failing in that attempt, they may be swallowed up by the lines that have routes suitable for supersonic operations. If they do not merge and are not swallowed up, their financial situation may become so precarious they will begin to exist on government subsidy, or simply turn up their toes and go bankrupt.

The local service carriers, too, may well be caught up in the blast of the supersonic jet. Consider the affluent passenger who alights in Seattle from his two-hour cross-country flight from New York. Will he be content to spend a like amount of time getting from Seattle to his destination airport near Pocatello, Boise or Spokane? And how will the local service carriers respond?

While all of the effects upon the airlines

themselves cannot be forecast completely at this time, it is safe to predict that because of the sheer magnitude of the dollars involved, the advent of the supersonic transport will inevitably result in a much smaller number of airlines in the United States, and much greater concentration in the industry.

As for the aircraft manufacturers, the forecast is even more bleak. If the supersonic transport should be commercially successful, it may well drive from the skies the slower, subsonic jets—and their manufacturers. The result would be even greater attrition in the ranks of the commercial plane producers, whose death rate has already been substantial. Now gone from the ranks of commercial aircraft builders are such once familiar names as Martin and Convair (General Dynamics). Douglas has had its problems, and it is not at all certain that relatively affluent Lockheed will attempt to build another commercial plane.

This tendency toward concentration would certainly be increased with the advent of a supersonic transport that is successful in an economic sense. It could even be that but one or two large aircraft complexes would remain: the prime contractors who design and manufacture the aircraft together with their respective (client) subcontractors. If a completely successful supersonic transport is actually built, there may be little demand for competing, subsonic planes.

The utility of the supersonic transport is indeed a two-edged sword: if the plane is suitable for a relatively small number of airline routes and can operate only from a limited number of airports, it may be an economic disaster for the manufacturers and for the taxpayers who put up most of the money. On the other hand, if the manufacturers are able to come up with a versatile craft, capable of operating quietly and efficiently over a large number of airline routes, and able to satisfy the demands of a large portion of the traveling and shipping public, then its effect may be to destroy much of the value of presently operating subsonic aircraft and to create another set of problems for the airlines and for their financial backers who hold substantial mortgages on the aircraft that are presently flying.

[From the Nation, May 29, 1967]

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT—II—HEAT, COLD, RADIATION AND THE BOOM

(NOTE.—This is the second of Mr. Ruppenthal's three articles on the supersonic transport. The first (The Nation, May 22) dealt with some of the economic aspects of the SST. The third will consider some of the political and social ramifications of the project.)

(By Karl Ruppenthal)

Before the proposed U.S. supersonic transport can get off the ground, some impressive technical problems must be solved. One of these concerns heat. When a plane travels through the air at three times the speed of sound, the heat generated on the skin of the craft will be on the order of 500° Fahrenheit—about the temperature that a French chef uses to broil a steak. Because aluminum loses much of its strength after prolonged exposure to such temperatures, neither aluminum nor any of its presently developed alloys can be used for the exterior surface of the SST. At present, the designers of the Mach 3 (three times the speed of sound) transport are working with titanium alloys and stainless steel. The disadvantage of steel is that it is heavy; titanium is much lighter, but it is relatively new on the industrial scene. It is also difficult to form and expensive to work. While it is entirely possible that new technologies for working this metal will be discovered, they are not yet at hand. Titanium offers promise to the aircraft designer and to the scientist, but to the banker it promises heavy costs. A great many research dollars will be spent in an effort to develop an air frame that will be sufficient to the task and still be light enough to carry a profitable payload.

The heat produced by flying through the air at high speeds produces other problems. How are the airlines to keep the passengers from being broiled alive as they speed about in their supersonic oven? While the task of air-conditioning the plane is not a momentous engineering feat, it requires the development of a system capable of dissipating large amounts of heat quickly and efficiently and without employing heavy or bulky machinery.

Paradoxically, flying at high altitudes where temperatures run as low as −100° centigrade, the plane's fuel (kerosene) may tend to freeze. The engineers are thus attracted to the idea of linking the two temperature problems together: heat created on the surface of the plane might be dissipated into the plane's fuel supply. To the man at the drafting table, this looks like a fairly straightforward solution to the problem, but to the pilot who is trained to think in terms of fire, the prospect is less inviting.

The spectrum of new engineering problems is challenging and wide. Windows and other openings on the SST must be able to withstand a wide range of temperatures and pressures. The problems associated with windows are so great that it is likely there will be no windows whatsoever in the cabin, and the pilot's windows may be functional only for take-off and landing. The plane may cruise entirely on instruments, depending upon radio, radar and other electronic devices to achieve separation from other planes.

Since the Mach 3 jet will cruise at 60,000 to 80,000 feet (10 to 15 miles)—its pressurization systems must not fail. The cabins of today's jets are pressurized to the equivalent of about 5,000 feet when they are at cruising altitude (normally between 24,000 feet and 41,000 feet mean sea level). The fail-safe features of the 707 and the DC–8 provide an oxygen mask that drops automatically in front of each passenger in the event the cabin loses pressure. But this will not be good enough for the Mach 3 craft. Should the cabin rupture at 60,000 feet, the passengers' blood would boil, and the oxygen mask would be of no avail. Only a space suit, or a system which cannot possibly fail, will suffice. This means fail-safe pressurization systems, doors that will not leak, windows that cannot be blown out. All of these features can be developed, but each development may add to the weight of the craft, and they will certainly add to the cost.

High-altitude flight creates another problem which aviation has not yet fully faced—the hazard of radiation. At the cruising altitudes of the SST, the primary cosmic radiation consists mainly of protons (the nuclei of hydrogen atoms). The energy of these particles can be extremely high. Nuclear scientists have stated that the shell of the aircraft will not protect the occupants from radiation; as a matter of fact, it will act to increase the dosage rate.

Flying at the new cruising altitudes, the occupant of an SST will be exposed to a radiation dose equivalent to about 2 millirem per flying hour. Since 500 millirem per year is the maximum specified for nonradiation workers by the International Commission on Radiological Protection, a passenger (or crew member) would receive the maximum permissible dosage in 250 hours—just one-fourth the amount of flying time plane crews are now allowed annually by the Civil Air Regulations.

Further, particular solar events greatly increase the radiation dosage. Anyone passing through such an event might receive the maximum permissible annual radiation dosage in a single flight. Because of the genetic implications of radiation, some biologists have suggested that crew members for the SST be selected entirely from people beyond the normal childbearing age.

Thus, all hostesses on supersonic transports would be at least 45—a breed of flying grandmothers who would contrast sharply with the image of the chic young thing the airlines have cultivated so assiduously these many years. Far more serious from an economic standpoint would be the effect upon the working life of pilots. The cost of training well-qualified DC–6 captains to fly the Boeing 707 was on the order of $30,000 per man. If training costs for the SST are but twice that amount, an airline will think twice before making such an investment in a pilot who has very few productive years ahead of him. The FAA requires all airline pilots to retire at 60.

Furthermore, one competent test pilot has stated that in today's jets a pilot can wait as long as fifteen seconds before reacting to a situation without risking irreparable harm. If he is correct in his estimate that only five seconds of reaction time will be available to the SST pilot, trouble may be in store. For it is well known that as a man becomes older, his judgment may improve but his reaction time becomes longer. In short, it looks now as though neither young men nor old men will be suitable as pilots for the SST.

Turbulence also will be a problem. As the airlines took to flying at altitudes used by subsonic jets, they began to experience clear air turbulence. Several of today's jets have encountered turbulence that has breached the aircraft structure or thrown it completely out of control. The supersonic transport must be designed to withstand the most severe conditions that can be encountered, and about these conditions relatively little is now known.

What is known is that the impact increases with speed, and the standard practice for subsonic jets is to reduce speed as soon as the condition is recognized. The worst problem of clear air turbulence arises principally from the fact that at present there is no accurate way to forecast its existence. Unless major advances are made in weather analysis, it may be impossible for the supersonic airliner to know of clear air turbulence far enough in advance to take precautionary measures.

But these problems of radiation, heat transfer and metal fatigue pale by comparison with the one great problem of supersonic flight, for which nothing approaching an answer has yet been found. That is the sonic boom, and indeed the problems of the boom are so important and so far from solution that they may wreck the nice economic calculations that have been made by proponents of the SST, and the SST timetable as well.

Many people are under the misapprehension that the sonic boom is a momentary phenomenon. In a movie made a decade or more ago, some Hollywood star flew through the theoretical "sound barrier." As his plane approached the speed of sound, he encountered many weird phenomena, but once the speed of sound was exceeded, all was smooth. There was no vibration, no problems—and no boom. How the aircraft industry wishes that the Hollywood version of the sonic boom were reality! The fact is that the sonic boom, a shock wave, is a continuing phenomenon, and it is created when a plane flies at any speed higher than Mach 1.

If a supersonic transport were to cruise at the speed of Mach 3 at altitudes used by present-day jets, it would leave in its wake a trail of destruction fifty miles wide. Although the Air Force has taken great pains to minimize the damage caused by its supersonic jets, the number of damage claims filed against the federal government has been steadily increasing. Some 3,000 were filed in 1962 alone. The Air Force no longer publishes the number of claims filed or the amount of reparations demanded, but it is known that

the dollars paid, together with the cost of processing claims, has already run into the millions.

Sonic boom damage caused by military planes has been responsible for a wide variety of claims. In 1962 a farmer in North Dakota was paid $1,048 because his animal had to be shot after a boom caused it to bolt into a barbed-wire fence. Another farmer in Hallock, Minn., was paid $50 because booms caused his chickens to panic and suffocate against a wall. In Cedar City, Utah, a store owner was paid $1,900 to replace plate glass windows and stock damaged by a boom. A farmer in Northern California sued the Air Force for $1.25 million for boom damage to livestock and irrigation pipes.

Even when the claims are farfetched, they must be investigated, at a cost of about $100 per claim. The Air Force recently investigated (and denied) a claim from an elderly recluse who sought $19 million in damages because he alleged that a boom had turned his house upside down. Also denied was a claim from a Cleveland motorist who said that sonic booms had ruined his automobile's power steering.

Because of the rising number of claims the Air Force has in recent years run a public relations campaign. Hundreds of civic leaders along B–58 test corridors near Strategic Air Command Headquarters in Omaha and the General Dynamics plant in Fort Worth have been assured that sonic booms aren't much louder than thunder. "The flights are the by-product of training maneuvers to save lives," said an Air Force spokesman. "Americans will have to learn to live with sonic booms. There's going to more of them—a lot more."

This is a sobering background for the SST, particularly when one considers that most of the Air Force flights have been conducted with relatively small planes and over sparsely populated areas. The shock of the sonic boom varies with the size of the aircraft, and the damage created by the boom obviously varies with the value of the real estate that lies in its wake.

Uncertain about the effects of the sonic boom, the Federal Aviation Agency undertook experiments in Oklahoma City some time ago. After the residents had been carefully prepared, a series of runs was made. When there were claims of structural damage, the FAA made appropriate inspections. It also purchased structures in various parts of the city to record the vibrations and to note how much damage actually occurred.

At the outset, the residents of Oklahoma City were rather proud that their city had been selected for these important experiments. Many of them were eager to see them succeed. When the booms first began, most residents were mildly amused. But as they progressed, many of them became annoyed. At the conclusion of the test, many Oklahomans breathed a sigh of relief that the ordeal was at last finished.

In their official pronouncements the FAA has stated that the tests indicate that 73 per cent of the Oklahomans indicated that they could live wih the boom (at least, with a sonic boom such as they experienced during these particular tests). This means that some 27 per cent of the residents indicated that they would be unwilling to tolerate even that much sonic boom. That fact is significant for several reasons.

In the first place, the people were well conditioned. They knew when to expect the sonic booms, knew that they would occur only in daylight hours. They understood that the experiments were carefully monitored and controlled, and that they might well serve a useful scientific purpose. Add to that the fact that there are no historic shrines in Oklahoma City; no ancient castles that might be shattered by a sonic boom; no Revolutionary War structures; no great galleries; no sensitive seismographic instruments.

Consider also that much of the industry of Oklahoma City is based on and around aviation. The very large Air Force base, Tinker Field, together with the various installations of the Federal Aviation Agency, supply by far the largest payroll in the city. Within its metropolitan district are aviation schools, aircraft plants and other small industries with an aviation orientation. Much of the rest of the economy is based on petroleum, for which aviation is by far its largest single customer.

Important also is the fact that the residents of Oklahoma City knew that the sonic boom program was temporary. But despite all the factors, more than a quarter of the people affected found the boom intolerable. During the twenty-six weeks of carefully controlled sonic boom tests in Oklahoma City, the Federal Aviation Agency received 15,452 complaints from residents and 4,901 formal damage claims. However, a spokesman for that agency concluded that the fault was not with the sonic booms but with the public relations efforts of the agency. Said Maj. Gen. J. C. Maxwell, the FAA's director of the SST program: "We [shall] need to do a much better job in telling the SST story in the years ahead."

Speaking of the tests, B. O. K. Lundberg, the Swedish aviation expert, states that the number of people protesting the boom would be far larger than the number of people ever expected to enter a supersonic plane. He states that every flight across the United States would produce a "boom carpet" covering some 10 million people and terrifying millions more.

Although thousands of damage claims have been filed and millions of dollars paid for their satisfaction, no claims have as yet been filed for the most tragic effect of the sonic boom. It was not until last January 11 that the Interior Department revealed serious damage to the prehistoric cliff dwellings in Mesa Verde National Park. Some of the most scenic areas known to man have been defaced. A Navajo Indian, Guy Quazzie Teller, watched as the shock wave from a single military plane demolished a large portion of a magnificent overhanging cliff.

On October 4, 1966, Park Ranger Charles B. Supplee, "a qualified archaeologist," observed continuing damage by sonic boom between 12:27 and 12:31 P.M., and at 2:33 P.M. park rangers counted eighty-three sonic booms from August 11 through December 22, 1966. On October 12, 1966, after three short booms were reported, "approximately 10 to 15 tons of dirt and rock was found to have fallen from one of the formations near the bottom of the Navajo Loop Trail, in the park." Interior Secretary Stewart Udall said that the situation was disturbing because of the "intrusion of the sonic boom on the fragile masterpieces of nature."

According to *The New York Times*, Udall discussed the matter with the Air Force "which promised cooperation but suggested that the Federal Aviation Agency should be consulted. Air space is considered to be the province of the aviation agency."

George B. Hartzog, Jr., director of the National Park Service, reported that the number of sonic booms over the Canyon de Chelly (in Mesa Verde National Park) had increased sharply in 1966. "With extensive back country and side canyons, the total damage is impossible to assess; however, it is reasonable to assume that it is extensive in view of the on-site observation in Canyon del Muerto." There park service engineers estimated that about 80 tons of rock fell on the cliff dwellings.

Additional damage has been found in Bryce Canyon and Zion National Parks in southern Utah. There, amazing sandstone formations, the result of nature's forces conspiring together for millions of years, have been reduced to rubble in an instant by a single sonic boom. While the Interior Department presumably could ask monetary redress from the Defense Department, such a payment would be nothing more than an internal transfer of funds. Nothing can restore the damaged areas.

The severe wreckage already done in the U.S. by a handful of supersonic military planes increases the probability that such historic cities as Antwerp, Nuremberg and Vienna will never permit supersonic planes to approach within 100 miles. It goes without saying that the prohibition against overflight will be automatic for such jewels as Paris, Florence, Rome and Athens. The West German and Swiss Governments have already announced that they will forbid SST flights over their jurisdictions if their people find them annoying.

Even in the United States, where the historic shrines are much younger and less priceless, it seems improbable that even the flying public will be willing to risk boom damage to Mt. Vernon, Independence Hall or the White House. It seems more likely that the public will restrict the planes. That would mean that their utility would be severely reduced and the total cost per plane increased accordingly.

Some of the proponents of the SST seek to minimize the problem by saying that some inconvenience is the inevitable price of progress. They liken the process to the necessity for a prairie horse to become accustomed to the passing of an occasional railroad train. But obviously this is no realistic parallel. Given all that is presently known about the sonic boom, if regularly scheduled supersonic flights are permitted across the country, thousands of structures must be redesigned and rebuilt and their occupants fitted with sound suppressers, or a sonic boom right of way something like 100 miles wide must be cut from coast to coast.

Some people have suggested that since the force of the boom is a function of the size of the plane, a smaller version might be built for flights over land. Thus, they contend, the larger model (built by Boeing) could make the overwater hops while the smaller model (built by some other company) could fly over land. While this suggestion has the virtue of spreading the pie among several aircraft companies, it has the disadvantage of additional cost—perhaps $1 billion more. And much of the time that potentially would be saved flying a supersonic transport from Los Angeles to Vienna would be consumed in transferring from the little jets to the big jet at New York, again to the little jet in London or Paris. Furthermore, the size of the market for each type of aircraft would be so reduced that there would be virtually no chance that either could ever pay its way.

Speaking of the problems of the sonic boom, C.B.S. reporter Bill Stout suggests that if the SST is restricted to overwater hops, the SST could easily become a multi-billion-dollar bust. And while over-ocean sonic boom problems have been dismissed as insignificant by the SST promoters, it is not at all clear that this view is shared by the ocean shipping industry, by pleasure boatmen or by the fishing interests. If the sonic boom swamps a few yachts, damages the masts in merchant vessels, and rudely awakens sleeping passengers on ocean-going liners, an entirely new set of legal problems may be created. Who is to say that the aviation industry has the right to interfere with ocean-going commerce? Might the sonic boom be construed by the shipping nations as interference with the traditional freedom of the seas?

As small segments of the public have become aware of the destructive potential of the sonic boom, public apprehension has increased. Unless they have a clear economic interest in the project themselves, many people will seriously question whether the increased speed can possibly be worth the cost. They are not impressed by the statements of SST promoters that the public simply will

have to get used to the boom. Nor are they convinced that overland operations should be permitted even if the earth-bound humans in sparsely populated areas are somehow compensated for the noise.

All of this raises serious questions concerning the feasibility of the supersonic transport itself and important questions also in a somewhat different realm. Should decisions critically affecting the living qualities of the earth be made only by the promoters, the bureaucrats and the technologists? Or should such decisions be shared by the people who must inevitably bear the brunt of them and who inevitably underwrite the cost?

[From the New York Times, May 21, 1967]

SUPERSONIC ECONOMICS

Supporters of Government subsidies for the supersonic passenger plane have continually stressed that it is needed to strengthen the nation's balance of payments. But a special report made for the Federal Aviation Agency and kept secret until now punctures this sales pitch. Far from helping to reduce the deficit in the balance of payments, the report by the Institute for Defense Analysis suggests that the SST may actually add to it.

The report states that the gains from foreign sales of an American SST will be more than offset by a big increase in American tourist spending abroad as well as by a reduction in sales of subsonic American planes. The F.A.A. disputes this analysis, insisting that if 500 SST's are sold, the balance of payments would benefit to the tune of $17 billion, while if 1,200 are sold, the gain would be $32 billion.

But given the high—and still unknown—cost of the SST and the problem of the sonic boom that threatens to limit its use, there is doubt that the manufacturers can sell 500 planes, to say nothing of more than twice that number. Some studies made for the Government estimate that only 200 to 300 will be sold by 1990.

The very fact that there can be no certainty about the sales prospects for the SST or its impact on the balance of payments argues for a deliberate and conservative approach in financing it. Statements based on hope and supersalesmanship are considerably less convincing than the hard facts of supersonic economics. The SST is supposed to be a commercial venture. It should meet commercial standards of investment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRIFFIN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE, NOT STATE DEPARTMENT, MUST RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—LXXX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to once again express my disappointment over the inactivity of this body with regard to the human rights conventions. There are those among us who say that the Department of State and the President have not done their share in convincing us to fulfill our constitutional responsibility of ratifying these treaties. I would hereby let it be known to each Member of the Senate that the time for "passing the buck" has terminated. We must step up to the challenge that the Founding Fathers of our great Nation created for this body. We must act upon the conventions.

The State Department is the oldest executive department of the U.S. Government. It originated with a resolution of the Continental Congress of January 10, 1781, as the Department of Foreign Affairs, and was reconstituted as the Department of State on September 15, 1789. Thomas Jefferson was our first Secretary of State from 1790 to 1793.

With the rise of the United States to a position of power and responsibility in world affairs, the American people have increasingly recognized the influence of foreign affairs on their daily lives and have taken a more active interest in foreign policy.

This relatively new position of the United State of America has greatly increased the responsibilities of the Department. Today State has 7,500 American employees in the United States and an equal number stationed abroad. In addition, it now employs approximately 10,000 foreign nationals at our overseas posts.

The Secretary of State is the President's agent and principal adviser on matters of foreign policy and is responsible for the operation of the Department of State and the U.S. Foreign Service. He, in turn, has four chief advisers. The daily work of the Department is carried on by specialized units, most of which are headed by Assistant Secretaries.

One of these, the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, is subdivided into five offices, including the Office of International Economic and Social Affairs. That office, as described in the Government Organization Manual, "coordinates and develops for the Department, U.S. positions on the international aspects of human rights."

The State Department has, throughout this decade, maintained a very realistic stance on the Human Rights Conventions. The Department has informed Members of the Senate that State favors ratification and intends to see that the President ratifies each convention at such time as we in the Senate have given our advice and consent.

Mr. President, we cannot ask for the State Department to do more. It is we, and not they, who have been granted the responsibility of consenting to the ratification of any treaties. Our Constitution states unequivocally that two-thirds of the Senate must consent before the Department of State or any other Department in the executive branch can play any further part in the treatymaking process. We have shirked this responsibility long enough. We, the Members of the Senate, during the 90th Congress, should accept the opportunity history has thrust upon us. We should ratify the Conventions on Slavery, the Political Rights of Women, Forced Labor, Genocide, and Freedom of Association.

PRESIDENT OF CHICAGO BANK SPEAKS OUT ON TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Mr. Alvin F. Friedman sent me an excellent letter and statement endorsing the truth-in-lending bill. As the president of a Chicago bank with extensive experience in the installment lending field, Mr. Friedman is in a particular good position to judge the various arguments which have been raised against the truth-in-lending bill. Mr. Friedman concludes that all of these arguments are without merit and that it will be a simple matter for lenders or extenders of credit to provide full disclosure of credit costs to the consumer. Mr. Friedman points out the somewhat absurd position of banks who advertise that they pay 5 percent interest on savings but charge "4 percent" on loans. Obviously, few banks can stay in business on these terms. The truth-in-lending bill would require the banks to admit that their so-called 4-percent loans are really approximately 8 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD Mr. Friedman's excellent letter and statement.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMALGAMATED TRUST & SAVINGS BANK,
Chicago, April 27, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Congratulations on the good work you are doing in the Senate, re: your credit disclosure bill.

I certainly support the principle that retail merchants and lenders should be required by law to disclose to the consumer all credit charges, both as dollars and cents and as the approximate yearly percentage rate, before the transaction is completed. Some of my reasons for this position are per the enclosed.

Keep up the good work!

Cordially,

ALVIN F. FRIEDMAN,
Vice President.

RETAIL MERCHANTS* AND LENDERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED BY LAW TO DISCLOSE TO THE CONSUMER ALL CREDIT CHARGES EXPRESSED BOTH AS DOLLARS AND CENTS AND AS THE APPROXIMATE MAXIMUM YEARLY PERCENTAGE RATE BEFORE THE TRANSACTION IS COMPLETED

A free society demands that the consumer be given the facts by which to make an intelligent choice, whether he takes advantage of that knowledge or not.

The American competitive system of free enterprise cannot operate as it is supposed to operate unless the participants have available to them, before the time for decision, the maximum possible information on which to make a decision—that is, to compare the price and quality of one service supplied by one supplier with that offered by another. The long list of consumer credit abuses makes it clear that such is not the case in the area of consumer credit transactions.

The 3 per cent per month plan of small loan companies is really 36 per cent per year! The small service charge of 1½ per cent per *month* on department store charge accounts could be as high as 18 per cent per year, i.e., if monthly payments are made *after* the grace periods.

The 4½ per cent of new car financing of some commercial banks is actually a charge of $4.50 per year per $100 loaned and amounts to an annual interest rate of approximately 9 per cent.

The so-called 7 per cent rate for financing used cars offered by some dealers is at least

---

* Revolving charge accounts could be exempted.

13 per cent per year and sometimes very much higher—18 to 25 per cent per year or more.

The advertised 5 per cent rate on home improvement loans is not less than a 6 per cent first mortgage, as it would seem, but is nearly twice as much, or about 10 per cent per year.

The cost of teenage credit now being promoted by some retailers as only "pennies per week" is sometimes as high as 80 per cent per year.

The Federal Trade Commission states that the installment add-on or discount rates is untrue and misleading, and that the real rate is approximately twice the stated rates in these cases.

When the consumer is informed as to the true credit rate, it is significant to note that he pays much less than the *un*informed consumer. This conclusion was reached in a study conducted by Consumers Union in October of 1964.

The question obviously arises, therefore, why are not more consumers informed? The answer is that present credit practices are simply too complicated, complex, and confusing. For example, after four hours of instruction on credit rates with an excellent textbook and well-experienced teacher, only 38 per cent of a group of *college students* were able to figure out the annual rate of interest within six points. The average consumer remains uninformed, with results that are often socially destructive.

Now, if a disclosure bill became law, a consumer wishing to finance a used car for 18 months, with an unpaid balance of $700 and monthly payments of over $46, the car dealer would have to show the consumer, before he signed any papers, that his total finance charges were about $129, and that this is a *yearly* rate of 22 per cent. After the consumer has this useful information, he could more intelligently decide if he wanted to pay these charges, or if he might wish to "shop around" for less costly financing.

In the long run, the best interests of the business community will always be served if there is honest and effective competition. It is obvious that a competitive and effective pricing system cannot be successful in the presence of misleading or deceptive pricing practices.

President John F. Kennedy recognized the plight of the confused and often bewildered consumer when he stated, "Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public. Legislation should therefore be enacted requiring lenders and vendors to disclose to borrowers in advance the actual amounts and rates which they will be paying for credit."

Recently, a vice chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Chairman of the Installment Credit Division of the New York Bankers Association, publicly urged that lenders be required to state, both in dollars and annual interest rate, the maximum cost of consumer loans.

To simplify the computation, rate charts have been worked out and printed which make it easy to determine the consumer's annual rate. For example, disks, slide rules and charts devised and perfected by the Credit Union Supply Association, Bowery Savings Bank, U.S. Department of Defense, and the Michigan Agricultural Extension Service, respectively, give to little-skilled clerks the ability to compute the *approximate* annual rates in a few seconds which are accurate to a tenth of a percentage point.

The United States Department of Defense requires that sellers and lenders dealing with our three million servicemen and their families disclose in advance the dollar amount and the *approximate* annual rate. This Defense Department action is implemented by the use of a prepared table of figures which shows the *approximate* annual percentage rates for level monthly payment plans, within ¼ per cent point at the lower rates and 1½ per cent at the higher rates.

In the states of Massachusetts and Washington, in 1966 and 1967, respectively, there are laws requiring retail merchants and lenders to disclose both dollar amount and *approximate* annual rate of credit costs. The Deputy Commissioner of Banks and General Council of Massachusetts has been quoted as saying:

"I am happy to report to you that the implementation of the legislative purpose expressed in the new Massachusetts statute on Truth in Lending has met with an unusual and unexpected measure of success. *The allegations made by those who opposed the principle of truth in lending, on the ground that it was completely unworkable, have been proved beyond doubt to have been in error. We are encountering no difficulty from the lending agencies of this Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. I think it a fair statement to say that the banking interests at every level are cooperating in every possible way, and that as a result thereof, the public interest is being substantially served."*

Our Canadian neighbors in Nova Scotia and Ontario have passed legislation requiring complete disclosure of credit costs both in dollars and cents and as an annual rate. Nebraska's installment Sales Act of 1965 required that full disclosure of the yearly rate must appear on one of the documents or written instruments.

In addition, savings institutions are giving and advertising the *effective* rather than the nominal rates of interest. This further demonstrates the fact that financial institutions are capable of disclosing annual rates, figuring interest daily, and allowing deferred and irregular payments. Furthermore, it is a general practice for real estate loans to be stated in terms of actual *yearly* interest. The Boston Federal Savings and Loan Association shows the *annual* interest rate on its application form. The Federal Housing Administration's Guide for Home Buyers and Owners quotes monthly payments, total costs, and interest rates.

Also, experience with laws requiring *some* disclosure of credit rates shows them, too, to be successful. For instance, some state statutes, including the Illinois Installment Sales Act, already require that the total financing charges in dollars and cents be disclosed. Under Section 42, Chapter 74, of the Illinois Installment Loan Act, the lender is required to state the rate "as the dollar interest charge per $100 per year of the original principal amount." Other state small loan acts require that the interest be stated as a simple annual percentage on the unpaid balance.

In addition to the consumer, the ethical and efficient lender or credit extender will also benefit if credit prices are made explicit in an accurate and uniform manner. Indeed, we cannot have a workable free enterprise system unless there is an adequate framework of rules which require sellers to accurately and honestly inform the buyers about their wares. Requiring full disclosure of credit costs will restore healthy competition to the consumer credit market. Although some business men complained about the Truth in Securities Act and various other labeling and full disclosure acts at the time of the enactment, they soon came to realize that such legislation was essential to the maintenance of a competitive free enterprise system.

Basically, the question is whether full and meaningful disclosure should prevail in transactions between dealers and lenders on the one hand and buyers and borrowers on the other. Full disclosure will reward the ethical businessman, deter the careless and less ethical, and generally benefit all but the determined and conscious wrongdoer.

A major benefit of requiring full disclosure could be a significant contribution to overall economic stability.

The need for the stabilizing effect on the economy which could result from disclosure of credit costs has been pointed out by Dr. James Tobin of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. "The cost of credit normally rises in periods of boom and inflation and falls in periods of recession. This natural cycle in credit charges, reinforced by monetary and credit policy, is a stabilizing force on the economy . . . However, the stabilizing effect of changes in credit costs depends on awareness by consumers that the changes have occurred. If buyers are ignorant of the true costs of credit, they are less subject to influence by cost changes. Increasing consumer awareness, . . . will help to make the cyclical fluctuations of credit costs a more stabilizing influence on the economy."

Moreover, Federal Reserve officials believe that economic growth is impaired when consumers are misled about the price of credit. The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia in the April, 1960 issue of its *Business Review* pointed out that a real burden for the economy "occurs because consumers often buy on time in an uninformed way without knowing the cost of the money they are borrowing. When they do this, they not only hurt themselves, but they reduce the efficiency with which the economy provides goods and services in accordance with consumer taste."

ALVIN F. FRIEDMAN.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HENRY H. FOWLER

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, one of the most delightful, and one of the ablest Virginians is the present Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler.

On May 25 the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot did an editorial profile on Mr. Fowler, which, at the appropriate time, I shall ask consent be made a part of my remarks; but before doing that, I should like to point out that Secretary Fowler is the fourth Virginian to hold a Cabinet position during the 20th century.

Carter Glass served as Secretary of the Treasury under Woodrow Wilson, and then, in 1919, came to the Senate, where he served from that time until his death in 1946.

Claude Augustus Swanson was elected to the Senate in 1910 and served until his resignation in 1933, at which time he became Secretary of the Navy. Then, during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., served as Secretary of State.

I might say, Mr. President, that Mr. Fowler ranks, in ability and competence, equal with those three great Virginians who served with such distinction in the President's Cabinet.

I am proud of my friendship with Henry Fowler and with Mrs. Fowler; and Virginia is proud of this native of Roanoke who now resides in Alexandria—

and who is serving with such distinction, as Secretary of the Treasury.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD pertinent portions of an editorial profile of Henry H. Fowler, published in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot of May 25, 1967.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH AN INDEPENDENT STREAK

Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, who is known to hundreds in business, political, and government circles as "Joe," got the nickname while attending Jefferson High School in Roanoke.

"There was a restaurant, the Blue Ribbon, operated by two Greek brothers, Chris and Paul, where we'd go for hamburgers after dances. They had difficulty remembering our names and took to calling everybody Joe. We started addressing each other that way, and several of us who played basketball around the area called our team the Jefferson Joes. I carried the habit into college, and as I was one of the few Joes around, the name stuck."

He played, as well as read, furiously. He tried all sports, except football, which his father forbade. In college he was a boxer in the 129-pound—the featherweight—class.

"I didn't make any decision about a career until my senior year at Roanoke College. My father wanted me to be a lawyer. My mother, who was deeply religious—Momma sang in the choir in the Methodist Church—wanted me to be a minister.

"I liked to write, I liked to speak, I liked working with people, and had a pretty strong competitive instinct. Law, as a general discipline and as a profession, combined all those factors. The next choice, the thing I sweated out, was being a newspaperman."

(In high school he edited the "Junior World-News" in the Roanoke *World-News*, and in college the campus weekly. "I'm a frustrated newspaperman," he said.)

He was fond of the University of Virginia—and therefore went to Yale for his law degree. "I knew I mightn't do as much work if I went where I knew so many people; and when I landed on the campus at New Haven, I didn't know a single human being."

He won a doctorate at Yale on a Sterling Fellowship, took the Virginia Bar exam, and, on the way to New York City for a job interview, stopped in Washington for a social weekend. He liked the brisk intellectual environment and stayed as a law clerk with the firm of Covington and Burling.

After a year he joined the Office of General Counsel to work on a major Constitutional case in defending the Tennessee Valley Authority, not so much because he was drawn by the issue of private v. public power as by his concern as a Southerner in seeing an opportunity for the region's economic development. "It was the first evidence of a delayed Marshall Plan," he said.

While he was with the TVA he met and married a pretty administrative assistant in the architects' office, Trudye Pamela Hathcote. They have two daughters and three grandchilden and live in an early 19th Century house in the old section of Alexandria.

He worked in several Government agencies, including the War Production Board, during World War II, and directed the Defense Production Administration during the Korean War.

"I've always been a liberal among conservatives and a conservative among liberals. Anybody who knows me gets very confused by the situation. It's that independent North Carolina streak, that's all it is.

"That fellow up there—" he pointed to a portrait of Alexander Hamilton over his office mantel—"now I admire Jefferson as much as anybody, but the two of them—Jefferson and Hamilton—represent forces that are not so much conflicting as complementary.

"I always have admired the contribution Hamilton made to the creation of the national government, but I have a strong feeling for state and local rights.

"Looked at in the terms of Alexander Hamilton's contribution, I don't see how otherwise we can play the role of international leadership we didn't seek but which history and destiny placed upon us."

AND A DECEPTIVE CALM

Henry H. Fowler's call to leadership came one day early in 1965 when he, a lawyer of 56, was sitting in a board of directors meeting of the First and Citizens National Bank in Alexandria and received a call to come to a side door of the White House.

"I knew the President well, and I thought he planned to ask my opinion of various persons he had under consideration for the vacancy. Riding into Washington I organized my thoughts about what to say of their qualities and characteristics. We met in the Cabinet room and he put me in the Secretary of Treasurer's chair to his left and said, 'Well, now if you were sitting in my chair, who would you want in that chair?'

"I began my spiel, and after about three minutes, he cut me short, and after he finished speaking, that was that."

Had he any hesitancy about accepting?

"I'm just like a private given a gun and told to get in there. I had no hesitation at all.

"Let me say I'm all out for him. Lyndon Johnson has more background and experience for the Presidency and inspires in me more confidence than any man I have ever known.

"From a personal standpoint, I find him a very warm and stimulating individual. He fascinates me, the skill with which he operates. Sometimes I get almost bemused watching him handle a situation, but I never had a better boss.

"He's a man who always surveys very carefully the alternatives or options the situation presents, but having deliberated, he is capable of prompt and decisive action."

How does the occupant of the Treasury's hot seat maintain what seems to be an easy, self-contained calm?

"A lot of it is natural. Being a Southerner and a Virginian, I don't like to hurry when it isn't necessary.

"Secondly, when I was about 36, I had something called a spastic colon—which turned out to be an ulcer—and I was told I ought to try to do things deliberately. I certainly haven't lived up to it."

Does he turn to any special reminder in moments of stress?

He pulled from his wallet a mimeographed poem a friend had given him. Entitled *Slow Me Down, Lord*, it asks for help to know the magical, restorative power of sleep, the art of taking minute vacations, of chatting with a friend, petting a dog, reading a few lines from a good book.

Remind me each day of the fable of the hare and the tortoise that I may know there is more to life than increasing its speed; let me look upward into the branches of the towering trees and know that they grow tall because they grow slowly and well; slow me down, Lord.—

James F. King, his executive assistant, observed that the Secretary practiced some of it: "When it comes to the magical, restorative power of sleep, he proves he doesn't need as much as anybody else."

He seldom plays tennis, attends international conferences on government holidays, and devotes most of his reading to government documents.

About his only relaxation, noted Mr. King, is "just such an infrequent conversation as he has had with you."

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR SPONG AT EMORY AND HENRY COLLEGE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] delivered the commencement address at Emory and Henry College, in Emory, Va., on Sunday, May 28, 1967. In his speech, Senator SPONG described the problems and turmoil of our time as "recurrent themes of an industrial and urban age." After telling the graduates that the purpose of their education had been to provide them with "the historical perspective necessary for an understanding of where we have been, and the intellectual skills necessary for making intelligent decisions about where we are going," Senator SPONG pointed out to them that—

It will be your responsibility and your challenge to take the more advanced problems and issues of the technological and urban age out from under what Thomas Jefferson called the "regimen" of your ancestors. To acomplish this, you must add experience to your historical perspective and academic preparation.

I found Senator SPONG's speech provocative and thoughtful, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., AT EMORY AND HENRY COLLEGE, EMORY, VA., MAY 28, 1967

I want to talk for a few minutes today about your world—about the world you grew up in and about the world whose future you, now more than ever before, have a chance to determine.

You are among the first of a generation to live outside the immediate experience of two events which had significant materialistic and profound psychological implications for your elders. These events were the depression and a world war. At the same time you are among the first to have spent your entire life in a world alerted to the potentialities of atomic and nuclear power.

Your age has been characterized as one of skepticism, of unrest, of anxiety, of moral breakdown, of a disregard for law and order. Some supporting evidence can, of course, be found for all of this.

I believe, however, that the events and situations of our world can also be viewed as recurrent themes of an industrial and urban age.

In 1962 Michael Harrington published a book entitled *The Other America*. His subject was the poverty which exists in the ghettos of many of our large cities. Another author, Robert Hunter, wrote a book called *Poverty*, in which he defined the term as the condition in which persons "though using their best efforts, are failing to obtain sufficient necessities for maintaining physical efficiency." After studying all available statistics, Hunter concluded that "about 10 million Americans were living in poverty."

If the name of Robert Hunter is less familiar than that of Michael Harrington, it may be because Robert Hunter wrote in 1904.

People demonstrate—for civil rights, against the war in Vietnam, and for various other causes. But such activities are not without their antecedents. In the early years of our century, Susan Anthony waved picket signs for women's suffrage. The Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Anti-Saloon League carried their crusades into the bars and saloons themselves. The so-called

"bonus army" of veterans marched on Washington in 1932 demanding cash bonuses and was dispersed only after regular troops had been called out.

And student involvement in such activities is not original with our decade. If today's anti-war signs say "Draft Beer, not Students" rather than "Schools, not Battleships," it may be because this is 1967 and not in the 1930's.

Today, some adults, including members of the academic community, encourage students to refuse to fight in Vietnam. Yet Charles Eliot Norton, Harvard professor emeritus at the time, advised students not to enlist for service in the Spanish-American War, because it was an "unrighteous war."

Pointing to antiwar demonstrators and draft card burners, some persons have concluded that the United States is losing its patriotic tradition. But it was in 1933 that the magazine, *The Nation,* after describing antiwar demonstrations, predicted, "It will take more than flag waving and bugle calls to empty the colleges for another war." Of course, only a few years later the colleges were emptied as Americans went to fight a "war to end all wars" and to try where they had failed before "to make the world safe for democracy."

Unfortunately, the world is still not so safe for democracy—as evidenced by Cuba, Berlin, the Middle East, some areas of the developing nations and the Southeast Asia country of Vietnam. And it is not so certain that the "war to end all wars" completely accomplished the purpose of its slogan. While a nuclear war has become widely recognized as the prelude to destruction, we find ourselves involved in the so-called "limited war."

Furthermore, we are told that our people are confused and uncertain about our current involvement in a particular "limited" conflict.

But that is not so novel either. *U. S. News and World Report* wrote "Down at the grass roots, what people want is peace, if they can get it. Failing that, they want to fight a war, when they must, that they have a real chance to win. They don't see this chance in an all-our war with Communist China." The same article quotes one person as saying "It's foolish to fight little fires until Russia is ready to launch an all-out attack," while another person suggests "pull all our men out, cut the losses short."

The article is 17 years old and refers, of course, to the Korean conflict.

Observers speak of a breakdown in respect for law and order and the President of the United States calls for a massive program to control crime. Organized crime is said to present a particular threat. If we refer to the problem today as organized crime rather than gangsterism or racketeering, it is perhaps because crime has become more subtle, more sophisticated, if you like. But to say that it is a recent threat is to ignore the Al Capone era and such things as the 500 gang murders which took place in Chicago alone between 1920 and 1929.

Likewise, to point to a moral breakdown among youth is to disregard much of what took place in the 1920's and to point to a Billie Sol Estes or other corruption in government is to forget a Tammany Hall, the teapot dome and a Boss Tweed.

This does not mean that our problems are the same as they were in previous years. In fact, the complexity and magnitude of these problems, and even their focus has changed drastically.

What I am suggesting is that many of our problems are in general the old industrial-age problems in the new wrappings of a further developed technological and urbanized nation. We have, for example, had the problem of war before, but not the same threat of destruction. We have had poverty before, but not on the same scale; war demonstrations, but not with the same implications; a previous relaxation of moral standards, but not with the same results. We have had urban problems but not the questions of air and water pollution, rapid transit, health and educational manpower on the same massive level.

Yet, despite this increase in the scope and intensity of our problems, advanced technology and expanding educational opportunities have offered a new insight into our problems and an increase in the capacity for solving them.

You have not been given all the answers to your problems here in the past four years. Hopefully, you have acquired the historical perspective necessary for an understanding of where we have been and the intellectual skills necessary for making intelligent decisions about where we are going.

It was Thomas Jefferson who noted that as the human mind "becomes more developed, more enlightened; as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered; and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times." "We might as well," he continued, "require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as (require) civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of our ancestors."

You can no longer wear a boy's coat. At the same time, the world into which you are going will not permit you to put on a man's coat all at once. In a way you will be required to start all over, at the beginning, as a freshman. You are likely to enter an office or company which has its procedures set and over whose control you will have little influence. It is probable that you will not begin earning quite as high a salary as you would like or doing the "interesting and creative" jobs that you want to do or holding the responsibility which you feel you are capable of handling. In some cases you may not be able to determine what time you go to lunch or how long you have to eat. You may be required to follow certain procedures, even on things as minor as answering the telephone, which you feel are ridiculous.

You may feel now that you know your particular field well. I trust that in many instances you do. But you will not always succeed and you will not always be right. You are likely to find that four years of studying does not match ten or fifteen years of direct experience and that there are aspects of your chosen profession which you never thought of. A doctor, for example, may be expert in his particular medical field, but if he cannot arrange the business part of his job, he is likely to find that bills do not go out, that the needed supplies are not maintained or that his record system is not complete. Or take the case of a teacher, a lawyer or a newspaperman. No matter how knowledgeable each might be in the area of his specialty, each will be truly forceful and influential only if he also has the understanding of human nature which comes with experience. These phases of a job may seem minor or peripheral to you, but they are essential for effectiveness and efficiency.

This is not intended to discourage you. Neither unbridled optimism nor undue pessimism is warranted. If you have the historical perspective and intellectual tools which I mentioned and the good fortune of finding a job with a capable and progressive company, this experience should be only a part of your continuing education, and additional preparation for the role you will later play. For, not only do those from whom you must now begin to learn have experience in their professions, but they also have experience in dealing with the problems and issues which are recurrent in our history. These persons have already wrestled—if on a lesser scale—with poverty, with disease, with finances, with war and peace. They have made progress, they have laid foundations on which to build. They may not have the answers to all the problems posed by the broadening scope and intensity of technological and urban development. They certainly cannot hand to you on a silver platter all the solutions you need in the upcoming decades. But you would not want that, for that would deny you the opportunity to develop your own potentialities and to meet your own problems. It will be your responsibility and your challenge to take the more advanced problems and issues of the technological and urban age out from under what Thomas Jefferson called the "regimen" of your ancestors. To accomplish this, you must add experience to your historical perspective and academic preparation. "Nothing ever becomes real," said Keats, "till it is experienced—even a proverb is no proverb to you till your life has illustrated it."

I hope your lives will be richly illustrated and I wish you well in all your endeavors.

WHAT'S NEW AT PATUXENT WILDLIFE REFUGE?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as Senators know, I have for many years been urging appropriations for a research project at the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge near Laurel, Md., designed to preserve American rare and endangered wildlife. The program is now beginning to provide positive results. There is increasing public awareness of the problem and interest in helping solve the problem.

On May 26, Burt Schorr, writing in the Wall Street Journal, provided us with a most interesting and informative article on the attempt to take whooping crane eggs from the nesting grounds at Wood Buffalo National Park and return them to the Patuxent Center for hatching. This project is underway right now and is a significant step in the preservation of whooping cranes and an eventual increase in their numbers. Mr. Schorr also discusses several other aspects of the rare and endangered wildlife program.

I ask unanimous consent that his story entitled "United States, Canadian Agents Plan an Urgent Joint Operation Next Week," be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES, CANADIAN AGENTS PLAN AN URGENT JOINT OPERATION NEXT WEEK—HELICOPTERS WILL CARRY TRAINED TEAMS TO SEEK OUT ELUSIVE QUARRY IN THE NORTH COUNTRY

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—An urgent international operation starts next week. Here's the lowdown:

Two U.S. Government agents arrive by plane at Fort Smith in Canada's remote Northwest Territories to join their counterparts from Ottawa. A U.S.-Canadian team then speeds by helicopter over the almost-impassable lake-and-muskeg terrain to preselected destinations. Trained hands probe for the mission's precious quarry and place it in special insulated carriers warmed by hot-water bottles to 99 degrees. Back in Fort Smith, the U.S. operatives load their prize aboard a Canadian government aircraft and fly nonstop to their secluded Maryland countryside headquarters. There a tense wait begins.

Another CIA caper? Hardly. The operation is designed to aid survival of the nearly extinct whooping crane. What the U.S. Government men—actually two soft-spoken biologists from the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center outside Washington—aim to bring back from Canada is five or six giant beige and reddish-brown whooper eggs scooped from nests in the wild.

If the hopes of the Patuxent bird men are

realized, some 10 days of artificial incubation will produce a number of tawny, fluffy-feathered whooping crane chicks. These birds, together with others hatched later from additional eggs, could in turn beget more whooping cranes. The potential result: A major victory in the 30-year struggle of naturalists to preserve the graceful whooper, North America's tallest bird (over four feet), from eradication by trigger-happy hunters and the intrusion of civilization on its shrunken habitat. A count of the species' present survivors turned up a meager 43.

STEPPED-UP EFFORT

The Canadian quest is only one of the signs that Uncle Sam, after decades of half-hearted effort, is now committed to preventing endangered North American, Caribbean and Pacific wildlife species from following the passenger pigeon and the penguin-like great auk into extinction.

In the fiscal year ended last June 30, Congress began providing significant infusions of cash for preservation projects. One result of this spending, a $145,000 wildlife propagation setup that will permanently house the whooping crane incubator and newly hatched birds, is nearing completion at the Patuxent center.

With more than a dozen wildlife specialists added to its staff, the Interior Department's Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife also has been able to begin essential studies of other endangered creatures. These range from the California condor, a giant vulture whose population is believed to total less than 100, to the black-footed ferret, a small and rarely seen Great Plains denizen that spends much of its time underground in prairie-dog burrows.

Naturalists, pleased by the Government's concern, say it reflects a surge of public support for preservation of the total natural environment.

THE ENVIRONMENT CRISIS

"There's a new awareness of pollution problems and the environment crisis that makes our job easier; people are beginning to recognize that diversity of species is the best index of an environment's worth," asserts Roland C. Clement, staff biologist and vice president of the National Audubon Society, which has pioneered in wildlife preservation efforts since its founding in 1905.

Businessmen, too, seem to sense a change in public attitudes. Some see wildlife protection as a way to earn good will.

Not long ago, Northern States Power Co. and Boise Cascade Corp., after conferring with Federal wildlife representatives, set aside a total of 330,000 woodland acres in northern Minnesota and Wisconsin as sanctuaries for the imperiled national symbol, the American bald eagle. Both companies adopted such safeguards as marking their land-management maps with eagle-nesting sites, establishing buffer zones 660 feet in radius around active nest trees and barring foot trails and other development that would make the nests more accessible to man.

"If corporate officials don't take such steps, they're going to face increasing Government encroachments," a Northern States spokesman predicts.

But Federal wildlife men still have much fact-finding to do before they can be sure what new protective moves to make. It was only last year that the Government got around to publishing its first comprehensive list of endangered species—some 300 birds, mammals, reptiles, amphibians and fish. Sample selection: Indiana bat, gray whale, Hawaiian monk seal, American alligator and shortnose sturgeon.

Collecting data on wildlife is a hard job. Some of its difficulties can be glimpsed in the work of the Craighead brothers, John and Frank Jr., two Montana ecologists. They have been studying the Yellowstone National Park grizzly bear since 1959, supported by Government and private funds.

The grizzly, or ursus horribilis, sometimes comes in half-ton sizes. It can turn without warning into a savage juggernaut of claws and teeth—a trait that used to discourage close scientific surveillance. But using hypodermic darts loaded with a muscle-paralyzing anesthetic and then administering shots of tranquilizer, the Craigheads immobilized more than 400 bears for examination.

RADIO-EQUIPPED BEARS

To learn more about life among the grizzlies, they affixed colored tags to the ears of 225 of them and fitted more than 30 with two-ounce battery-powered collar radios. (The radios were donated by Philco-Ford Corp., a Ford Motor Co. subsidiary, which also developed special tracking equipment able to pick up the radio "beeps" from as far as 20 miles away.) Thus, the minute-to-minute whereabouts of individual bears could be known.

As a result of their efforts, the brothers were able to make the first acurate generalizations about the Yellowstone region's diminished grizzly population (estimated at 850 in Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, and Colorado). One Craighead finding is that the average wild female grizzly doesn't breed until her fifth year and only produces one litter every 3 years. Another is that the average grizzly life-span in the wilds is only 5 or 6 years, with hunters outside the Yellowstone Park limits accounting for about 40% of the mortality. Reflecting the Craigheads' belief that a female might easily be killed before reproducing once, their final report will recommend tighter state game regulations to allow shooting of only a few "trophy" grizzlies each year, rather than the more general "meat" hunting now permitted outside the park.

The far smaller size of the whooping crane population has made whooper detective work every bit as exacting as grizzly tracking. One dedicated American ornithologist, Robert Porter Allen, spent a decade before finding some of the few remaining whooper nests in the 17,300-square-mile wilderness of Canada's Wood Buffalo National Park, which will be the target of next week's joint U.S.-Canadian expedition. Though the Canadian Wildlife Service suspects a dozen pairs of the birds are now mating there, it probably won't be able to pinpoint the location of more than half of them when time comes for the egg-napping, says David Murno, director.

PREDATOR PROBLEM

Robbing these nests won't imperil whooper survival as it might seem, U.S. and Canadian wildlife men argue. "Studies suggest that nearly half of the whooping crane nesting effort is wasted due to predators eating eggs and other factors," says Ray C. Erickson, the Patuxent biologist who will lead the mission to Canada. "In addition, there's a heavy loss of young birds."

Six years' successful experience in artificially hatching eggs removed from Florida and Oregon nests of the less rare sandhill crane raises hope for much improved survival of baby whoopers through use of an incubator. But a question remains as to whether the artifically incubated cranes will in turn produce offspring in captivity. Patuxent-reared female sandhills have produced over 30 eggs during the last two years. Yet none of these eggs have proved fertile; the male birds haven't done their part.

The Patuxent bird men now theorize that because all young animals seem to "imprint" or become mentally fixed on the first living individual seen, early exposure of the young sandhills to human beings has prevented them from accepting each other as mates.

So if whooping crane eggs are successfully hatched, Mr. Erickson plans to insist that any person approaching the birds be garbed in a white shroud—thus vaguely resembling a parent crane—or be concealed behind a screen. In addition, the young birds will be exposed to Canus, an adult whooping crane now in residence at Patuxent, as well as life-sized whooper silhouettes cut from plywood and painted white.

THE ALASKA CENTENNIAL OPENING IN FAIRBANKS: A GREAT SHOW

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, along with my colleague from Alaska, Senator BOB BARTLETT, I had the privilege of attending the opening of the Alaska Purchase Centennial in Fairbanks this past weekend. Representatives of our State and Federal Governments and of the Government of Canada participated in this event, which was an unqualified success and reflected great credit on those who brought it about.

A vast amount of highly intelligent planning, good taste, sound judgment, and dedicated effort produced a result which drew hearty and deserved praise from all who attended.

The days of 1898—the days of the gold rush—were brought to life vividly, entertainingly and charmingly. Past history and custom were entrancingly brought before a new generation of pioneering Alaskans. The tourists will love it. This achievement by the Centennial Commission was in itself an historic event and will remain for future generations to enjoy. There was much else—all of it very good.

An interesting article on the opening, written by its west coast correspondent. was published in the New York Times of Sunday, May 28. I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the news story by Lawrence E. Davies be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALASKANS OPEN AN EXPOSITION TO MARK THE CENTENNIAL OF "SEWARD'S FOLLY"

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, May 27.—Alaskans today commemorated the 100th anniversary of "Seward's Folly," one of the biggest real estate deals in American history.

DOGSLEDS TO SPACE

Ribbon cutting and speeches by American and Canadian officials opened the exposition, in which the transition of Alaska from the dogsled era to the space age is depicted.

Senators E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening, Alaska Democrats, Representative Howard Pollock and Gov. Walter J. Hickel, Republicans who replaced Democrats in last November's election, and Arthur Laing, Canadian Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, had roles in the opening ceremonies.

President Johnson was represented by Ross D. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Former Judge Vernon D. Forbes, chairman of the Alaska Purchase Centennial Commission, J. D. Vogwill, president of Alaska 67, and several others were on the program.

The centennial center was unveiled at the end of a week of mild temperatures, ranging during the day from 50 to 60 degrees, at a time of year when it is light here at midnight. A midnight baseball game is scheduled for June 21, between the Fairbanks Goldpanners and a team from Japan.

Humorous as well as serious references to the Russian-American land deal worked out by Seward with the Russian Minister, Baron Edouard Stoeckel in 1867, marked the celebration's start.

A celebration marking the sale of the land to the United States by Czarist Russia began at a 41-acre exposition center in this old Gold Rush town. State, Federal and local

governments and individual contributors are spending on it more than the $7.2-million paid by a reluctant Congress in the original transaction.

"Seward's Folly," negotiated in 1867 by the then Secretary of State William H. Seward, gave the United States 586,400 acres of land at the price of a 5-cent postage stamp for every four acres.

The Alaska 67 Centennial Exposition is expected to draw about 400,000 visitors. But, like Canada's more ambitious Expo 67 in Montreal, it is accepted in advance by enthusiastic Alaskans as a money loser.

During the year, in 41 communities all over the state, the Purchase Centennial will be observed, but the officially designated focal point for the next 126 days, until Sept. 30, is the Fairbanks site on the Chena River here in the interior of the 49th state, 100 miles below the Arctic Circle.

A KOSYGIN "TELEGRAM"

The official program bore a series of fictitious telegrams, including one signed "A. Kosygin, Moscow," that had the Soviet leader giving this notice to Alaskans:

"Sirs: Have filed for injunction with International Court of Justice. Cease all activity at Alaska 67. Examination of grandfather rights indicates we still hold title to property you call Alaska."

The Fairbanks phase of the statewide observance packs in a mixture of education, the arts—ranging from handicraft of Eskimos, Aleuts, Athabascan and Tlingit Indians to musicals and drama on several stages, along with paintings by Alaskan artists—and a spectrum of amusements.

Visitors to the amusement park climbed aboard open cars drawn over a mile-long track by a little steam locomotive of the "Crooked Creek & Whiskey Island Railroad," a reproduction of an engine with a pot-bellied smokestack that operated over narrow-gauge tracks to the goldfields around 1885.

Others preferred to "mush" behind a dog team, with wheels substituting for sled runners in the absence of snow.

EMPHASIS ON CRAFTS

The exposition planners laid heavy emphasis on native arts and crafts. A village built on the site has brought Eskimos and Indians to Fairbanks for the summer to live in Eskimo sod houses and Indian log cabins. A house of stretched walrus skins illustrates the housing of King Islanders living off the state's western coast.

Dr. Erna Gunther, chairman of the anthropology department at the University of Alaska, set out to fill a small anthropological museum at the fair with art and artifacts to match the slogan, "Native arts of Alaska, come home."

"What I've tried to do is to find Alaskan art work all over the world and bring examples back for the exposition," she said. "Here is an ivory-decorated wooden sunshade from the museum of Rear Adm. Adolf Etolin of the Russian Navy in Finland. He spent 1820 to 1824 in southeast Alaska. I have a wooden figure six feet tall, not a totem pole but a figure memorializing a person, coming from Mexico City."

Her prizes include, she said, one of three known copper masks, inlaid with abalone shells, made by Tlingit Indians. She borrowed it from a museum in St. Joseph, Mo. A similar mask, she noted, is possessed by the Museum of Primitive Art in New York.

LOG CABINS SALVAGED

The exposition took advantage of Fairbanks's urban renewal projects to salvage 34 log cabins, which have been permanently installed to house exhibits at the fair site. In fact, all structures on the grounds, except the United States pavilion with its silver geodesic dome, are marked for retention as part of a lasting pioneer mark.

The old Palace Saloon at the corner of Gold Rush Street and Sourdough Way has been rebuilt. It boasts of a picturesque 22-foot bar found by its owner, Bob Guthrie, in the ghost town of Iditerod.

"Wiley Post," Mr. Guthrie said, "had a drink at this bar in 1934 when he made a forced landing at Iditerod on one of his attempted trips around the world."

The saloon and adjoining cafe, along with cancan dancers on a tiny stage, offers a menu of sourdough pancakes, raindeer sausages, reindeer miner's stew and Alaska king crab.

A Gold Rush era exhibit of immense popular potential is "The Big Stampede," housed in Pioneer Hall. An audience seated on a slowly revolving platform views a series of 15 murals by C. (Rusty) Heurlin, long a leading Alaskan artist, showing gold prospectors in the Klondike and Fairbanks rushes at the turn of the century. A taped narration of 45 minutes by Ruben Gaines, a Pacific Northwest radio commentator and storyteller, explains the murals.

Nearby the largest sternwheeler of its cargo-carrying type ever to operate on Alaskan inland waters—the 242-foot-long Nenana—has been reconditioned from her rotting stage into a modern restaurant for permanent use at the fair site.

While Anchorage and other cities and towns participate in their own centennial expositions during the year, Sitka, the headquarters of Russian America, takes the center of the stage on Oct. 18.

A century ago on that date the Russian flag was hauled down and the Stars and Stripes hoisted. Congress had not yet begun action to appropriate the purchase price for Alaska worked out six months earlier.

THE CITIZEN, THE CRIMINAL, AND THE CRIME

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the May 28 issue of the Washington Evening Star contains a lengthy feature article written by Ronald Sarro and Walter Gold, in which the frustration of being a Washington policeman is graphically depicted.

Coinciding with the publication of this article was the news of the release by Kemper Insurance of a 30-minute motion picture entitled "The Thin Blue Line," dealing with crime and police problems.

In a city which saw a 60-percent increase in crime from last April to this April, the lament of a policeman, as reported by the Star, is:

We get absolutely no cooperation from people, and when you do, the courts defeat it. Sometimes you wonder if it's worth it, and maybe you look the other way.

In this context, Kemper publication asserts:

A wave of frustration has swept over the entire field of law enforcement, adversely affecting police recruitment and the rate of resignation.

The writers of the Star article also quote an unnamed policeman as saying:

I knew that if anyone challenged my arrest, I'd get no backing from the top—the officials, that is—they have no set policy. Sometimes if they think no one will raise a stink about it, they'll pat you on the back and tell you you're a good officer.

The increase in crime, together with the obstacles placed in the path of arrest by recent court rulings; congestion in our courts; and the attitude that somehow, collective society is to blame for the actions of criminals, hardly auger well for the permanence of the basic equation for the lessening of crime.

Few law enforcement officers would disagree that the prospects of prompt capture, speedy trial, and severe penalty are major deterrents to crime.

In all three respects, we as a nation, are failing.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Evening Star article and the publication by Kemper Insurance, which describes the crime problem in the Chicago area, be printed in the RECORD.

I ask also that two recent editorials from the Evening Star, entitled "Bad Day on the Crime Front" and "Crime: What's That?" be printed in the RECORD; also the text of a speech on Washington crime which I delivered on May 25 before the Political Study Club of the District of Columbia.

I further ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Wyoming State Tribune of May 17, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

In this latter item, Tribune Editor James Flinchum, after describing the prospects of a brutal summer of civil unrest in America, asserts that—

Before all of this occurs, the Johnson Administration, which is sitting back complacently and refusing to do anything against such lawless outbreaks, had better take action.

I thoroughly agree with that observation.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 28, 1967]

THE COPS TELL THEIR STORY: "YOU'RE DAMNED IF YOU DO, YOU'RE DAMNED IF YOU DON'T"

(By Ronald Sarro and Walter Gold)

As you pound the pavement, you wonder whether you will make the arrest that will cause a riot.

Wheeling around in the white cruiser, you know that in this city the smallest incident can turn into a life-and-death situation.

Deep in the pit of your stomach, you feel you're damned if you do, and damned if you don't—and nobody else really knows how it is.

You are a policeman, but white or Negro, you're mocked, ridiculed, spat upon, stoned, taunted, enticed or jumped at the slightest provocation by militant youths.

President Johnson calls it a national trend towards lawlessness. You call it a powder keg of hostility and hate.

Most demoralizing of all, you feel the people you're doing it all for—the community—are not with you. Your morale is the lowest.

What once would have been a routine arrest becomes a federal case, an incident, a disturbance with dangerous racial overtones.

That split-second decision you'll have to make on whether to use your nightstick and gun quietly gnaws at you. And you wonder whether the man above you will back you up.

That about sums up how Washington's on-the-beat policemen say they feel today.

To find out what it's like to police Washington streets The Star went to the men who do it, interviewing dozens of policemen in the city's 14 precincts.

This was in the wake of recent shooting incidents involving policemen and youths.

The officers were breaking a department rule by talking to reporters, and Police Chief John B. Layton was opposed to the story. One reporter was asked to leave a precinct building for attempting to conduct interviews. But they talked anyway.

The National Crime Commission, in its report on police, observed that "the capabil-

ity of a policeman, and particularly one who works in a high crime rate or slum neighborhood, to act in a restrained manner is constantly tested."

In doing his job, the commission said, "A policeman's authority is daily challenged by unruly juveniles anxious to detect any weakness or fear. In dangerous neighborhoods, he may be mocked, threatened or even spat upon.

"Even if an officer is of the highest quality, his work and the people with whom he must deal may cause him to become disillusioned or angry," it said.

So is it on Washington streets.

"It's the people's attitude about police work," said one veteran Negro officer. "It's a rotten job and you do it.

"You wonder if you'll make the arrest that will cause a riot. If you can see that far ahead, you don't make the arrest and avoid it.

"You put your job on the line every time you step out of this precinct," he said.

BAITING A POLICEMAN

The type of baiting a policeman is subjected to was seen last week just after two Negro youths were wounded by the Negro officer on the Northwest playground during a struggle which stemmed from a routine arrest.

The playground had been cleared for the investigation, and two white policemen guarded the entrance. A bearded Negro youth tried to push his way into the playground. He was told it was closed for the time being.

"What the hell do you mean I can't go out there, man, I pay my taxes," the youth said. As the policeman repeated his superior's instructions, the youth, taller and heavier, pressed toward the policeman's face, saying:

"Look, whitey, you guys have just murdered (they were wounded) two more of my brothers and I'm going out there to find out why."

There was another exchange, and then the agitator said, "If you want me to move back, whitey, then you're going to have to shoot me . . . you're going to have to murder me like you just did my two brothers."

The officer was then flanked by a racially mixed group of newsmen, and some youngsters broke the tension by laughing at the agitator. Whereupon he said, "All right, whitey, you've got me outnumbered but you just wait. You'll have to shoot me before the day is over."

As he left, he shouted over his shoulder, "This is the last straw. We're going to get even with all of you before sundown."

FORCE UNDER STRENGTH

Eight out of 10 Washington policemen are white. The city is more than 65 percent Negro. Eight out of 10 arrested persons are Negro; as are eight out of 10 victims of crimes.

The Metropolitan Police Force is more than 300 men short of its authorized strength of 3,100 men. Many of its men regularly work six-day weeks.

Both Negro and white officers emphasized that the color of the policeman's skin doesn't make much difference on tense Washington streets.

"If they have a riot, they are not going to pick out whites or Negroes. Just policemen, and we're all in the same boat," said an 11th Precinct Negro private.

A veteran of nine years on the force, he said, "I'm apprehensive out there. Some of these youths provoke police to arrest them just so they can yell police brutality."

"I've taken some verbal abuse myself, although not too much without acting. The kids know that to claim brutality is the one way to get back at police for exercising his authority no matter how justified," the officer said.

"DON'T TURN YOUR BACK"

Talking of his "apprehension" on the street, the Negro officer said, "It's don't turn your back or make a mistake, because it could be your last time.

"In 1959, I felt I had the community's support, the community with me. Now nobody's with us, not even the businessmen. All they say is they never see a cop."

He continued:

"They'll abuse you out there, the kids, calling names, struggle and put up a fight for no reason, same tactics as ever, just more of it. You very seldom get in trouble over major crime; it's always the petty things.

"An officer is afraid to use his gun, even if it's justified. Officials are constantly putting it in your head about the penalties. Some officers don't want to get involved under these conditions. The old time cops wouldn't have stood for it.

"Even in the most routine arrest, a crowd is going to gather . . . And you wonder, is the fellow going to complain; is the case going to be thrown out of court; are you going to be sued for false arrest?

"You are afraid to move out there and you gotta be careful. Some officers are afraid to do anything. Others are a little jumpy, because of the tension and may be quicker to use the stick.

"But a policeman has a gun, a nightstick, and a blackjack, and when someone attacks you, you have to assume he's trying to do you in, and act accordingly," he said.

UNDERSCORES DISRESPECT

A white 14th Precinct officer underscored the disrespect for police by youth. "It's police in general they don't like and it doesn't matter about the color of your skin," he said.

"We're enticed every day, mostly by name calling and rock throwing. They have a favorite obscene name they use—and they use it on officers of both races.

"A man will call you that and the policeman gets mad. He might tighten up on his hold on the man's belt some, but I've never seen a policeman hit one for it.

"It's funny about force. A colored policeman often can use force and get away with it. They (youths) can't charge discrimination."

A policeman for four years patrolling a high tension area in Northeast, the officer said, "These kids hate cops. They just hate the white ones more.

"The book says its a felony assaulting an officer, and you can use your gun. But no one can tell you what to do out there. You do what seems best and right for the moment," the officer said.

"We get absolutely no cooperation from people and when you do, the courts defeat it. Some times you wonder if it's worth it and maybe you'll look the other way."

The officer said that when responding to calls for certain crimes, like "man with a gun" or "robbery in progress," he "will have the gun ready, but not out, or I should say I'm ready to pull out the gun."

"You wonder about getting killed every day. You go into the projects, and everything you do is wrong, even if you're trying to help them," he said.

A 29-year-old Negro officer assigned to a mid-town precinct offered a poignant appraisal of the situation. He told it this way:

"A lot of us, especially the Negro officers, thought that things would be different once the city started hiring more colored men to be policemen here.

"We thought that, with a more balanced police force, there wouldn't be as many complaints from the people that the 'white cops' were picking on them. The white officers were glad . . . the colored people would stop squawking.

"But somehow, none of this happened. Instead our own people turn against us in many cases, calling us Uncle Toms, and 'the white man's slave.'

"To the nigger on the street—that's right, we call some of our own niggers; there's a difference, you know, between a Negro and a nigger— . . . to the nigger on the street we were traitors.

SCOUT CAR INTEGRATION

"The integrationists were yelling, 'integrate the scout cars,' so we integrated the scout cars and that didn't do much good either . . . A black officer and a white officer would make a joint arrest and, if it was a white man we locked up, we were picking on him. . . . He'd say, 'Your black partner tell you what to do?' . . . and the Negroes said just the opposite, so we still couldn't win.

"It used to be that every time a white officer shot a Negro suspect, the civil rights groups raised all kinds of hell. Now they do it every time any policeman shoots a criminal."

The Negro officer concluded:

"But whenever one of our men, white or black, gets attacked or even killed by a hood, you never hear the good citizens raise hell. I'd like to know what goes through their minds. Do they think that we're something less than human, something like discarded trash that isn't missed?

"As for me, man, when I police, I just play it cool. I'm no hero."

SEES "BACKPEDALING"

The young white lieutenant assigned to a downtown precinct said, "It's no secret that the police here are backpedaling. They let these bums get away with so darned much only because any type of crackdown brings screams of protest from the civil rights groups.

"I say the hell with these civil righters and the protesters. If a guy breaks the law, then lock him up and charge him with the offense. And if he gives you any lip, verbally or physically, use whatever force is necessary to maintain your arrest, or your name is mud.

"Because the word gets around that you backed down, and from then on you have to fight every punk in the precinct to keep law and order."

A 40-year-old white private from an uptown precinct observed, "We'll probably never get back to the old days when a policeman was a policeman and his word was law and, by God, you'd better not defy him or you'd go to the hospital before you went to jail.

"Perhaps we kicked around too many people too often and now the cycle has gone the other way. Neither way is really right. The only way to restore some sort of law and order is for more than half of the people who live here to rise up against the criminals who are less than 5 percent of the population."

ON A POWDER KEG

A policeman on the beat is "sitting on a powder keg," according to a 13th Precinct Negro private, a member of the force for four years.

"If you don't get a man off the street right away, there is a possible incident. A lot of times this is impossible. There are many times when the arrest is provoked.

"They know—the unruly ones—what our limitations are and take it upon themselves to cause a disturbance. You have to do something about it and if you don't, you're harassed by everyone," the officer said.

"You're caught between the devil and the deep blue sea. Juveniles know just how far they can go and they take you to the breaking point. It's the code of the street. To live in it, you have to be stronger than the next man," he said.

PERSONAL CONTACTS

"But the average policeman likes being a policeman," the private continued. "They train you to use your logic, but you don't know what you'll do in the heat of battle."

Many of the officers interviewed emphasized the need for personal contacts with members of the community in non-adversary settings. One suggested, "When they

have community relations meetings, the privates who patrol and live with the people should be invited, not just the officials who are hardly ever out on the street."

A Negro sergeant, who has served on the force nine years in the 10th and 2nd Precincts, said some officers have taken the street difficulties personally and say "what's the use, and do just enough to satisfy their captain.

"They see a crime in progress and they turn the other way . . . A lot of men have the feeling they are not going to be backed up. They are constantly hounded by superiors. There are inequities in enforcing department policies. Police don't have the guidelines to help them in these tense situations.

"HAS BETTER CHANCE

"I have run into both Negroes and whites who are afraid of the people they have to police. I have seen one officer directing traffic while his partner was in a fight. That's ridiculous.

"A Negro officer has a better chance of getting to know the people in his precinct simply because of his race . . . We ought to get back to the ideal of all Negro precincts. . . . There are white officers in number 11 who won't go into Barry Farms (public housing project.) Negroes can."

The sergeant said one difficulty in developing better police-community relations is that "white officers have trouble telling one Negro kid from another. They can't be police in these areas.

"Police and city officials are catering too much to these so-called community leaders around here. These community leaders have got to stop talking about the long hot summer, and riots and these things. They are planting the idea with people. Trying to generate a riot. Trying to incite a riot. And I mean Stokely and Barry and the rest."

One Negro private, a 10-year veteran of Anacostia duty, said:

"I think Washington police take more abuse without retaliation than any other major police department. In other places, police would bash some heads in," he said.

"Here we are told to stay away from areas during disturbances, and in effect not protect the public, but leave it to community leaders and they end up with glory for preventing something they sometimes contributed to starting," the officer said.

He charged that "some poverty workers have a very hostile attitude toward police and transfer it to the people, and especially the youths."

A 25-year-old white former private, who has just quit the force out of disgust and disillusionment, said "I feel sorry for the guys I leave behind."

Bitterly, he said "I put in my time, did what I was told most of the time and managed to avoid a real blow up with one of those damn agitators.

"I knew that if anyone challenged my arrests, I'd get no backing from the top—the officials that is—they have no set policy. Sometimes, if they think no one will raise a stink about it . . . they'll pat you on the back and tell you you're a good officer."

One tough Negro private of 20 years on the force criticized the conduct of some of his fellow officers.

"Some white and Negro policemen feel you go out and shoot everybody down and that's the way you solve the problem," he said.

"In some of these crowd situations, some officers act like spectators. They don't know what to do or are afraid to do it.

"Putting on a uniform and swearing in does not make a cop. These rural men who come into the metropolitan area are not used to handling big city problems."

"In Anacostia, I went into a crowd of 200 people and pulled out a boy who threw a rock at a police car. They didn't bother me. They knew me and knew they couldn't beat me."

REFLECTS ON DIFFERENCES

A veteran white officer who served in both the 11th and 5th Precincts, reflected on the differences between policing in 1952, when he came on the force, and today.

"The men are jumpy," he said.

"Policing now is completely different than it was 10 years ago. I used to enjoy going to work," he said, adding:

"The biggest part of it is that these youths have no respect for any authority. In the past they normally would give police some backlip. But now they think nothing of jumping a policeman.

"They are looking to agitate a policeman into doing something to cause a scene. You are tense. It affects your working conditions, your home life, your marriage."

ALWAYS FEAR

This point was echoed by a Negro private from the 14th Precinct. A seven-year veteran, he said, "In the back of your head there's always fear.

"I do my job and don't think about it. If I didn't, I'd end up in the nut house like (a name). His wife kept on him, reminding him about the chances of getting killed."

This officer told his views on working the troubled far Northeast area. He said:

"No two officers are alike. We're people, too, you know. You take as much as you can and there must be flexibility. If you can see that far, don't make an arrest, and avoid a riot.

"The law says to make an arrest, but you have to use your own judgment. So you let the minor ones go. But in a major offense, I take my chances and make the arrest.

"The best thing to do with name calling is to ignore it. Some officers won't and get all excited about it.

"But I won't stand for it when they come right up to your face and cuss you out, or spit. I might even bash a head. But it takes years of knowing and experience, not what the department teaches you."

For example, he said, "In a crowd situation, when two policemen pull up, don't get out of the car. Back off and get all the men you can and then go back in there. Two men couldn't possibly handle it. They lose communications leaving the car, and could lose a life or get beat up."

A 14-year veteran Negro officer, assigned to the 14th Precinct, said: "When these crowds gather," he added, "put the loudest mouth there on the spot. If you're having trouble quieting down a drunk, challenge the loudmouth to help."

A white 14th Precinct officer had much the same idea: "I've got a favorite saying when a man's mouthing off in a crowd. I tell them, 'You know so much about it you tell me what to do.' That usually shuts them up."

He said that in disorderly crowd situations, "there just aren't enough arrests. The precinct is just content to break them up. At least we should bring them all in and call their parents and make them come down here, pull them away from their television sets if you can find them, and make them control their kids so the parents won't have to come down here again."

TELLS OF SUCCESS

A seasoned lieutenant from a precinct east of the Anacostia River told of success in handling a crowd of youths in the manner the 14th Precinct private advocated.

"About the first of the year, there was this group of youths throwing rocks at a police car with white and Negro officers in it. We arrested all 15 of them.

"A fellow from the human relations council and I sat here in the precinct and we brought in all the parents. It was encouraging. The parents were very cooperative. One whipped his kid right here. They really chewed these kids out."

A contrasting example was observed by a reporter in a precinct last week. The mother of a 9-year-old Negro boy blasted her child for telling police he saw two older youths stealing lawnmowers.

"You're nothing but a stool pigeon. Next time you don't know nothing, you didn't see nothing, and you walk the other way," the mother said, accenting her warning with a poke to the face.

IN NEW SOUTHWEST

And what of the policemen in the precincts where racial tensions are not so acute? Is their attitude about the job better?

Said a 25-year-old 4th Precinct white private:

"I'm glad that I'm in the new Southwest area, where most of our problems are housebreakings and noncontroversial crimes . . .

"I put in my eight hours a day and that's all. I have no desire to get out there and become a dead hero. . . . Sure, I'm looking for another job, isn't everyone?"

A 36-year-old white police private assigned to the 7th Precinct in Georgetown asserted, "If those officers who patrol the Negro sections of town think their hands are tied, they ought to come over to Georgetown for a while.

"We've got the kids and the beatniks to put up with along The Strip . . . and those little monsters, white or not, give us more headaches than a whole mob of colored kids.

"Sometimes we can't tell the boys from the girls the way they dress, until we get them to the precinct house . . . and then there is sometimes hell to pay for locking up some big shot's son or daughter who was dressed like a fag in the damnedest assortment of old clothes you've ever seen.

"White or black, you can't win as a policeman here," said the Georgetown area officer.

CHANGE IN HABITS

There were other views on the change in policing habits.

"It's for certain that we aren't policing like we used to, mainly because there just aren't enough of us to go around," said a 38-year-old white police detective.

"When I left the 2nd Precinct in 1965, there were 228 men assigned to just that precinct. I checked there yesterday and there now are only 112 men, counting officials. Now I ask you, how the hell can you patrol a precinct properly with less than half the manpower you had in 1965 and crime up nearly 100 percent?"

A huge Negro sergeant, crippled by a brick that a Negro youth hurled at his back last year, tapped his cane on the floor as he talked of returning to the job, if he ever can.

"You don't think much about the situation out in these street incidents at the time. You do what you think is right and use as much force as you think is necessary. A police officer's first duty is to uphold the law. I have been called all sorts of names, mocked, harassed, enticed. But you cannot inject your personal feelings into it."

Two discs were shattered by the brick, thrown from a group of angry youths protesting his arrest of seven unruly Negroes in Anacostia. Asked if he had any second thoughts about the handling of the incident, the sergeant said, "I wouldn't have done it any other way."

THE THIN BLUE LINE: THE POLICE/THE PUBLIC

(By Fred E. Inbau, professor of criminal law, Northwestern University Law School)

(NOTE—Fred E. Inbau is a member of the Chicago Crime Commission. He is a former director of the Chicago Police Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory, a widely recognized authority on criminal law procedures, and author of several books, including a standard law text, Cases and Comments on Criminal Justice. He is also the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science.)

In the early morning hours of a day in October 1963, three young hoodlums savagely assaulted Frank Perry, a uniformed police officer on duty with the Chicago Police Department. His assailants overpowered Officer Perry and seized his gun. He might have been killed except for the sudden appearance of two fellow officers in a cruising squad car.

The men who attacked Officer Perry were apprehended, tried and convicted. They had long police records; their offense was a serious threat to community law and order. Yet, the three convicted criminals, ages 23, 19 and 19, were granted probation. For reasons unknown, the trial judge expressed the opinion that Officer Perry was a "crybaby".

TRADITIONAL VIEW OF THE POLICE

During most of the 20th century, an American policeman seldom had to face a charge of "crybaby". Although a particular police force might sometimes serve as a target for rough humor or often as the excuse for public cynicism, most communities saw nothing wrong with their police that could not be corrected by a new chief or by the election of a local reform ticket.

For all their human imperfections, American policemen were regarded as courageous protectors of the innocent. In line of duty, they regularly faced the threat of physical harm or, if need be, the utlimate fact of death. It was no exaggeration to regard them as a thin line of men in blue striving to defend the peaceful members of society from its thugs, murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals.

HAVE WE CHANGED OUR MINDS?

Every casual reader of the newspapers knows that something has happened to this traditional view of the police. The scarewords "police brutality" regularly appear in the headlines. Too often holiday weekends produce stories of conflict between young pleasure-seekers and the police in resort areas. Motorists complain of improper enforcement of traffic laws. Newspaper reports of trials in court tell of repudiated confessions, alleged mistreatment of prisoners and charges of police bribery and incompetence.

From the slums to the suburbs, from the stories in daily papers to the decisions of the highest courts in the land, controversy rages over the conduct of policemen and the proper use of police powers. So widespread is the confusion and dissatisfaction that observers striving for impartiality must ask: Who has changed? The police? Or the public?

WHAT THE FACTS SHOW

If the widespread indictment of the modern policeman can be supported at all, surely it must be on the basis of some factual evidence. Is today's policeman less self-sacrificing in his traditional struggle with lawbreakers? Available figures make a mockery of any such contention.

Instead, records prove it is becoming increasingly hazardous to serve the American public in the uniform of a police officer. During 1965 one in every ten policemen throughout the nation was the victim of an assault. In New York City during the same year, assaults on policemen increased 8% over 1964. From January through June, 1965, 264 Chicago police officers were injured on duty; during the same period of 1966 the number increased to 364. In July, 1966, excluding the detective division, 76 Chicago police officers were assaulted by persons resisting arrest; another 73 were injured as a result of mob action or fights between citizens. Over a recent five-year period, 406 Atlanta police officers incurred major injuries while making arrests. During the past six years, throughout the nation, 278 officers were killed.

In the area of professional skills, are the police of the '60's less accomplished than those of earlier days? It would, indeed, be difficult to show that they are, on the basis of any objective evaluation. Evidence indicates many fewer cases of physical abuse of suspects than formerly and far less intrusion on the constitutional rights and privileges of citizens. The so-called 3rd degree during the interrogation of criminal suspects—a fairly common practice twenty, or even ten, years ago—is a rare occurrence today. As for police procedure in general, it is an established fact that today's policemen are much more highly trained than ever before.

It seems certain that we must look elsewhere for the cause of the current wave of dissatisfaction with our police forces.

THE POLICEMAN AS A SYMBOL OF SOCIAL ILLS

Undoubtedly much of today's criticism of the police results from the fact that the policeman has come to be the uniformed symbol of many social ills. Unlike other representatives of local government—aldermen or members of the school board, for example—the policeman is on public view day in and day out. He therefore feels the brunt of much of the community's pent-up resentment over social conditions.

It is unreasonable to regard the policeman as responsible for the plight of minority groups. He did not create the slums or the Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos; nor have the police caused segregation and discrimination. Nevertheless, there is a widespread identification of the police with all these failures of society.

The psychology of this identification—the source of much basic resentment against the men in blue uniforms—is easy to understand. Most motorists have had the experience of being stopped or ticketed by a traffic policeman. Even when the driver knows that the action is justified, he is still likely to feel some humiliation and embarrassment. If the officer seems brusque or rude, or if the motorist can convince himself that he did not violate the law (perhaps, "only a little bit", his anger will burn hot. Psychologically, it is a short step from anger against a particular man in blue to transferred resentment of all police officers.

Perhaps most damaging of all to the image of the policeman has been the role he is forced to play when controversies over the civil rights of minority groups cause violence. With each passing summer it becomes more and more difficult to distinguish between legitimate social protest and flagrant violation of laws designed to protect persons and property. Puzzling and unpleasant though this choice may be for us all, for the police, who are professionally responsible for the maintenance of law and order, it is a cruel dilemma.

POLICE MORALE IN THE CRISIS

Men who accept hazardous public service as a way of life hope for the good will and good opinion of their fellow citizens. It is hard for the police to accept daily danger in the face of mounting public disrespect and outright hostility. A wave of frustration has swept over the entire field of law enforcement, adversely affecting police recruitment and the rate of resignation.

During the first six months of 1964, 1965 and 1966, Chicago's police resignations—without pension and for the purpose of accepting other employment—jumped from 20 in '64 to 37 in '65 and to 90 in '66. In July, 1966 alone there were 37 such resignations!

A breakdown in police tenure and recruitment would produce dire consequences for our society. As the false image of policemen as the defenders of inequities in our social system gains a greater and greater hold on the public's imagination, we tend to forget that we must depend on these same men to protect us from the criminal element in our society. Nothing less than a highly trained and soundly motivated body of men, replenished by effective recruitment and wholeheartedly devoting itself to career service, will protect the American people from violence and crime.

A CHANGE OF PUBLIC ATTITUDE IS CALLED FOR

If we are to arrest the obvious deterioration of police morale, a dramatic change in public attitude is called for. Our citizens must come to a more realistic appreciation of the awesomeness of a policeman's responsibility. Reasonable allowance must be made for inevitable errors of judgment in the performance of his duties.

When the public appraises the conduct of any other public employee or of any member of another profession, due allowance is made for the frailties of human nature. All too often, in the case of a policeman, we make no allowance for the normal human traits of impatience and anger. We forget or ignore the frustrations that confront him in his job every day.

We should never forget, in our dealings with a police officer, that he may have spent an eight-hour day confronting drunks, thieves and thugs. He may have suffered painful blows. He may have been attacked by knife or gun. A near psychotic may have spit in his face. At all times, nevertheless, he is expected to suppress any expressions of resentment or frustration. We expect him to show the composure of the surgeon, the patient understanding of the clergyman, and the learning of an appellate judge. And if he fails, he and his office may be condemned or scorned in a manner never inflicted on any other public servant.

All this is not to suggest that the public must condone whatever the police do, or that we should never hold the police accountable for mistakes. No responsible police officer asks for or expects any such special privilege. We must evaluate a police officer's conduct in any given situation within the context of all the facts and circumstances confronting him at the time of his decision-making.

THE COURTS AND THE POLICE OFFICER

Not only is the individual police officer frequently second-guessed in a particular case by the public or the press, but it has become highly fashionable lately for judges to formulate police policies and prescribe police procedures. A number of recent decisions severely limit the effectiveness of police officers in dealing with suspected criminals.

Even cases of physical assaults on officers —for example, the instance of the assault on Officer Perry, with which we began this discussion—seem in recent years to have been resolved in court with unusual leniency. Naturally this form of consideration for the proven guilty is the practice that the police find hardest to accept. Inevitably, it lessens their willingness to risk life and limb in scuffles with law-breakers.

It is the constitutional function of the courts to insure that no one is convicted except by "due process of law". In essence, this has always meant a "fair trial"—providing adequate safeguards to protect the innocent. For example, if the prosecutor seeks to use as evidence a confession that the police obtained by force, threats, or promises of leniency, the evidence should be rejected by the court. Under such circumstances an innocent person might make a false confession. But in the past few years, decisions of the Supreme Court have held that, regardless of the validity and reliability of the evidence against an accused person, it must be suppressed if the police deviated from the procedures prescribed by the courts.

This practice of turning the obviously guilty free—for considerations apart from the protection of the innocent—is a considerable factor in producing the present low morale of the police.

SOME KEY CASES AND DECISIONS

A few cases may help explain police resentment. Several years ago a housewife in Washington, D.C., was raped in a laundry room in the basement of her apartment building. Strong suspicion centered on one Andrew Mallory, a relative of the building's

janitor. In fact, the suspect was the only one who could have been in the basement at the time, but the victim could not positively identify him as the rapist because he had used cloth to conceal his features.

Several days later the police located the suspect and held him in custody a few hours. After a short period of questioning—without the use of force, threats, or promises of leniency or any other conduct that might make an innocent man confess—the suspect admitted he was the rapist. His confession, together with other evidence, satisfied a jury, beyond a reasonable doubt, that he was guilty.

Nevertheless, upon appeal to the Supreme Court, the conviction was reversed on the ground that the confession was inadmissable as evidence because the police had violated a rule requiring arrested persons to be brought before a judicial magistrate "without unnecessary delay". It was futile to try the confessed rapist again because the confession was indispensable to proof of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. He was therefore released.

Soon afterwards he assaulted another woman, and later was caught burglarizing a Philadelphia home in which he had attempted another rape. This time, with no technical out, he was sent to the penitentiary.

In another Washington, D.C. case, the Supreme Court rule laid down in the above case required a trial judge to release a man who had not only confessed to the murder of his wife, but had also led the police to the place where he had buried her body. In ordering the defendant's release the trial judge said: "I will direct a verdict of acquittal, but I do so with a heavy heart . . ."

Policemen experience a feeling of bitterness and frustration when they see a dangerous criminal set free. But Supreme Court decisions rendered on June 13, 1966, by a vote of five justices to four, seem to indicate that we have not seen the end of the practice.

The Supreme Court held that before any criminal suspect can be questioned by the police he must first be advised:

a. that he has the right to remain silent;

b. that anything he says can be used against him;

c. that he is entitled to consult with a lawyer; and to have him present during questioning; and

d. that if he cannot afford a lawyer, he is entitled to have one provided for him.

All of this was entirely new law. Over the years, at least thirty state supreme courts, and at one time the Supreme Court itself, held that the Constitution did not require the police to warn a suspect of a right to remain silent (although, this did not permit the police to force him to talk). Just a few years ago the Supreme Court specifically held that the police were entitled to question a suspect even though he asked for a lawyer and even though a lawyer was at the police station, trying to see him.

These earlier decisions were based upon the theory that the Constitution provides only that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." Nowhere in the Constitution is there any guarantee of the right to counsel before the start of a prosecution.

The warnings now required will be a considerable handicap to the police in producing evidence against guilty persons—especially the warning regarding the right to counsel because the standard advice of every lawyer to his client is: "Don't talk." The burden of this decision on the police results from the fact that many serious crimes can be solved only by the interrogation of criminal suspects. Fingerprints and other circumstantial evidence are rarely found in cases involving muggings, murders, or rapes committed on the streets and alleys of our cities.

CONCLUSION

In our efforts to preserve individual rights and civil liberties, we cannot impose so many restrictions on law enforcement agencies that they will be powerless to prevent crime and apprehend criminals. Our only practical course is to strive to improve the quality of our law enforcement agencies and to create an atmosphere in which the civil rights and liberties of all will be respected.

This must be done by selecting and promoting our police on a strict merit basis and by making certain that they are properly trained and adequately compensated. They must also be internally supervised with respect to abusive and corrupt practices and protected against politically inspired interference.

Further progress will result as the general public once more develops a sound and realistic attitude toward law enforcement agencies. As a guide toward our thinking on this point, the plea of Commissioner G. B. McClellan of the Royal Mounted Police deserves the consideration of all law-abiding citizens: "When the policeman exceeds his authority, bring him up short, but when he is doing a tough, thankless and frequently dangerous job for you and for all you hold dear, for God's sake get off his back."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 22, 1967]

CRIME—WHAT'S THAT?

There is one thing to be said for our new Attorney General, Ramsey Clark. You never know what to expect when he takes off on the subject of crime.

In an interview the other day, the attorney general was reported as saying in effect that all the talk about a national crime wave is much ado about nothing. "The level of crime has risen a little bit," Clark said, "but there is no wave of crime in the country."

As an item in support of this thesis, the attorney general told of one city (unidentified) in which crime was up 1 percent from last year. But last year, he added cheerfully, crime in that city was down 1 percent from the year before. As for official statistics which indicate substantial yearly increases in crime throughout the country, Clark said: "We do ourselves a great disservice with statistics."

For our part, we do not quite know how to interpret this comment. It is true that crime statistics do a great disservice to the Clark suggestion that the crime wave talk is a case of making mountains out of molehills. But our attorney general, in all deference, is talking through his hat—at least as far as the crime statistics for Washington are concerned. Whatever the fact as to the statistics for his unidentified city—statistics, incidentally, which he seemed to think were quite useful—the figures for the Nation's Capital add up to a devastating rebuttal of the Clark crime thesis.

The most recent statistics for Washington show a dismaying crime rise here of 59.7 percent last month over the previous April. This included a 103.8 percent jump in robberies. The rise in serious crimes in March was 51 percent over March of 1966. The President's message on crime in Washington, promising safe streets and so on, went to Congress in January. The local crime statistics for that month revealed a jump of 42 percent over the same month a year ago. And to take a longer statistical journey into the past, the crime index in Washington 10 years ago was about one-fourth of its current level.

Yet our attorney general tells us that "we do ourselves a great disservice with statistics." It would be nice, we suppose, if the nasty figures could be thrown down the sewer. Then it might be possible for some people to believe that there really isn't any such thing as a crime wave. Possible for some people that is, but not for those who are the victims day in and day out of robberies, rapes, burglaries, assaults, and you name it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 24, 1967]

BAD DAY ON THE CRIME FRONT

About half of the first page of the last edition of yesterday's Star was given over to the story of crime in Washington. And it couldn't have been otherwise—unless one believes that the way to deal with crime is to pretend it isn't there.

This latest chapter of our local crime story began Monday evening when a police officer was forced to shoot two hoodlums who attacked him on a school playground. Around noon yesterday a bank messenger was shot to death in a robbery at 10th and P Streets NW. At about the same time a young woman, Judith K. Robeson, who worked for Senator Carlson of Kansas, was found brutally murdered in her apartment at 800 Fourth St. SW. To top off the day, police had to battle a crowd of unruly youngsters trying to crash the city's annual Cadet Corps review at Eastern High School. After bottles and rocks began to fly, 19 arrests were made. All of this, of course, was over and above the daily run of "routine" crime in this city.

It seems to use that a day of this sort should be enough to shake up the most complacent, the most myopic, crime watcher. But maybe not.

Senator Carlson put his finger, perhaps unintentionally, on the root of the difficulty.

It fell to him to phone the bad news to Miss Robeson's parents in Kansas. "I tell you," he said, "it was rough. This kind of thing is just unbelievable until it happens (to someone) in your own office."

Well, "this kind of thing" is believable enough to thousands of people, generally "little" people, in Washington. All too often, they have seen members of their families murdered. They know what rape, robbery and assault mean. It is believable to the policeman whose daily stint is becoming more and more hazardous, while more and more fools or worse mouth the cry of "police brutality." And every indication is that the trend of crime is going up, not down. We hope that "this kind of thing" will not have to happen to someone in everyone's office before the threat of crime is taken seriously.

A new District crime bill—not a "tough" bill, but better than nothing—has started to move through the House. If it is passed, we hope the Attorney General, who seems to think that crime is something of a myth, will support it. And we also hope that the President, who makes fine speeches about safety in the city, but who unwisely vetoed last year's crime bill, will sign it into law.

Perhaps the message that is implicit in Senator Carlson's comment will get through to these protected gentlemen who have the power, if they will use it, to do something effective to curb crime in Washington.

TEXT OF REMARKS OF SENATOR CLIFFORD HANSEN AT NOON MEETING OF THE POLITICAL STUDY CLUB OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Each of us here today has at least two things in common. We are all interested in politics, and we live in a metropolitan area that has one of the highest crime rates in the nation.

And so I would like to speak with you for a few minutes about a war being fought right here at home—a war which we clearly are losing.

With all due respect to the Attorney General, statistics and our own newspapers tell the story of crime in the nation and in Washington.

Since 1960, the United States population has increased eight per cent. Crime of all types has increased 46 per cent. Much of

this increase has been among juveniles. Indeed, it has been reported that of all criminals arrested by the police, the most frequent age is 15.

The Washingtonian soon learns, as have my wife Martha and I, that the streets of Washington are not a good place to be found when the sun goes down. Crime in Washington during the month of April increased 60 per cent from the level of April a year ago.

Our city seems to be caught in a double play that favors criminal activity. On one hand, crime is increasing; and on the other, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a fully-staffed police department.

Recently, the Washington police force had 310 vacancies.

One wonders if factors more than high risk and low pay haven't contributed to the disinclination of our young men to don the blue uniform of our most valuable public servant.

There's a line by an anonymous poet which goes, "God and the soldier we adore in time of trouble, and not before." This is equally true of our police. A motorist will look with disdain upon an officer who tickets her for speeding; five minutes later, that same officer may nab a mugger or purse snatcher who had made that motorist his victim.

It is a fact that in the United States today, combined spending to prevent or punish crime, carries an annual price tag of 27 billion dollars. This is 7 billion dollars more per year than we spend on education. Crimes of violence increase at an incredible rate.

Evidence of nationwide crime syndicates which form an invisible government in our major cities is more apparent every day. But paradoxically, our courts and our social philosophers seem constrained to weep, not for the murdered, but for the murderer . . . not for society's law-abiding majority, but for society's law-breaking minority.

Recently, when a New York court was forced to throw out the conviction of a confessed six-time murderer because of the so-called Miranda decision on voluntary confessions, District Attorney Aaron A. Koota had this to say:

"The United States Supreme Court has weighted the scales of justice heavily in favor of the criminal suspect. I am not a prophet, but the handwriting on the wall indicates a trend on the part of the court to outlaw all confessions made to police. If and when that meloncholy day comes, the death knell of effective criminal law enforcement will have been sounded."

I suggest to you that the criminal law exists to protect those who obey it from those who don't. When the courts distort this basis for the law to create from it a system of false equality that was never intended, the law ceases to become a shield for the society it is supposed to protect.

It becomes instead a pitiful instrument which feeds on trivia and technicality and serves neither to protect society nor punish society's offenders.

Sir Edward Coke wrote nearly four centuries ago that "reason is the life of law. The common law itself is nothing else but reason. The law," he said, "is the perfection of reason."

But how is reason served when by a one vote majority of the Supreme Court, the self-admitted guilty are turned upon society to wreak their havoc on the bodies and treasures of those who obey the law? When this occurs, the law and reason have parted company.

All of us are familiar with the Mallory decision. The U.S. Supreme Court turned loose a confessed rapist because a day had elapsed between his arrest and his arraignment. Mr. Mallory's response to the society which had gifted him again with his liberty was to again commit the crime of rape.

The history of man's efforts to create a framework of civilized law suggests that a debilitation in the system's appendages spreads rapidly through the trunk and to the heart.

We have today increases in crimes of violence on the streets; a system of organized crime throughout our nation; we have Stokely Carmichael threatening to "tear" our "cities apart."

Mr. Carmichael has told us in painfully graphic terms that he intends to take over Washington lock, stock and barrel. Given this young man's propensity to violence and his thirst for power, Washington might well indeed have a long, hot summer.

Law enforcement officials from J. Edgar Hoover down, agree that most positive remedy to crime—whether it be violence in the streets, systems in the cities, or sedition in the slums—is prompt capture, speedy trial and severe penalty.

In all three respects, we as a nation are failing.

The obstacles before our police negate prospects for prompt arrest and arraignment.

The congestion in our courts makes the speedy trial unlikely.

And a peculiar philosophy pervading our society is lessening the severe penalty.

It is highly unlikely that the Congress will take any action to vitiate recent Supreme Court decisions which I feel have contributed not only to the increase in crime, but the decrease in apprehension and conviction.

But there must be some things that we, as citizens, can do to protect ourselves, rather than simply double-bolt the door at night, and keep a shotgun at hand.

It seems to me that one of the most basic protective measures is to decrease the criminal element in our society by the rehabilitation of first offenders.

Studies show that we have a better than 50–50 chance of saving the first offender and keeping him from a career of crime.

Also, to keep criminals from society, we can demand much tighter control over parole and release of multiple offenders, particularly those with a record of crimes of violence.

Studies show that a life sentence for most prisoners runs only 12 years before parole. U.S. News and World Report stated early this month that of all criminals freed in 1963, from Federal prisons, 82 percent were rearrested for new crimes by June 30, 1966.

And so, I suggest that we not be so quick to turn loose the man with the long rap sheet. The parole and probation schools have pitted the classic school, with its emphasis on law, against the humanitarian school with its emphasis on man. The community protection role should take precedence over rehabilitation of the convicted multiple offender.

We have an obligation to offer freedom and aid only to those not likely to assault society again and that is the first offender—the one who goes to prison with the best chance of being rehabilitated.

I am thoroughly convinced—from watching the rehabilitation program at the Wyoming State Penitentiary, during my term as Governor, that we must not, in our penal system, throw the first offender into the environment of the hardened, habitual criminal.

The education of environment works to the detriment of those who might be saved from a life of crime. If it requires special prisons for first offenders only, then I think we ought to consider making that economic commitment. Or we could simply segregate our prisons now in existence.

But in any event, the importance of keeping first offenders from habitual criminal elements is a vital step in the diminution of the size and potency of society's criminal element.

Another measure that we could take—this applies to apprehension—is to enact a realistic wiretapping law which goes beyond the very limited national security authorization requested by the President.

I have helped author a bill that would create a search warrant-type procedure for the granting of electronic surveillance warrants by judges at the Federal, State and municipal levels.

To get authorization for a wiretap, an authority would have to show cause, establish need and deposit all of the information gleaned from wiretaps with the authorizing judicial authority.

The telephone wires which connect every town and city are an important factor in the organization of criminal networks. The ability to intercept these messages is of ever-increasing importance in law enforcement.

I am convinced also that we should reconsider our attitude toward juvenile offenders—and child raising.

This question goes to the very heart of the child-parent relationship; to the permissive school of child-raising that is invoked today. This philosophy, I might add, is largely of the same Doctor Spock who preaches Viet Cong supremacy in the company of civil rights leaders who ought to know better.

I think it is well to remember that children are young adults. What they will be in maturity, they are becoming as children.

As adults, they will reflect the moral judgments they see made in the home: both by example, and by loving but positive discipline.

They will be compassionate if their earlier lives reflect the therapy of compassion.

They will have a lively concern for others if their lives have been of concern to others.

A child needs to be involved in his family; not just fed and clothed by it. He needs to be guided by his family, not just shielded by it, and he needs at least as much Mom and Dad as Doc Spock and television.

When parents again take responsibility for the conduct of the lives they create, I think we will find fewer of our young people dragged into juvenile court.

But once they're in those courts, I firmly believe that they ought not to be clothed in a mantle of anonymity and freedom from exposure.

In the Rocky Mountain country which has been my home for more than 50 years, there is a splendid old judge in Helena, the capital of Montana.

He is Judge Lester Loble. His philosophy for controlling "juvenile crime" was outlined in a speech in Salt Lake City.

Said Judge Loble, "If they're tough enough and big enough to topple tombstones, steal cars and knock old men over, they're big enough to be tried in open court with their parents in the front row and with press coverage."

But more important than any of the foregoing, is the attitude of the common citizen toward the criminal, toward society of which he is a part, and toward the law enforcement officer whose job is his defense.

In commenting recently on the upcoming task force report on organized crime, former Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach blamed apathy for the flourishing of such crime. It could also be blamed for the flourishing of most of our crimes.

We need to involve ourselves in the problems which face our over-worked and underpaid law enforcement officers.

We need to take the demeaning term "cop" out of our prose.

We need to make the term "support your local Police" more than a bumper sticker.

We need to rise up in righteous indignation when a little band of hate mongers threatens to badger a police officer, who is doing his duty, offends one of their number.

We must signal the lawless minority that the law-abiding majority of us will stand behind the police whose excellence is our shield against rampaging crime.

If our cities have become jungles, we are partly to blame—not for any so-called "collective guilt of society," but for our apathy

and our misguided sentimentality for those who prey on the persons and property of our citizens.

We are failing because we have lost sight of the importance of punishing crime, praising police, pitying victims, and protecting society.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, May 17, 1967]

TROUBLE AHEAD

The echoes of the shooting in Houston had scarcely died away early this morning before the disclaimer went up that the rioting at Texas Southern University was organized. Many people, however, will find this hard to believe.

How can hundreds of students engage in such an event, employing firearms, molotov cocktails, chain lengths and other weapons, if it is not organized? The making of a molotov cocktail in itself is not a spontaneous act; nor is the collecting of firearms under the dormitory roofs of a large educational institution.

People hereabout would be a little horrified, we think, if a large cache of arms were discovered in the dormitories at the University of Wyoming. Yet in defense of the rioting at Texas Southern University last night and early today, it is described as a spontaneous occurrence. Presumably the collection of deadly weapons by the students body is a part of their academic efforts.

It is clear now that with the rioting that occurred last week at the Negro college at Jackson, Miss., and this latest outbreak at another Negro college in Houston, the long hot summer predicted by racial rabble-rousers has begun.

It is time that Congress cast aside its chariness, as reported in a column on this page today by Washington observer Holmes Alexander, and commence an intensive investigation into the circumstances of these grave breaches of the peace.

An article that appeared in the Sunday, May 7 issue of the New York Times and later inserted in the Congressional Record by Sen. Jack Miller, Iowa Republican, contains some grave warnings of the events to come.

It quotes the national secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society, one Gregory Calvert, 29, a former history teacher, as saying that group is "actively organizing sedition" and that is it working to organize a guerrilla force in urban areas.

It describes the dominant hero of the New Left movement as Ernesto Che Guevara, the onetime ranking Castroite official who disappeared under mysterious circumstances from Cuba several years ago, was believed at first to have been murdered, and now is reported in South America organizing guerrilla-type revolutions to break out all over this hemisphere.

The Times article reported that some of the young student followers of the New Left movement have gone so far that they now regard Communists as "squares" and have no use whatsoever for "establishment liberals."

It quoted a 24-year-old graduate teaching fellow at Michigan State University at Ann Arbor, identified as Michael Zweig, that he thinks violence is necessary and adds that the idea frightens him. Mr. Zweig adds somewhat as an afterthought: "There isn't a great deal of personal liberation in burning down a Cleveland store."

A student who succeeded Zweig as president of the Students for a Democratic Society at Ann Arbor expressed the belief, according to the Times article, that "Nicaragua and a lot of other countries" ought to organize to resist the United States.

Against what? It is not said; apparently just to "resist the United States," whatever that means.

Four persons were wounded in that rioting at Houston last night. Before the cries of "police brutality" go up, let it be noted that three of the wounded were policemen, one of them hurt so critically that he later died; and only one was a student.

Before this summer is over, a lot of policemen may be wounded and killed, battling to preserve the peace and to prevent a disintegration of our society through such anarchic acts as occurred last night in one of the country's largest cities. Yesterday afternoon the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. said the Negroes demanded their "freedom." Freedom for what? To riot, shoot at the police, throw molotov cocktails?

Before all of this occurs, the Johnson Administration, sitting back complacently and refusing to do anything against such lawless outbreaks, had better take action. Congress also holds a responsibility and the House Un-American Activities Committee should commence immediately an investigation into all of these acts and statements from New Left rabblerousers.

There is trouble ahead in this country. Big trouble.

THE LIVING AND THE DEAD OF HILL 881—WHAT PRICE THEIR SACRIFICE?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Mr. John G. McCullough, of the editorial page staff of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, is a man of great patriotism and great eloquence. He wrote an article on the meaning of war in Vietnam that, in its simple beauty, comes close to the meaning of war anywhere, at any time.

I will not describe it to this Chamber but offer it to the Senate for its own contemplation. I would say, however, that a public school in northeast Philadelphia plans to do a "choral speaking" arrangement of it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NO PLACE FOR FLAGS OR BUGLES—THE LIVING AND THE DEAD OF HILL 881—WHAT PRICE THEIR SACRIFICE?

(By John G. McCullough)

What do you tell them? What do you say to these quiet warriers in shrouded rest now on litters? How do you explain it all to this stilled file of the dead?

Hill 881 is a mark, a rough circle, on the military maps of South Vietnam. There are two 881s. They are 2,890 feet high and this makes them important to men who wear steel helmets and carry weapons. They are the high ground. So long as there have been wars men have fought and died for the high ground.

So men with the big whistles mark the map and speak into a field radio. Then the young warriors, many of them with boy faces under men's helmets, heed smaller whistles and move through the valley in this northwest corner of Vietnam.

WAR WITHOUT FANFARE

This is not a place of flags or bugles. The young men, as they lean forward against the now rising ground, wet their lips. Sometimes they breathe deeply. They put one foot in front of the other. They continue to move.

Morning sun slants through the windows of a fifth grade, parochial school classroom in Northeast Philadelphia. A girl is at the blackboard drawing lines to show the parts of a sentence. A woman, eyes wide in shock, suddenly is in the doorway. Her hair is in curlers. The nun at her desk is puzzled and starts to rise. "Some officers came in a car," the woman blurts out, "and said our Buddy was hurt bad in the war. I'll have to take Betty home." The nun tries to remember. Was it seven or eight years ago that Buddy was in this room—drawing lines around sentences?

In the living room of a house on a narrow street in West Philadelphia two Marine Corps officers sit with a Negro woman. They have told her her son has been killed in Vietnam. Now they explain that his body will be returned home and they offer to help with the arrangements. The mother nods. But she only half listens. She looks at a photograph of her son and she thinks that it was just this time last year that he posed for this picture in a high school cap and gown.

OTHER HILLS 881

Hill 881 has no name. The 881 tells only the height of the hills in meters. The others usually had names, although some were just numbers. There was Pork Chop Hill in Korea. There was Sugar Loaf and "The Draw" on Okinawa. Bloody Nose was Pelelieu. Iwo Jima's was "The Mountain." There were hills and bigger all along the line in Europe of the 1940s and back in the earlier 1900s, too. It is not the names that make them special. It is the men who climbed and crested them, the many who died, that makes them important. Millions of men go into uniform. Hundreds of thousands get into combat. The number of men who have climbed and fought their awesomely private and intensely personal wars on the 881s, the Pork Chops and the Sugar Loafs of history is far more limited.

FALLEN OF WORLD WAR II

There are prayers on these places, but not the prayer of organs and stained glass. "God, don't let the weapons jam," or "God, get the ammo and the water up." These are the prayers. Sometimes the prayer will be "God, don't let the mortars hit here." For on the 881s and the Sugar Loafs fate spins a wheel. A man you've never seen twists a knob an extra click and it is your turn. A rise of rock but inches high becomes a sanctuary. And the men who have climbed the slopes and come down again will for the rest of their lives be able to close their eyes and see each fold of ground, the brush, the debris of battle. They will see, too, their friends and the "others" in the grotesque sprawl of the fallen.

In a past war, after another 881, those who remained sought out those who had fallen. Then, too, there was a row of covered dead on litters. Those who lived paid tribute for the most part simply by standing close to those who were covered. For there is a closeness, one that others cannot know, between those who live and those who die on Hills 881.

From Okinawa's Sugar Loaf one of those who walked back was a warrior given to profanity. For days and nights he had fought alongside two friends. He watched them die. So he sought them out among the others who had fallen. And when he found them he sat on his heels near their covered heads and took from his pocket a harmonica. After he had knocked the tobacco shreds and dust from it he played softly, and over and over, the strains of "Silent Night, Holy Night." That it was the heat of summer made no difference to him or to the others who silently gathered around to join in this battlefield tribute. When someone later asked him why the music, he explained, with an oath that meant nothing, that this was "the only holy song I know."

COMRADES IN ARMS

So what do you say to those who fall on a Hill 881? Do you speak of duty and country? Not to these men. They were "on the Hill." That talk is for those who were not. Do you talk of democracy or of a threat to the world? No. They know of this, too. Nor would it achieve much to talk of pickets, flag burnings and draft defiance at home.

The men who fight to the crest of the hills in this war have in this something

which sets them apart from those who climbed other hills in other wars. So they think, not of those at home who dissent, but of those who move beside them up the slopes and whose friendship and judgment is really all that matters on a Hill 881.

So all you can say with your thoughts to these men in shrouded sleep is: "I'm sorry for what happened to you." This is what the Marine said with his harmonica. His way was better.

MORE ACTION IS REQUIRED IN OUR MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, every schoolboy knows the story of Robert Fulton and how he could not find anyone to invest in his submarine. Historians have said that had Napoleon put more money into this venture he would have won at Waterloo.

But we seem to have fallen prey to the same inaction syndrome that has previously condemned other great nations to downfall. Maginot Line mistakes are being committed by computers in the Pentagon in the name of "cost effectiveness." This is the excuse for not doing something new on the grounds that it will cost more than what it replaces. A century ago, I am sure, everyone was arguing that steamboats would be more expensive than sailboats, but in those days it did not matter. We could wait for the British to prove that that was wrong. But we cannot afford that luxury today, when the future of freedom rides on our ability to get there first with new discoveries. If the Russians beat us once in the race for weapon supremacy, that may be the end.

Two weeks ago, Gen. Bernard A. Schriever addressed himself to just this point in a speech before the Aviation/Space Writers Association at their meeting in Las Vegas, Nev. He is now retired, but his counsel deserves attention because of his great record in building a strategic missile system when we were faced with a possible missile gap in the late 1950's. In his speech he points out that we are incurring grave risks in deferring our investigation of space as a corridor of threat.

In the previous Congress, we appropriated $50 million more than was requested by the Secretary of Defense for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory research program. Those funds still have not been applied in spite of our anxiety that we were not proceeding at sufficient speed. When the Secretary of Defense submitted his new program for fiscal year 1968 he cut the Air Force proposed budget for the Manned Orbiting Laboratory again—this time by $80 million.

We have not fully completed a review of the new budget, but I, for one, intend to examine our military research program very closely. It may be that more support from Congress will be needed to override the inaction now prevailing in the Department of Defense.

Because this subject is of great consequence to the Nation, I ask unanimous consent that General Schriever's speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

A LONG VIEW OF THE U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

(By Gen. B. A. Schriever, U.S. Air Force (retired), Aviation/Space Writers Association, Las Vegas, Nev., May 15, 1967)

First, I want to commend all of you in AWA on the occasion of your 29th annual meeting. You certainly know where to hold a convention. I believe it was the practice of writers and philosophers in the olden days to locate where they could meditate and concentrate without distractions. It is certainly being loyal to the traditions of your profession to meet here in the desert . . . in this atmosphere of austerity and privation.

Actually, I welcome this opportunity to come to Las Vegas, the gaming capital of the country. My game is golf, as some of you may know, and I generally shoot in the low 70s. If it gets any colder than that I quit.

Seriously, it's nice to be here and I am both honored and grateful to have a place on your program.

Mr. Haney and Mr. Johnston have talked about the Apollo program. This afternoon Dr. Adams and Dr. Pickering are going to outline the prospects for manned and unmanned space flight in the next ten years. I've agreed to speak at this time on "a long view of the U.S. space program" which I assume, by inference, extends beyond the moon and the next decade.

This isn't the easiest subject in the world. In fact, a lot of us have been trying to see beyond our noses in this space business for some time.

I'm convinced we can do all the forecasting, second-guessing and blueprinting we want, but we're really not going to come to grips with space until we change our thinking . . . or at least, expand it. Thus far, our explorations geographically have shown more imagination than our explorations intellectually.

We have to recognize, just as we gradually came to do with the airplane, that old standards, old criteria, and old ways of doing things may no longer pertain. I admit it's difficult *not* to be subjective about space when, as Emerson said, we find ourselves "sensitive to a thousand influences, instructed by the past, invited by the future . . ." Yet if we are to be constructive about its potentials we must come to know space not as a stranger but as an intimate friend. This means knowing its faults as well as its virtues—its possibilities both for us and against us.

Space *may* have no decisively unique military advantages, beyond these of observation, warning and communications identified in the Rand studies of 21 years ago. But we'd better be sure. And we can't be sure unless we keep an open mind and an open technology, with respect to military space applications. At present we still act as though we're not certain that space is here to stay or that defense in and from it is important.

I'm concerned because I believe that in the long run the value of the U.S. space program will be determined by our national *attitude* as much as by our *aptitude*.

By this I mean we must not only have the tools, the talents and the technologies to achieve difficult goals, but the desire and the determination as well.

Someone has said that the future cannot be predicted, but that futures can be invented. I would agree. The lunar landing program is nearing reality because we as a Nation invented the technologies necessary to it. All of the great developments of this century are the products of invention, not prediction. Wishful thinking has never produced an ounce of hardware or an iota of defense. Yet we spend a great deal of time and effort trying to predict the future of space and wish away the perils of its unknowns.

Amazingly enough, one of our problems today is the absence of incentive for invention and innovation in military aerospace systems. Considering the growth in research and development in recent years, both in funds and projects, it is remarkable that this should be so. Nevertheless, there is no space goal or space technology that I know of that is presently straining our capacity for inventiveness or ingenuity. But there are four factors that are working against any trend toward vigorous space progress.

In the first place, necessity is the mother of invention and few, if any, space goals are viewed as "necessary" today. The defense establishment has been hard pressed to justify military requirements in space according to the present ground rules of "see need, see solution."

Secondly, any significant invention is always preceded by an active curiosity. We are not very curious about space today. We would prefer to dismiss by logic any fears that an enemy may find a corridor to free world vulnerability through space. What, we ask, can an enemy do militarily by means of space that he cannot do as effectively by conventional means? The fact that we have no definitive answer doesn't mean there isn't one; it only means we ascribe to the enemy our own limitations of thought or technology. A nagging curiosity can be a useful national asset. Part of the research and development responsibility should be the task of keeping curiosity alive and healthy.

Third, there is the economic factor. War and welfare are making heavy demands on the treasury. And it's precisely when cash is short that cost-effectiveness becomes the way of life. Admittedly, decision-making is not nearly so difficult when there are no budget problems. But basing decisions on comparative costs can be risky. There's a circular dilemma here that leads nowhere. First, since inventions can't be predicted, neither can their costs, which makes them high risk projects. Second, without tangible cost figures, such "high-risk" proposals can't compete against proven systems, where costs and capabilities are known.

Fourth, there is the problem of national purpose. I suggest that this is an inhibiting factor rather than the positive influence it should be because our national objectives today seem clouded and uncertain.

Just about ten years ago, when I suggested that ballistic missiles might be springboards to space, I was admonished for making that "provocative" suggestion. Since then, many other proposals or alerts from military sources, some of them elementary to progress or productive to national security, have been rejected as provocative or destabilizing or escalating the arms race.

This is of great concern to me, for I am of the opinion that the competition between Communism and freedom still exists. I believe the threat to our security not only has not disappeared but actually has sprouted a few more hydra-like heads. I do not perceive where our cautions about innovative defense technologies or our strict subscription to the "peaceful" purposes of space have altered in any way the Communist campaign for, first, technical; second, economic; and, third, political superiority in the world. Space is one avenue toward the achievement of these goals.

Now please don't misunderstand me. I'm not trying to resurrect the space race or infer that the Soviets have better space capabilities than we have at present. I'm talking about the "long view" and from where I sit it seems to me that we're not as alert today as we should be to technological opportunities.

What can we do about this?

For one thing, we must try to give more encouragement to invention, innovation and creative thinking.

Some scientists, for example, have expressed concern over what effects certain space-applied forces might have on missile

warheads. Or about the feasibility of satellites systems for missile defense. Or the consequences that improved orbital surveillance capabilities might have on the survivability of our sea-based ballistic missiles.

In the second place, scientific and technical curiosity not only needs to be stimulated, but properly compensated as well. Curiosity is expensive today. Few companies, particularly those operating on fixed-price or incentive contracts, can afford to do much free lance experimenting. Incentives are awarded today principally on performance—not the performance of the product, but the performance of the contractor in meeting schedules, staying within costs, and improving efficiency.

There also is little pronounced curiosity about space on the part of the public. As you in the editorial professions know, your space copy must be sensational, spectacular or controversial to attract attention outside of the "trade." In our self-satisfied technological affluence, we may have become blasé about space. Or, as I would prefer to think, we simply have not educated the public sufficiently to the significance of space . . . at least it's post-lunar significance.

We put a great deal of faith these days in surveys and public polls, which usually show that the majority favor the status quo, or have no opinion. As an example, I was amused by the 1776 political poll imagined by humor columnist Art Buchwald recently. His survey showed that "63 per cent of the colonists thought the British were doing a good job," "83 per cent thought the Minute Men at Lexington hurt our image," and only "12 per cent thought the Declaration of Independence was a good document." Mr. Buchwald reported that "on the basis of the results of this poll, the colonials decided they didn't have enough popular support for a revolution and gave up the idea of a United States of America."

Public opinion is vital, but progress depends on leading it, not following it.

Third; if we are going to overcome the present economic obstacles to space progress, we must prepare technologically to do several things. One: we must get on with the research and development necessary to reusable space boosters. I know this is no simple project. We looked into it many times while I was in the service. Here's another instance where justification becomes a brick wall. We can't actuarily justify the high costs of developing a reusable system until we have the necessary volume of space missions; at the same time we can't cost-effectively program any high utilization of space vehicles until the price comes down. Let me just add, incidentally, that the airplane was once in this very same predicament.

Still on the subject of economics, it is equally important to close the loop at the other end. The ballistic type of re-entry and return is at best primitive. The Soviets, as you know, recently had a sad lesson on the risks involved.

In addition to being an awkward and unsophisticated technique, the Gemini-type re-entry requires a very costly recovery force. We will gain a real operational as well as an economic advantage when we achieve a piloted re-entry and precision landing capability.

There is another aspect to the economic factor which inhibits our progress. Economic reasons are given frequently to explain why we *can't* pursue a certain proposal or develop a certain technology. With all our reputed scientific and technological resourcefulness and our reputation for technical breakthroughs, perhaps we should be actively exploiting technology in search of an *economic* breakthrough. Every step forward doesn't *have* to cost more than the last. First costs are not necessarily the minimum costs, and often prices can be reduced rather quickly as has been the case, for example, with boron fibre materials.

Fourth; if our long view of the U.S. space program is to be a positive and productive one, we must strive to see space included in the fabric of national policy, national posture, national progress and national purpose.

At present our attitude toward space, like our aptitude, is fragmented. Space is admissible to peaceful purposes but not to military, though the distinction is still indistinct, in my judgment. Space has broad support in its unmanned phases, but the value of manned space ventures is still being debated.

On the first of these points I have nothing to add. The arbitrary separation of space activities into peaceful and military is just that—arbitrary. It simply serves to emphasize, by comparison, the straightforwardness of the Soviet program. Their single-purpose program seeks only to attain a versatile technological superiority which, once attained, will serve the political purpose they choose regardless of what kind of a space program we have or how we categorize it.

Deliberation over the respective merits of manned and unmanned systems is, I believe, very serious to the long view of space. In the emphasis we have placed on technology, it is easy to relegate man to a subordinate position. Yet this goes against every experience of mankind over the ages.

We have made black boxes do a great deal for us, and the end of their potential is not yet in sight. But neither is man's potential exhausted.

Further, I am of the opinion that having man on board will eventually contribute to the economy of space missions. The "Six Rs" inherent in space operations—rendezvous, resupply, repair, replace, rescue and return—all demand human judgment, dexterity and ability. The life support systems necessary to safety and survival may well prove to be a cheap price to pay for such proven versatility. It may be cheap indeed once we have significantly improved present-day thrust to weight ratios.

As most of you know, I've talked a lot in praise of technology over the last dozen years or so. At the same time I've tried never to lose sight of the fact that people make technology possible; that the proper partnership of man and technology gives us the means to design our destiny.

We have elected to include space in that destiny. It's a wise choice. It would, perhaps, have shown greater wisdom if we had pioneered space voluntarily instead of waiting for a boost from sputnik.

The Soviets know our indecisiveness and consider it a weakness. As one Russian official observed: "The U.S. is a great and powerful country," he said, "but it has a hard time deciding what to do."

If we are not to be an after-the-fact nation forevermore, we must shift to an attitude of action rather than reaction, decision rather than deferral, in our space ventures and in other affairs of national and international significance.

Present technologies afford us the means and future technology the options to do whatever we want with our environment. Space is a part of that environment. We live on an orbiting planet which the dissensions of man have pockmarked with the afflictions of war and other inhumanities. These have been carried to the far reaches of the land, on and under the seas, and into the skies.

If we are to keep space free of the means or the implements of threat, we must take the long realistic look at history—and recognize that peace prevails only when those who would victimize others are denied the means to do so.

Technology today is by far the principal enabling instrument of national power. If we're out in front in technology—in space and across the board—let's keep the pace. If we're on a par with any other nation, then I suggest we're not doing enough.

We can't afford to fall behind the power curve at a time when technology is the overriding factor in the measurement, application and determination of power internationally.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION UNIT OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE CONCLUDES COMPREHENSIVE HEARINGS ON AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967—HAS TESTIMONY UNDER STUDY — ABATEMENT LEGISLATION WILL BE BOTH REALISTIC AND EFFECTIVE, SENATOR RANDOLPH FORECASTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on May 18, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of our Committee on Public Works concluded hearings on S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967.

Under the informed and capable chairmanship of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the subcommittee conducted 6 days of hearings in the field, 2 of which were devoted to tours of industrial plants and research and testing facilities, and 12 days of hearing in Washington.

The subcommittee received testimony from approximately 124 witnesses representing a broad segment of public opinion and representing all levels of government. Industry, labor, conservation groups, and independent scientific, technical, medical, and other professional experts likewise were heard. In addition to statements by the witnesses, extensive supporting material was received. In all, the printed record of hearings will be in four volumes of approximately 2,600 pages.

This year's air pollution abatement legislation presents the Congress with one of the most involved and complicated subjects in the entire field of domestic affairs. And certainly it is the most complex pollution abatement legislation which has come before the Committee on Public Works during my more than 8 years of service on it, including the greater part of the past year as its chairman.

The task of abating air pollution on a national scale requires consideration of highly involved technological, meteorological, medical, physiochemical, and economic matters. It is, in short, a question that involves consideration of human ecology in its broadest sense, namely, the entire range of man in his urban environment. On this, as well as many other subjects before Congress, there is an oversupply of "instant experts" who are presuming to prejudge and even second-guess the subcommittee and the full committee before sessions are held by either to consider the basic legislation and amendments proposed or to be proposed. The "instant expert", in this frame of reference, is the individual who—without attending hearings and listening to testimony and questions and answers on many facets of the subject under consideration—alleges in advance prejudicial actions by members who will deliberate on the legislation and make recommendations to the Senate, and, indeed, to the whole Congress.

Mr. President, I have been a cospon-

sor and constant advocate of every pollution abatement measure which has been reported from the Committee on Public Works during my tenure in this body. My commitment to improving the quality of our environment has not been diminished by my proposal of amendments to S. 780. As I stated when introducing my first amendments on this subject, it is my conviction that they will enhance and make more effective the administration's efforts to solve the air pollution problem. These amendments were addressed to what I consider certain deficiencies in S. 780 as introduced. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has given me assurance that they will receive the same kind of consideration that is given to all responsible proposals in the field of pollution abatement, and I ask no more and no less.

Testimony presented to the subcommittee by administration's witnesses contained certain contradictions and inconsistencies on the subject of ambient air criteria, ambient air standards, and emission standards. Similar inconsistencies appeared in the testimony of other public and industry witnesses.

The subcommittee has an arduous task ahead of it in resolving these inconsistencies and in reporting a coherent, effective, and workable air pollution abatement bill. This task will not be lessened by the offer of simplistic solutions which present the problem in terms of "good guys" versus "bad guys." We must all work toward the same end of improving the quality of the human environment. There are honest differences of opinion in how best to achieve that end within the limits of present technological capabilities and without creating undue economic dislocations. I shall continue to work toward that end, and I am confident that the members of the Committee on Public Works will continue to maintain a record of achievement in this area.

It is my belief that we will report an improved version of S. 780 in the first session of the 90th Congress within time for Senate action and, I hope action also by the other body. This measure must be realistic and effective, and I predict it will fulfill these objectives.

CHRISTENING OF THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER U.S.S. "JOHN F. KENNEDY"

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, in Newport News, Va., on last Saturday, the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy* was christened. Present were members of the late President Kennedy's family including our distinguished colleagues, the Senators KENNEDY.

President Johnson, in a brief and moving tribute, spoke of John Kennedy, his ideals and the symbolism of the carrier *John F. Kennedy*.

Also in attendance were many thousands of Virginians, including those who had labored at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., to build the *John F. Kennedy*.

The simplicity and dignity of the launching touched all who were present, and its meaning was eloquently described by the editor of the Norfolk Virginian Pilot. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Norfolk Virginian Pilot, May 27, 1967]

CHRISTENING OF THE "KENNEDY"—LIEUTENANT'S NAMESAKE

John F. Kennedy once cited, as an example of the opportunities awaiting young people choosing careers in government, his rise from an obscure lieutenant to commander-in-chief of the armed forces. He might have applied the same subtle humor to today's launching in Newport News of the aircraft carrier bearing his name. For the lieutenant was in the PT flotilla, an element of the "dungaree navy," without much polish or much to polish: a collection of thin-hulled motorboats with a thin line of rank separating skipper from crew. A PT compares to a carrier as a mosquito compares to an eagle.

Yet there was style in the World War II PTs and in their dangerous work and, it follows, in the young men who manned their greasy parts and their torpedoes and their cockpits. The same sort of style distinguishes the carrier; it is in the pilot's eye and fingers, in the flightdeck sailor's graceful arms and nimble feet, in the controlled violence of the catapult and the arresting gear's functioning. Style and orderliness were innate in the lieutenant and the commander-in-chief. The USS *John F. Kennedy* is being well christened.

"The cost of freedom is always high," Mr. Kennedy said upon an occasion that invited no humor. The Cuban crisis was building up. "But Americans have always paid it," he added quickly. "And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission. Our goal is not the victory of might, but the vindication of right—not peace at the expense of freedom, but both peace and freedom, here in this hemisphere, and, we hope around the world. God willing, that goal will be achieved."

John F. Kennedy led America toward that goal then. The *John F. Kennedy* on joining the United States Fleet will inherit a role in the mission, in this hemisphere and around the world.

STRONGER GUN LAWS NEEDED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a band of armed men recently forced its way into the chamber of the California State Assembly. It was, as the Los Angeles Times asserted, a striking example of the need for effective gun control legislation.

As it turned out in the California case, no one was shot. But the elements for disaster certainly were there—for all of the rifles and pistols and shotguns were loaded.

The ironic factor is that the armed men who stormed the legislature were protesting a proposed gun control ordinance. Those armed men serve as a chilling reminder that legislation should be passed swiftly to keep firearms out of such irresponsible hands.

The editorial in the Times discussed the California incident at length and it certainly is worthy of serious attention. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 4, 1967]

STRONGER GUN LAWS NEEDED

The need for effective, comprehensive weapons control laws was never better illustrated than when a band of Negroes armed with loaded shotguns, pistols and rifles forced its way into the Assembly chamber at Sacramento.

The performance shocked not only those legislators and others in the Capitol who were supposed to be intimidated thereby but all law-abiding Californians who did not think such things possible in this enlightened day and age.

Ostensibly the so-called "Black Panther Party for Self Defense" was on the scene to protest a proposed law which would make it unlawful to carry a loaded weapon within a city.

The Black Panthers insisted the bill was "racist." But neither that view nor their actions found takers among Negro legislators. Assemblyman Leon Ralph (D-Los Angeles), felt the bill was aimed at other groups and that it should "be applied equally to all, black or white." Assemblyman Bill Greene, whose district includes the Watts area, branded the action "senseless" and added that "no person, black or white, can condone this."

As a result of the unseemly demonstration it is probable that the measure will be made even more restrictive or an even broader act passed.

That the Black Panthers should lay stress on the constitutional right to bear arms under the circumstances which obtained at Sacramento, makes their position completely farcical.

Certainly the authors of the Bill of Rights never had in mind such groups as the Black Panthers, the American Nazis, the Minute Men or the KKK when they wrote, in the Second Amendment:

"A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

On the other hand, perhaps they foresaw the need for a well-regulated militia to protect against the emergence of just such groups in the future.

Under existing California statutes it is a violation of the Fish and Game Code to carry a loaded weapon in an automobile. There is, however, absolutely no law which prohibits carrying loaded weapons in plain sight on the public streets or anywhere else including, obviously, the chambers of any state, county or city legislative body. There is, of course, a law against disrupting a legislative session. But that hardly meets the situation.

Several days before the Sacramento demonstration Atty. Gen. Thomas Lynch declared that there is no place in this day and age for "Wild West" exhibitions of firearms.

"The time has come," Lynch said, "when we have to legislate against carrying or exhibiting guns in public places."

The Times agrees. The present situation is ridiculous—and fraught with danger.

Even the National Rifle Assn., that most militant defender of the right to possess arms, should agree that incidents such as occurred in Sacramento and which may occur elsewhere, cannot be tolerated in modern society.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the war on poverty is one of the favorite whipping boys nowadays, perhaps second only to our efforts in Vietnam in the amount of vituperation and scorn that is heaped upon it, day in and day out, by certain vocal elements.

But fortunately the innate good sense of the American public has not been

swayed by this continuing criticism of the poverty program, any more than it has been by the almost constant carping on the Vietnam issue.

A good, solid majority of Americans favor a continued or expanded war on poverty, just as a good solid majority of Americans favor our efforts to prevent the loss to the free world of South Vietnam.

Roscoe Drummond, in a very perceptive article in today's Washington Post, puts the complaints about Sargent Shriver and his Office of Economic Opportunity in their proper perspective.

Admittedly, there have been mistakes, perhaps many more mistakes than should have been made. But they can and should be corrected without doing so at the expense of the millions of Americans who live below the poverty line.

Mr. Drummond concludes his article with the following paragraph, a brief statement with which I heartily agree:

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

Let us hope that Congress will show the same good sense as the general public, by rejecting the idea that OEO should be dismembered and its programs distributed among the various Government departments.

I ask unanimous consent that Roscoe Drummond's excellent column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1967]

THE WAR ON SHRIVER: PUBLIC BACKS FIGHT ON POVERTY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the antipoverty programs and backs all of the antipoverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class American that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

THE GUN MEN'S POSSE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Chicago Sun Times recently discussed what it termed attempts by some interested and well organized groups to spur creation of civilian posses. Instead of curing civil disorders, the newspaper suggested, such posses might well lead to pitched gun battles in the streets.

It'd be just your bad luck if you happened to get in the line of fire, as many would. The posse just might get you. Think of that, when you consider whether you want one in your home town or not—

The newspaper said in an editorial. Law enforcement obviously must be left to professional law enforcement agencies, not a bunch of amateurs. The editorial is a stern and timely reminder of some of the consequences of some of the people taking the law into their own hands. I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Chicago Sun Times, May 10, 1967]

THE GUN MEN'S POSSE

The National Rifle Assn., which thinks that everybody who is anybody at all should be able to own guns in any quantity, has now come up with another hair-raising notion: It has urged its 800,000 or more members to form armed civilian posses as a "potential community stabilizer" against rioting in the cities.

Well, now. So no urban home would be complete without a gun, or several guns. The impulse is understandable: It is a romantic thing, harking back to the posses of the old West. Even in those days, the vigilante was a dubious character, and in today's crowded city would be an even greater threat to both lives and rights. Police work is better left to the police, and if the police are inadequate, there's the National Guard, and if that's not available, there're still sheriff's deputies and state police in large numbers. If a tense situation does not develop into a riot, it no doubt would if hot-headed amateurs go about brandishing and firing guns.

In its blindness the National Rifle Assn. ignores another flaw in its terrifying plan: If its members can get, own and use guns, so can the citizens who are members of mobs. If one side starts shooting, the other side can too. What the gun toters advocate, then, are pitched gun battles in the streets, and it'd be just your bad luck if you happened to get in the line of fire, as many would. The posse just might get you. Think of that, when you consider whether you want one in your home town or not.

NO VIGILANTES, PLEASE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what this country needs is a substantial infusion of support for its law enforcement agencies. Those agencies need money to hire more men, to train them better, to equip them better. The point of this would be to win the war on crime and protect our citizens. All of these aims would be furthered by President Johnson's proposed Safe Streets and Crime Control Act.

What this country does not need is people taking the law into their own hands. That is just what the criminal tries to do and we have had enough of that. The Chicago Daily News suggested recently that certain well organized groups are urging a return to law by vigilante. The vigilante system was thoroughly discredited decades ago, and any attempt to revive it would surely be laughed out of town. The editorial in the Daily News is an enlightening one, and I respectfully ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 10, 1967]

NO VIGILANTES, PLEASE

The National Rifle Assn. has urged its 800,000 members to constitute themselves as civilian posses to help "stabilize" things in case of urban rioting.

We suggest that Gov. Kerner and Mayor Daley put their respective police chiefs on the alert to break up any such attempts at vigilantism.

The organization that has led the fight against gun control laws goes even further, in the May issue of its magazine, and recommends that homeowners arm themselves against "savagery and pillaging." It recommends 12-gauge shotguns, but adds that "there is a good deal to be said for a sledge or ax handle."

What is obviously intended as propaganda to whip up support for the rifle association's position comes near to being incitement to terror.

While the association piously presents itself as abetting the regular authorities, it also suggests that these authorities may prove wholly inadequate to cope with large-scale rioting. In those circumstances, "the armed citizen represents a potential community stabilizer" whose "support of law and order" could prove essential. "What if the National Guard were overseas in a major war?" the magazine asks. "Who then supports the police?"

It can be assumed that the men in charge of law enforcement at the local, state and national levels have considered such contingencies and made plans to suit.

One trouble with vigilante groups is that they do not really work to protect society, but only one faction of it at the expense of another. Far from contributing to lasting order, that only incites the other side to lash out in its own behalf, making the

police task far greater than it should have been.

The other trouble with vigilante groups is recalled ironically by the National Rifle Assn.'s self-description as the "foremost guardian of the American tradition."

Nothing could run more contrary to the American tradition than for private citizens to start fancying themselves policemen.

U.N. ALONE SHOULD DEFUSE MIDDLE EAST POWDER KEG

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column which appeared in the May 24 edition of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette. The editorial is entitled "U.N. Alone Should Defuse Middle East Powder Keg."

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

U.N. ALONE SHOULD DEFUSE MIDDLE EAST POWDER KEG

The currently escalated war of nerves between Israel and the Arab states is one of deep confusion, except for one dreadfully clear fact: the Near East is a powder keg which with a single foolish move or miscalculation on the part of anyone from a chief of state to buck private, could set off fierce fighting and trigger World War III.

With U.N. Secretary-General U Thant in Cairo in a desperate effort to reach some solution, the one hope is evidence that neither the Arabs nor the Israelis are anxious for a fight at this time—but both sides have made such threats and such moves as to make armed clash almost inevitable.

And Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser put a large chunk of powder-saturated fat into the fire Monday when he announced that Egypt will block Israel's access to the Red Sea.

Fortunately, Israel's immediate reaction was to wait and see whether Egypt will carry out its threat to blockade the Gulf of Aqaba—but the situation was explosively precarious at best.

The developing storm in the Middle East is particularly crucial to the United States, which is already deeply involved in an interminable shooting war in Vietnam, and which has long standing commitments to maintain peace and security in the Arab-Israeli world.

The critical nature of the current crisis, as it relates to the possibility of World War III, was cited on the floor of the Senate recently by Sen. Joseph Clark, D-Pa., who pointed out that an understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States is absolutely essential if war in the Mideast is to be prevented.

"I would think it would be as obvious to the leaders of the Soviet Union as it is to our own government," said Sen. Clark, "that an outbreak of fighting between Israel and its neighbors could quickly spread and produce a highly dangerous confrontation between the Russians and ourselves.

"Our relations with the Soviet Union have already suffered greatly as a result of our involvement in Vietnam. If, on top of this, the Middle East flares up and becomes an area of controversy, all of the progress toward that most essential detente made since the death of Stalin could be quickly dissipated, and we could find ourselves again in two armed camps, moving progressively closer from cold to hot war."

Further complicating the crisis is the probability that it didn't really develop from the threat Israel and the Arabs feel for each other, but rather stems from inter-Arab rivalries, and especially the competition between Egypt and Syria for the leadership of the Arab "revolution."

This theory seems to gain support in Nasser's startling decision to demand withdrawal of the 3,400-man United Nations peacekeeping force that for 10 years had patrolled the 117-mile armistice line between Egypt and Israel.

Why had Nasser, with up to 50,000 troops tied down in civil war in Yemen, taken a move that left him directly exposed to Israeli forces?

The answer seems to be partly because his early posturing had not been taken seriously enough, partly to squash the irritating charges from monarchist Jordan and Saudi Arabia that he had been hiding behind the U.N. shield—a "pane of glass" neither side had dared shatter—and partly to outdo the firebrand Syrians and restore himself as the most militant and daring of the Arab leaders.

If this was the basis of Nasser's move, it is irresponsibility at its most dangerous worst—and he must somehow be persuaded to reconsider before the tensions spark an Arab-Israeli war, and possibly more.

Some U.N. diplomats think U Thant made a serious blunder in acting too hastily in acceding to Nasser's demand to remove the U.N. Emergency Forces without an effort to emphasize the folly of such a move. However, there is little doubt the secretary-general took the only action he could once the demand was made, for no U.N. operation has ever been imposed against the will of the host country.

But, with the crisis deepening and Russia making saber-rattling statements in the midst of belligerent attitudes in both Israel and the Arab nations, what can be done to avert catastrophe?

Clearly, this is a situation that calls for strong action on the part of the United Nations to bring the full weight of the organization to bear as a restraining influence.

Some way must be found to make the U.N. effective—perhaps by persuading Israel to let the U.N. forces patrol her side of the frontier from the Gaza Strip to Sharm el Sheikh on the Gulf of Aqaba, something she has not consented to before. Such action on the part of Israel not only would bring the U.N. Emergency Force back into the picture as a shield against provocative border incidents or invasion, but also should have a great impact on softening tensions.

At any rate, the United States should avoid any unilateral intervention, but insist upon working only through the United Nations.

A COAL-TO-GASOLINE CONVERSION PILOT PLANT IS DEDICATED AT CRESAP, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last Saturday I participated, with Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, and others, in dedicating a coal-to-gasoline conversion pilot plant at Cresap, W. Va. The plant will be operated for the Office of Coal Research under a contract with the Consolidation Coal Co., a subsidiary of the Continental Oil Co.

This synthetic liquid fuels pilot plant will utilize the technology developed by the research division of the Consolidation Coal Co., at its laboratories in Library, Pa.

The coal used in the process is pulverized, dried, and then mixed with a solvent derived from the process. Part of it is dissolved, and the coal is then subjected to heat and pressure. Through a series of filtration steps a liquid extract is obtained, and the ash is removed.

It is further processed through reaction with hydrogen in the presence of a catalyst. This results in a synthetic liquid crude material that can be further refined into high octane gasoline through normal oil refining processes.

At this stage of the process development, natural gas is used in the manufacture of hydrogen which is then used in the reaction process. Eventually it is hoped that the hydrogen will be made from coal. Then the only raw materials will be coal, water, and air.

This pilot plant process is intended to verify the economic feasibility of making gasoline from coal at a competitive price. A successful end result will extend the Nation's liquid fuel energy reserves by hundred of years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the remarks made by me at the dedication ceremony.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, DEDICATION OF COAL-TO-GASOLINE CONVERSION PILOT PLANT, MAY 27, 1967, CRESAP, W. VA.

Fifty years ago a man named John Andrews was admitted to Navy Department offices in Washington when he promised that he could furnish a substitute for gasoline at a cost of two cents a gallon. Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels and his assistant, Franklin D. Roosevelt, listened intently and then agreed that the theory should be investigated, for America was going to need all the fuel she could get to see us through World War I.

A test was arranged at Brooklyn Navy Yard. John Andrews took a small can from his satchel, asked for a bucket of water, and poured the contents of both into the gasoline tank of a test engine. At least one-third of the mixture was water, but the engine started immediately and ran until the tank was dry. Other tests were equally successful, but nothing ever came of the project because Andrews, I am informed, wanted the Navy to give him a small fortune before he would disclose the contents of his magic potion.

The whole episode was described in Secretary Daniels' memoirs. What Andrews carried in the little can was never divulged, but it has been theorized that he used acetone to absorb acetylene and produce a liquid.

Now, what if John Andrews had carried a bucket of *coal* into the office of the Secretary? Well, that, figuratively, is what the director of the Office of Coal Research did when he came to my office with the concept of what we are here to dedicate.

But the groundwork for Cresap's Project Gasoline and all other projects coming out of OCR dates back to the time when our present Secretary of the Interior was still a Member of the House Committee that approved the bill for the Office of Coal Research program. We were colleagues in the House when the first OCR bill was passed by Congress.

I think we should also remember the efforts of my colleague, Senator Jennings Randolph, who, as a member of the House of Representatives, during the decades of the 1930's and 1940's, pioneered in urging Federal support of coal research. It was then Representative Randolph who, in 1944, joined with the late Senator Joseph O'Mahoney of Wyoming to press for research on synthetic liquid fuels. Those two men co-authored and co-sponsored the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944, which became Public Law 290 of the 78th Congress.

Senator Randolph and I in the Senate, and Representative Moore and other members of the West Virginia Congressional Delegation in the House, joined in supporting legislation to establish the Office of Coal Research, and Senator Randolph's interest in research in two vital and critical areas continues—the production of liquid fuels from coal and oil shale.

In process at the present time is a miscellany of projects to provide more economical

heat and power through use of coal; to abate air and water pollution; to provide building materials with a by-product of coal combustion that was once vented out into the atmosphere; and to filter sewage through beds of coal in the first step toward making contaminated water reusable.

A broad-scale attack on the problem of producing liquid fuels and pipeline-quality gas from coal has been largely carried through the laboratory development stage quite successfully.

The office of Coal Research program to develop improved methods of generating electricity from coal, while not yet as extensive as the liquid and gas conversion program, is equally vital to the coal industry and to the nation's energy base.

Two very promising new systems, the fuel cell and EGD (electro-gas-dynamics) are presently under development. Several other promising power systems are available for development.

To carry the presently contracted work to its ultimately necessary pilot plant stage, plus adding a few of the other promising power systems, will require funding considerably above the present level.

If the Office of Coal Research is to carry on to its originally planned objectives and return to our country maximum benefits in relation to its cost, the funds available to the Office must be greatly increased annually above that of fiscal 1967—which was really only the end of the preparatory period. This upward acceleration should be vigorously prepared for at least 10 years. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, this will be my purpose.

The Office of Coal Research has a substantial on-going program of major projects, and others available, which, I firmly believe, if carried to conclusion, will produce dramatic results not envisioned by even the more optimistic among us only a few short years ago.

We *did* foresee the potential, however, for coal and for all America in Project Gasoline. We know that it was possible to extract a high-grade motor fuel from the magic energy that is coal, but for too long it was assumed that the plentiful storehouse of petroleum reserves within the broad borders of this nation would be ample to see us through for generations to follow.

So, for too long the idea of a commercial coal-to-gasoline industry lay dormant in Files for the Future. Finally an imaginative plan was presented to the Office of Coal Research, and from that day we have been pursuing—painstakingly and patiently, but energetically and enthusiastically—the plan and the program that bring us today to this historic occasion.

As OCR Director George Fumich pointed out to members of the Independent Petroleum Association of America earlier this month, demand for petroleum products in this country will rise from 3½ billion barrels this year to 6 or 8 billion barrels in 1980, with perhaps double that amount by the year 2000. The 30 billion gallons of crude petroleum reserves are, to be sure, only a part of the total amount that lies beneath our soil, and I have every confidence that our great petroleum leaders will continually develop methods of drawing out the last drop that the Creator put there for our benefit. Yet, the stock is not inexhaustible, and to wait longer for inauguration of a program to provide substitute fuels would be sheer folly.

We may already have waited longer than good judgment—in retrospect—would dictate. Whether or not we like to think about the prospect, the supply lines for much of the foreign oil and products upon which we have come to depend could be severed tomorrow or on Monday or next month or next year. The danger is pointed out in every newspaper headline. It is not pleasant to comprehend.

An explosion in the Middle East could disrupt America's energy pattern and set our wells to pumping as they never worked before. If the crisis persisted, the petroleum industry could hardly be expected to keep up the pace of producing all the liquid fuels required. An industry developed at Cresap would be needed—and quickly. Let us pray that such exigency will never materialize.

In any event, peacetime requirements alone will justify the venture into this new energy field.

In not too many years, there will be another America placed right on top of the country we now know—twice as many people, twice as many cars, twice as many airplanes and homes and factories. But no more energy in the ground than God granted in his legacy to us. What we must do is to develop all the energy that is available, and we must do it without waiting for a shortage to develop.

Today we are on the threshold of another fuel industry in West Virginia. I congratulate the Consolidation Coal Company for its diligent undertaking. I thank Secretary Udall and Mr. Fumich for their belief in a dream which we are bringing to life through this intricate structure along the banks of the beautiful Ohio.

Besides creating a necessary new source of fuel for our tomorrow, this structure carries the hope of a more fruitful life for many West Virginians. Our miners have suffered the pangs of economic ills for many years. They have waited a long time for a Project Gasoline to open new opportunities to them. I believe that that day is dawning.

In closing, I wish to say that the bituminous coal industry has suffered far too long from a lack of genuine Government interest in its future welfare, or, more specifically, from a disproportionate financial support by the Federal government in the development of atomic power as coal's competitor in the electric utility fuel market. If coal, for a few years, could be assured of at least 25 per cent of the $200 million or more the Government is appropriating each year to the continuing development of atomic power, including development of the breeder reactor plant technology, the solutions to coal's present and future problems soon would be forthcoming.

The coal industry is strong today because of the wisdom and dedication of men in management and labor who refused to give up when coal markets declined following World War II. Such men can be relied upon to shape coal's future through research and development, but these efforts require increased support from the Government if one of the nation's most abundant sources of economical energy is to be safeguarded and most efficiently utilized for the future benefit of all Americans.

I regard coal research as the key to the energy future of the United States. I look for new efforts to increase the level of Government support for coal research, and I expect to be behind every project proposal which shows promise of making a significant contribution to the welfare of the industry and of future generations of Americans who will thus be able to rely on coal as a source of energy and new products in a wide range of modern forms.

Coal can be a cleaner fuel than ever, and a far more versatile one, through intelligently oriented research and development, fully supported by the Government. Research can and will unlock the door to a new age for mankind's oldest fuel.

DRUMMOND PRAISES L. B. J. WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, when the war on poverty was launched by President Johnson a few short months after he took over the reins of Government, the hope and promise of the American dream gained a new dimension, a new depth. It made the job of our critics around the world a little harder.

But, for some time now both the war on poverty and particularly Sargent Shriver, the man who has so brilliantly organized and led this experiment in social justice, have been among the primary targets of an undeserved barrage of attacks from the Republicans, who are flailing about in search of issues upon which to stand in the next election.

Roscoe Drummond's column in the Washington Post for May 31, 1967, entitled "The War on Shriver," has put these attacks into the proper perspective. Said Drummond:

> The volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

Sargent Shriver's war on poverty has the support of the majority of voters, Drummond points out. And it deserves the full support of all Members of Congress and a vote in favor of OEO's budget request when it comes before us.

I commend Drummond's column to the attention of all my colleagues.

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

THE WAR ON SHRIVER: PUBLIC BACKS FIGHT ON POVERTY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The American people are making no mistake in giving their strong support to the war on poverty.

Voters are 60 per cent behind the war on poverty and want it continued or expanded, the Harris Survey shows. Public support has been growing steadily for the last seven months.

The Nation as a whole has come to accept the war on poverty as one of the most compassionate, humane, and intelligent programs of the Johnson Administration.

And the Republican leadership in Congress, launching its own "opportunity crusade," avows that it favors all of the anti-poverty programs and backs all of the anti-poverty goals—but would do the whole thing differently.

Surely all this should be sweet music to the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Why, then, as he goes to Congress soon to defend his proposed budget, should Sargent Shriver, the coordinator-in-chief of the war on poverty, be the target of so much criticism for his administration of the program? Has he been a flop? Has he been incompetent? Has he been a dull-minded and routine administrator?

No one will argue, certainly not Shriver, that everything has come up roses in the Office of Economic Opportunity. But the volume and sharpness of the Republican attacks on the OEO, to the point that it ought to be closed out and the programs sprinkled around the already overburdened Washington bureaucracy, are excessive and ill-considered.

These facts ought to be borne in mind:

1. Much of the criticism comes from the extremists who pretty much cancel each other out—those who attack Shriver because they don't want the war on poverty to be doing anything and those who want Shriver to be asking for ten times as much as he is now doing.

2. The OEO has made mistakes. They should be recognized and corrected. The new

antipoverty bill now before Congress greatly tightens the program. But the OEO had to do things quickly in its early period and obviously it has not done them well. But let's not forget that if there were no OEO there would be no war on poverty. There would be no Headstart. There would be no Job Corps. There would be no Community Action and, above all, there would be little recognition on the part of middle-class Americans that poverty in the United States acutely exists—32 million men, women, and children beneath the poverty line who must be relieved.

There is no doubt in my mind that the war on poverty continues to need innovative, pioneering, open-minded, let's-try leadership. It would be very unwise to bury these new and experimental programs in existing departments which have more than they can do already and too many officials wedded to old programs.

DR. JAMES R. KILLIAN ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the establishment of a public television system is a matter of great concern to all Americans. A new proposal aimed at getting such a system started was set forth by the report of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

The heart of the Carnegie Commission proposal is public television and the leading architect for the commission's grand design for public television is James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

How to achieve the development and distribution of high-caliber programs under the supervision and direction of a nonprofit and nongovernmental corporation; and, the other reports and recommendations of the Commission were thoroughly explored recently on Theodore Granik's award-winning public affairs program "Youth Wants to Know."

James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, responded there to a panel of Yorktown High School students' penetrating and provocative questions. Dr. Killian's appearance on the program provided an opportunity for all Americans to discover, through the eyes of America's young people, a better understanding of the important issues of our time, as discussed by an outstanding authority in the field.

I ask unanimous consent that a partial transcript of that program may appear in the RECORD.

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

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

(Created and Produced by Theodore Granik; Associate Producer, Jay B. Cutler; Assistant to the Producer, Susan Gallagher)

Youth Wants to Know Presents Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., Chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

ANNOUNCER. Youth Wants to Know—the penetrating, provocative questions of America's young people.

Mr. GRANIK. Welcome to Youth Wants to Know. Our guest is James R. Killian, Jr., Chairman of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. Dr. Killian has had a distinguished career of dedicated public service. A report and recommendations of the Carnegie Commission, headed by Dr. Killian, heralded a new era for television. The Commission proposes the development and distribution of high caliber programs under the supervision and direction of a non-profit and nongovernmental corporation. How to achieve this grand design for public television will be the subject of many questions by our panel of Yorktown High School students. Let's begin with you, Peggy.

Question. Dr. Killian, is there really an untapped audience for public television?

Dr. KILLIAN. I'm convinced that there is, that in our local communities there are many kinds of talent that have never been given an opportunity to display that talent and get a reaction to it on television. And I think if we have the proper media, we're going to have people coming forward with all kinds of gifts and special qualities that will be appealing on television.

Question. Even with the diversity in programing in educational television, how do you propose to attract those who are interested in mass media?

Dr. KILLIAN. If the artist who wants to reach the largest possible audience feels that he has a better opportunity to do the kinds of things that to him represent integrity, in terms of his artistic talent, I think that he will find that public television, as we have proposed it, will give him an opportunity that he hasn't had before.

Question. Are you saying, Doctor, that educational television won't pay competitive salaries as commercial television?

Dr. KILLIAN. We hope that eventually it will. Certainly educational television is not now paying competitive salaries. In fact, many of our representatives of the dramatic and artistic and musical communities have really been subsidizing educational television by contributing their services. And this is not right for the long pull.

Question. Dr. Killian, it seems that with the salaries being paid and considering where the talent is at this time in commercial television, it would seem to be that all the good talent is being utilized. How could educational television bring out that much more talent? It seems the best talent is there.

Dr. KILLIAN. You've put your finger on a very important and difficult part of the whole television problem, because it is the kind of medium that uses talent up very fast. But it seems that we ought now to begin to plan to do the kind of recruiting, the kind of training, the kind of development of new talent that will enlarge this pool that television is going to require. But this is going to take time, and it is going to take a lot of doing. And at the present time we aren't training enough new talent for television. And one of the purposes of this proposed corporation is to provide ways for training new talent.

Mr. GRANIK. Then training will be a very vital part of this?

Dr. KILLIAN. Oh absolutely, it must be.

Question. Dr. Killian, how do you think commercial television is failing to do its job?

Dr. KILLIAN. Commercial television is geared to the demands of the marketplace, it serves the advertiser. This is an important function in our society, and the Carnegie Commission did not criticize commercial television for its concentration on economic objectives. But in meeting these economic objectives, and in serving the needs of the advertiser, they have to drive for the mass audience, to produce the largest number of listeners to a given program.

Mr. GRANIK. Aren't they also worried about that valley that might develop with a public affairs program?

Dr. KILLIAN. And sometimes if they put on a program that doesn't reach a mass audience, it tends to affect all the programs that follow.

Mr. GRANIK. The commercial Nielsens.

Dr. KILLIAN. That's right.

Question. Assuming that you do get the good talent and the new ways to present a program for public TV, what is going to make the people, the masses, want to watch it? I know, like if the President is on TV, or something, on all three channels, and I see that he is on, or maybe a moon shot or something. I immediately switch to the only channel, you know, that has something entertaining on it. And so this makes me wonder, are there all that many people really wanting to be educated and have the good stuff?

Dr. KILLIAN. I hasten to emphasize that public television, or educational television or whatever we call it, must not be limited to the lecture or the panel discussion or what might be considered to be the dull parts of education. There's no reason why it can't provide excitement and entertainment and elegance of programing that would appeal to all kinds of people.

Mr. GRANIK. In other words, we must dramatize it.

Dr. KILLIAN. That's right. We must.

Question. Dr. Killian, if Congress considers your Commission's plan for what you call public television, is there anything to prevent this from leading to perhaps a plan for public radio or even a plan for a public news paper?

Dr. KILLIAN. In the President's message to Congress and in the Magnuson Bill, which was introduced into the Senate, and the other bill into the House, radio is provided for along with television, and this Corporation that has been proposed would also help to provide more adequately for educational radio. And I'm sure that radio has a very brilliant future too.

Mr. GRANIK. Well, they've shown their need at the hearings themselves by carrying them live.

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes they have.

Question. Doctor, wasn't your Commission a little overly optimistic in expecting the excise tax proposal to pass Congress?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, we may have been optimistic, but we felt very strongly that we had to pose the issue of how in our system one can use federal funds for the support of free communications, and insulate the organization that is handling the communications, and we could find no better way than to recommend an excise tax which is a formula kind of approach, with a trust fund held by the Treasury. If someone else would invent another way to do this other than the excise tax, we would be very happy.

Question. But shouldn't some burden of the tax fall upon commercial television?

Dr. KILLIAN. This is one approach and one recommendation that many people have made that some kind of tax—the profits of commercial television, a license on sets as they do in England and some other foreign countries, there are many different alternatives, but we could find nothing so simple and direct and to us workable as the excise tax. And I would hasten to say that I think that this can be a very equitable tax, because public television when it is going as we think it will, full force, is going to reach in and touch some member of every family right from the very youngest on up. And we are, therefore, going to get very broad coverage, and, therefore, everyone will be benefiting from it.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that satellite communications will have an effective impact on educational television?

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes, I do, because I think the coming of satellite channels will make a veritable lower cost interconnection, more copious interconnection, will provide more channels for the distribution of television pro-

grams, so this is going to be profoundly important. However we may organize for public television by satellite, whether it is through a domestic satellite corporation as the Ford Foundation has proposed.

Mr. GRANIK. Will there be additional revenue from that?

Dr. KILLIAN. It depends on how Congress works this out. Whether there will be additional revenue, I think is still uncertain.

Question. Dr. Killian, wouldn't an excise tax be basically unfair to people who would not be interested in educational television?

Dr. KILLIAN. One can certainly argue this point, but I think the counter to that argument is what I've already stated that the comprehensiveness of the diversity of public television could be such that it touches everyone or every member of every family, so that there would be few people who would not benefit from it.

Question. Dr. Killian, I'm a little bit confused, this excise tax, I read something about it being for manufacturers and not for retail or vice versa or something like that, could you explain that? I mean, are there two possible excise taxes?

Dr. KILLIAN. No. We recommended a manufacturer's excise tax, so that under this arrangement, the company that manufactures the television set would pay an excise tax. The company would pay it. No, it would not be a tax on the individual. Now one can say that the company will pass along the excise tax in the retail price of the set, or they might, the excise tax being very low as we recommended it, they might find technological ways of reducing the cost of the set to offset the tax. One doesn't know just how this would operate.

Question. Dr. Killian, to change the subject just a little bit, if public television wants to have for one of its main goals better programing, who is going to define what better programing is?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think the American people again must define, the listeners must define what better programing is. But we have been very deeply convinced that a great body of American citizens who are not getting what they would like to get on television, because so much of the programing is directed at this mass audience, and let me use an analogy here, if I may. It is as though the book publishers of this country were concentrating only on the publication only of best sellers, and were forgetting about all the other kinds of books that we need, the text books, the need to know books, the small limited editions, and all these kinds of books that enrich our society and meet the needs of the individual. We want a television system that does that, too.

Mr. GRANIK. In other words, there may be 30 million listening to one program but there are 6 or 7 or 8 million others who would like to listen to others.

Dr. KILLIAN. This is right. We think that there are a great number of audiences in this country that are not now being reached at all, who are hungry for something, and if television can be designed to reach those people, and you add up all those different audiences, you're going to have still a very big audience.

Question. Dr. Killian, how would you be able to find out the public opinion? How would you be able to find out what kind of programing they want?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, there are many ways. Of course, the commercial people use the rating system. I would venture to hope that public television does not get encumbered with the kind of rating system that commercial television has to deal with now. But there are all kinds of ways of judging the audience response. People write in, people call in, you have different ways of polling to see what kind of audience you are getting. There have been many studies made of the audience of educational television.

Mr. GRANIK. The present rating system permits about 1300 in the whole United States to determine what the agencies buy.

Dr. KILLIAN. And, of course, the present rating systems, too, are giving some indication of how many people are listening to our educational television. So there's pretty good evidence, and the evidence shows that the audience for public television is steadily growing.

Question. Dr. Killian, if this audience is pleased by the results of the educational television, if you do accomplish a certain degree of excellence in the program which, as you say, reaches out and touches everyone, do you feel that commercial television will be released from its responsibility in this respect?

Dr. KILLIAN. I would hope not. I would hope that this would encourage commercial television to do a lot of things that it doesn't think it can do at the present time.

Mr. GRANIK. But it would still have to satisfy public interest, convenience and necessity.

Dr. KILLIAN. I think this is going to build very beneficial competition between these two. And I would also venture to suggest that public television, being freer to experiment, and not being under the pressures of the mass audience all the time, can invent new kinds of programs and new kinds of approaches to the way of reaching people that the commercial people then can pick up and enrich their own programs too. So I think these two things are going to feed into each other, and they are going to be mutually beneficial.

Question. Dr. Killian, Japan has five educational television networks, and two that are in color. Why couldn't we have more than two, more than one?

Dr. KILLIAN. Japan, I hasten to say, probably has in their educational television system probably the finest system in the world today. They are doing an extraordinary job of reaching their people, and they are spending, incidentally, something like $350 million a year on educational television. We're spending about $60 million a year on educational television in this country. And they are getting first rate results.

Mr. GRANIK. Does it frighten people when you say educational television?

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes it does.

Mr. GRANIK. You gave it a better name. That was always what we public affairs shows had to contend with, Dr. Killian.

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, happily, I'm an educator, and I come from an educational institution and I believe in education, but applied to television it does have a dampening effect, I'm afraid.

Question. Dr. Killian, why did your Commission decide instead of expanding the existing educational television network, why did they decide to establish a new corporation that will be much more expensive?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, our basic recommendation was that we should strengthen the local stations. We should have more of these local stations. We have 124 now. We think that ultimately to cover all the American people we should have about 380. And that those stations should be strong and independent, and they should determine what their programing should be. We don't want anyone to be telling the local station what its programing should be, or forcing on it any kind of programing. We did feel that in addition to the local stations we needed a national institution that could generate programs of national interest, to make these programs available by a system of distribution to the local stations, and that this national institution would exercise a sense of quality and build excellence and variety in the total system.

Question. Well isn't that what NET is doing now?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well NET is certainly contributing importantly to this objective. But we would like to see more diversity in the sources of programing in this country. We recommended, therefore, that there be at least two national production centers, of which NET would certainly be one. And it is my own personal view that NET might well be the proper instrument for handling news programs, political broadcasting, and so on. Now I have great confidence in NET and its role in this developing system.

Question. Dr. Killian, how can we prevent government control of public television?

Dr. KILLIAN. This is one of the key questions that we are confronted with at the present time, and that is being debated in Congress, and in our own proposals we tried to accomplish this, first of all by urging that this corporate entity, the Corporation for Public Television, be a private corporation, that it receive its funds through a trust fund and it also have private funds to supplement the federal funds and that it have a board of directors who could be free and independent. We must have freedom of communications as well as freedom of the press.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that the recent proposal by the Washington Post for changing how directors are chosen for the Commission, would that help prevent government control?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think it important that you look at alternative ways of appointing the directors of the corporation. But the Carnegie Commission itself reached the conclusion that in its judgment the most direct and simple way would be to have the President appoint these directors and have them—half of them confirmed by Congress, half of them appointed by the President, and half confirmed by Congress, by the Senate, and they in turn appoint six more. But we don't feel that this is the only way to do this, and that there may be alternative ways of doing it. But I hasten to point out that one of the best ways in this country of getting a first rate Commission, and a first rate Board is to have the President appoint them, because important people will respond to an invitation from the President when they may not respond to some other kind of appointive process.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you think that public television can be successful without the advantages of network telecasting?

Dr. KILLIAN. Without networking? Yes I do. In fact, again, it was the judgment of our Commission that we would not like to see a networking operation unduly prominent in the system of public television. There would be networking at times in the handling of certain kinds of programs, live, in which they would be broadcast simultaneously on all the stations.

Mr. GRANIK. Couldn't they serve also, these network programs, as a model for local programs?

Dr. KILLIAN. Yes, certainly. But we would like to see this distribution system operate so that every local station was feeding into it, and every station can look at all of these programs that are being fed into this distribution system and decide what it wants to use. But we would not like to see the system get the local stations always expecting to get the principal portion of their programing from Washington and New York.

Question. Much has been said about government control of this corporation, but I think there is another consideration. The United Auto Workers have pledged $25,000 in support of this corporation if it is formed. Do you see any danger in this contribution from pressure groups such as this?

Dr. KILLIAN. No I do not. In fact. I think we should welcome contributions from all sectors of our private—the private part of our society. And as you know, CBS, on the day that the Carnegie Commission report was released, said they would pledge $1 million

toward the endowment for the corporation, and I am hopeful that many other corporations will provide funds toward the private endowment of the corporation, as well as foundations, and individuals. If this is dispersed and you have support from many different sources, along with federal support, then it seems to me you have the diversification that would insure freedom.

Question. Dr. Killian, to change the subject just a little, I'd like to know, the lack of communication between student and teacher now in many of the large colleges and universities, why—how would instructional—I mean, how would, you know, instructional television be a more communicative media?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, let me answer that this way. So far, I think, instructional television is not very much used in the universities. But I think we are going to see a growing use of it, and one of the ways it is going to be used is that teachers will use television to show things that the classroom doesn't permit students easily to see, and you can zero in and see something intimately on the television screen that you couldn't see. For example, scientific experiments and demonstrations done in the lecture room. But something else is coming very quickly and that is the stored kind of television in which you will have a tape or a record with an hour's television program on it, that you can go to the library and take out and play back, and have your own television program and look at it at your leasure and any time you want to do it, and I think this is going to have a very profound effect on helping students teach themselves, and this is one of the most important aspects of education.

Mr. GRANIK. Would these be programs that they could record and play later or programs already recorded for their convenience?

Dr. KILLIAN. Both.

Question. Doctor, is the university obligated to educate the surrounding community?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think the university has a very great opportunity today to make a great contribution to the improvement of its environment in its own community. Yes, the university does have an obligation to help its community. I think you will find all around this country university programs at the present time that are designed to contribute to the welfare of the people, the surrounding citizens. There is an institutional citizenship responsibility here invested in the universities, no less than an industrial corporation or individuals. And one of the great changes in education in the universities I predict in the next decade is the emphasis which we are going to see on urban affairs, and all of the different ways in which scholars and students can contribute to urban affairs. In my own institution, we have students that are tutoring disadvantaged young people in our community. We have a summer school run by students for young people who otherwise might not have these opportunities. There are a host of things that students themselves are doing in the universities that are very significant and to me they are moving to see what can be accomplished by young people working with young people.

Question. Dr. Killian, do you thus see public television dramatically changing the American way of life?

Dr. KILLIAN. I think that public television can contribute very greatly to the quality of American life. And one of the reasons that I think that led those of us on the Carnegie Commission to do so was a feeling that we must in this country address ourselves to all the many different ways in which we can contribute to the quality and richness of American life. And by improving television, we felt we could do this. May I add something else here. I come from a background in which there is great concern with science and technology. I have a very deep conviction that one of our major problems today is how we can make technology benign, how we can take the miraculous technology of television and make it serve the best and highest aspirations of our society, and not permitting it to be addressed to trivia too much of the time. We've got to do this all along the line. And television is one of the ways in which we can make technology benign rather than an incubus for our society, and individual people in it.

Question. Dr. Killian, have there been any studies made on the effect of the impersonal nature of educational TV? Sometimes I may be irrational, but I get the idea that it is a little bit like 1984, and you sit there and you watch the tube, and you know, it is frightening.

Dr. KILLIAN. There has been a great deal of discussion about this. But one of the things that I think is ahead in this field of television technology is a two-way interactive television. There is a chapter in our report that discusses some of these future developments in technology. And I think down the road we're going to see a person sitting in front of a television screen being able to respond to the person on the screen, to record his own effects, to ask questions, to give indications of dissent or agreement. In other words, there is going to be a feedback, an interaction here, and this would get at the problem in part that you're talking about.

Question. You mentioned earlier that commercial television as it is today has to more or less fight for the money that they get, and appeal to the mass audiences.

Dr. KILLIAN. The whole public television system is impoverished.

Question. And this is unlike what the proposed corporation would do. They would be assured of their income.

Dr. KILLIAN. They would be insured of better programing, and through HEW, we recommended that they would get grants for operations, and new equipment.

Question. And yet today's commercial TV networks still show educational shows occasionally, documentaries, news programs, and so on.

Dr. KILLIAN. Frequently with great brilliance.

Question. And if your corporation, the Corporation for Public Television, were to prove itself to be fairly successful, don't you think there is a possibility that the other three commercial networks, because they have to appeal to mass audiences, might abdicate all responsibility altogether for showing any educational programs?

Dr. KILLIAN. A number of people have voiced this concern, but my anticipation would be again, as I said before, that there is going to be a competitive factor here, and if commercial television sees that some of the programs are highly successful that appear on public television, they're going to want to do them too.

Mr. GRANIK. If they began to lose some of their ratings.

Dr. KILLIAN. And I think, too, that public television will tend to change the taste of the listeners in this country. And they will begin to look to commercial television for the kinds of programs that they have been finding only on public television.

Mr. GRANIK. Instead of re-runs of re-runs.

Dr. KILLIAN. This is right. And the Neilsen ratings will start going down if the kinds of first rate public television programs would be neglected by commercial television.

Question. Dr. Killian, when I found out that CBS, you know, gave that million dollars, I was sort of amazed. That seemed to me sort of like a shoe shop giving, you know, money to a little shoe shop that might hurt the big shoe shop's business. So why did they do it, besides being nice and humanitarian and all that?

Dr. KILLIAN. Well, Dr. Stanton wrote a very eloquent letter about this saying that at CBS he and his associates had a conviction that an alternate system was needed in this country, that they would like to see the kind of system proposed by the Carnegie Commission, they thought it was sound, pluralistic, free of the controls that might otherwise encroach upon freedom of communication, and that they would like to give it a boost. And I think this is sound policy, and I think there was a very genuine conviction on the part of the people who made that decision that they would like to see a strong system of public television in the United States, and that this would be good for commercial television.

Question. Could it hurt them financially?

Dr. KILLIAN. I don't believe so. In fact, I think in the long run it may help them.

Mr. GRANIK. Dr. Stanton himself is an educator.

Dr. KILLIAN. That's right. He had his Ph. D. in psychology, as I recall.

Question. This conception of answering back the tube, though terribly exciting sounds rather frightening to me. Wouldn't this bring in the possibility of 1984 type view screens?

Dr. KILLIAN. No. Of course, 1984 is going to be a cliche in many respects, although I think the famous book was a very important event in our literary history. But I have a great conviction that we are finding ways of mastering technology so that we can turn it to humane uses, make it the servant of man and not in any way a dominating factor in our society. But we've got to constantly work at this. That's why we ought to be working at public television, because I think that we can master this miraculous inventiveness of mind, and put it to work for benign purposes.

Question. Would the Board of Directors of your proposed Corporation have the final say on political programs, say, produced by local stations?

Dr. KILLIAN. No, I would think not. They would have that final say on how the arrangements were made. For example, with NET to broadcast the speeches of political candidates. But I think that NET and the Corporation would probably want to turn panels of advisers or editorial committees that could make to them objective recommendations as to how they should handle this program.

Mr. GRANIK. I'm sorry to interrupt. I know there are many more questions. There just isn't time. Thank you, Dr. Killian for being our guest on Youth Wants To Know. Our thanks to you, panel, for your most interesting questions and to you, ladies and gentlemen, for being with us. Please join us again next week on Youth Wants To Know, where through the eyes of youth, we explore, we discover, we measure the important people, ideas and events of our time. Now this is Theodore Granik bidding you goodbye.

CONFRONTATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the explosive situation in the Middle East worries all responsible people. Not alone is there the potential of a confrontation between the two great nuclear powers of the world—the U.S.S.R. and the United States, but there are heavy overtones involving freedom of the seas. Additionally, a traditional Western-oriented ally of the United States faces threatened oblivion and American-supplied arms may once more be used against American-supplied arms.

Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, one of Washington's most eloquent and learned clergymen, had something to say on this subject last weekend which I believe

should be shared because of the erudite manner in which he explains his own ideas on this delicate situation.

I ask unanimious consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE TWAIN HAVE MET

We have lived with crisis for so long that we have vulgarized the vocabulary of peril. Yet we must find words to define the horrifying meaning of the conflagration that threatens the peace of the world in Asia and now in the Middle East.

Those who believe in the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, who reject the use of military force, and who may deplore our country's military posture in Vietnam, are now brought face to face with still another challenge to principle. Is there any difference between the situation in Vietnam and that in Israel? Why should there be a question. If force is evil, it is as evil in the east as it is in the west. If the use of military power is immoral, its use must be deplored wherever it is invoked, whether in Israel or by Israel. And we must take care lest parochial bias confuse the moral issue.

It is the inescapable verdict of our religious tradition that the use of military power is an evil. But what defense is there against aggression by military power? The answer: greater military power. Power is evil because it is brutal, brutalizing and corrupting. But without the defense of power, we become its victims. Power, then, is a necessary evil. The pacifist denies that it is necessary. The militarist denies that it is evil.

Both are sincere, but both, I fear, are wrong. We are seldom called upon to choose between an evil and a good. We are frequently called upon to choose between a greater evil and a lesser one. And to stand by in pious neutrality while innocent blood is shed is the greatest evil of all. To abdicate in the face of a threat is not necessarily a good, for while my life may be no more sacred than that of my adversary, it is no less sacred. Nor is immortality to be achieved by walking humbly in the posture of the sheep led to slaughter. Power is a necessary evil which we must use with the wisdom of discretion, with self-control born of humility, and only in the just cause of survival. For no man need consider it immoral to defend his life.

No event in history springs forth, Minerva-like, full-grown, or without antecedents. The events of the past week recall the crisis of 1956 when, on October 29, Israel invaded the desert of Sinai. Israel's avowed purposes were to destroy threatening Egyptian military bases in Sinai, to eject the Egyptian invader from the Gaza Strip, to safeguard freedom of navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba, and to put an end to terrorist raids from the Egyptian border.

These objectives were achieved within 100 hours. For a brief moment, there was an opportunity to create a new era of peace in the Middle East and to eliminate Nasser as a political factor in the Arabian world. Nasser lost fully one-half of his magnificent Russian arsenal without having had the opportunity to use it. A pro-western regime would have emerged if hostilities were permitted to continue for another 48 hours. And had this happened, none would have benefited more than the Arab States.

Mr. Nasser was rescued from oblivion by the intercession of the United States. This will probably rate in history's pages as one of the greatest blunders of the century. The President of the United States demanded that Israel withdraw.

Israel had no choice but to withdraw from Suez, from Gaza, and from the Gulf of Aqaba, for she was then, as now, dependent upon the good will of the United States. But Israel made certain assumptions. There were: That the presence of Israeli troops in Egyptian territory would be replaced by United Nations Emergency Forces; that withdrawal would be followed by a peace settlement to be sought as quickly as possible; and that at no other time would she be denied use of the Suez Canal or any other waterway leading to Israel.

These assumptions were endorsed by Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, the U.S. representative, approved by the United Nations Assembly, and further confirmed by Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

This was an American commitment. The sanctity of commitment, we are told, is the root of our involvement in Vietnam where we are fighting to prove that we will stand by a pledge once given.

We must not fall into the trap of comparing Israel with South Vietnam, or even with comparing America's commitment to Israel with America's commitment to Vietnam, for no two situations are identical. Nor is any war ever a matter of one simple dimension. Like an iceberg, the war on the battlefield is only the apparent manifestation of the underlying struggle whose major bulk is not always visible to surface view.

There is more than one war being fought in Asia. First, there is an undeniable civil war between South Vietnam and the Viet Cong. This civil struggle has become intertwined with a second war between the United States and North Vietnam, whose capital is Hanoi. To prove that these are two separate, though intertwined struggles, Hanoi will not address the reality of the South Vietnamese government in Saigon any more than we will openly recognize the existence of an entity called the Viet Cong. There is yet a third struggle in Asia, in our confrontation with Red China. And still a fourth struggle is the enigmatic and ongoing cold confrontation with the Soviet Union, which we still call the cold war.

There are, then, at least four definable wars in Asia. By the same reasoning, there are no less than five wars swirling about the Middle East.

Most obvious is the conflict between Israel and the Arab states, which headlines our present concern. But if we were to resolve this war even to Israel's hurt, the other four wars would remain to plague our peace-seeking efforts.

Always beneath the surface of the struggles in the Middle East is the hatred in many Arab circles for the modern world which is western civilization. This struggle is clothed in the pious garb of anti-colonialism, but it is basically a rejection of western democracy, an alien ideology. Israel is not the cause of the Arab rejection of the west; Israel *is* the west. And its very presence in its midst is regarded as an affront to Arab dignity. Her very existence is termed "aggression". But if Israel did not exist, the fury of primitive wrath would be levelled against other western installations . . . from "library" to embassy.

Never too far beneath the surface is a second struggle, that between Arab and Arab, a war which goes underground in a ratio inverse to the intensity of the other struggles. Were it not for the existence of Israel, this war would come out in the full force of its bitterness. Its victims already number the assassinated heads of more than one Arab state. Its present manifestations are between Egypt and Yemen and between Nasser's Egypt and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The prize is the domination of the Arab world. Nasser may have one eye focused upon Israel, but the other eye is upon the lush oil fields of Saudi Arabia which will be easier to tap from a military posture astride the soon-to-be-evacuated British outpost in Aden. Nasser's thrust in the Yemen is so intense that he has used poison gas. And the world is silent. Israel dampens the inter-Arab struggle and even links Arabs together in league. Israel is hardly the cause of that dissension, only its excuse for seeking more arms. With Israel eliminated, the house of Arab unity will dissolve in a bath of blood.

There is still a fourth war whose existence was largely responsible for the fiasco of Suez in 1956. It disrupted the tri-partite alliance of England, France, and the United States. It, too, wears a pious garb, for it speaks in terms of the national interest. In truth, it has little to do with the national interest, for it is concerned primarily with corporate profit. It pays few taxes; yet it demands much. Its prize is concession to exploit the oil wealth of the Middle East. A truce has been declared in this struggle by economic armistice, but it is too soon to know the extent to which it remains a factor in the formation of American foreign policy or British foreign policy. Britain has retreated in this struggle, having conceded to United States corporations, but France has not forgotten the lesson. Here again, Israel is the mask, the pawn, and the victim, but not the cause.

The fifth war is the most insidious. It is the war between east and west, the struggle between the United States and the world of Communism, in its abstraction, and the Soviet Union in its representation.

These five wars are interrelated. One influences the other. Yet they are separate, for even if you were to solve one, the others would demand separate treatment. Some of the struggles in the Middle East are intertwined with those of Southeast Asia. The common element of the precipitate is the confrontation of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is at this point that east and west have met in bloody confrontation.

There is more and more evidence that mobilization in the Middle East was triggered not in Cairo, but in Moscow. For not one single tank could move for long in Egypt's Sinai desert without the spare parts from Russia. Not one bomber could take off from Egyptian airfields without instructions, guidance, and maintenance provided by Russia. Therefore, logical deduction should lead us to conclude that Nasser has been unleashed not only to attack Israel, but to embarrass the United States. It's the Cuba syndrome, the Berlin blockade test.

America's justification for being in Vietnam is that it has given a commitment to the government of South Vietnam to defend her against her attackers. Russia, then, has shifted the arena in which the American commitment is being tested, as if to allow the world to judge whether America is committed to safeguarding beleaguered nations as a sacred principle or whether America is simply concerned with expanding empire and arenas of influence. Whether this is Russia's intention or not, this will certainly be the result of this week of testing.

What we have in the Middle East is the explosive emergence of a marginal struggle that now shifts to center stage as part of the struggle in Vietnam. What we have in the Middle East is a conflict of world powers compounded by the rivalry of Arab states emulsified by private investment, in all of which Israel is either symptom, pawn, excuse, or mask.

Elimination of Israel, even if that could be accomplished, would not resolve any of the more basic rivalries. In this context, the familiar assertion that it is only the Arab-Israeli issue which prevents the western powers from inaugurating an era of peace and harmony in the Middle East, must take its place with other old myths which do not square with new reality.

Israel is the diversionary issue on which the Arabs have presently concentrated their fire and behind which they conduct their rivalry. By acting as the breakwater, Israel has unwittingly rendered service to the Arabs and the west.

Israel is the barometer of storms having their sources elsewhere. And just as the fall-

ing barometer warns of approaching storms, so the falling fortunes of a small democracy warns of the weakening of the democratic world.

Hawks and doves are in confusion and few show consistency in their postures. Those who are hawks in one war may be doves in another. But no one can remain uninvolved for long. Each of us must frame a judgment upon which he will base his actions.

In evaluating each struggle, we must put the test of key questions. In each separate struggle, we must ask: Who subverts his neighbor? Which side seeks to expand the arena of human dignity? Which nation turns to the ballot rather than the bullet? Which prefers tanks and rocket to economic development? Which nations clamor for war? The answers may be difficult to ascertain for the issues are complex but final judgment must be based on the answer to the key question, which nation has asked for negotiated settlement at the peace table? The answer to this question must determine the nature of our commitment and which commands our support.

Once again the handwriting is on the wall. We are being tested, weighed in the balance. We must not be found wanting.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 953) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1967;" the following: "not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not in excess of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; not in excess of $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970;".

SEC. 2. Section 16(a) of such Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "This Act shall be carried out only with funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that specific purpose."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, because of the necessary absence from the city of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on account of a death in his family, he has requested me to handle the bill today, and I shall do so to the best of my ability.

I am not as familiar with this measure, which extends the Food Stamp Act, as is the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, the pending bill would extend the authority to appropriate funds for the food-stamp program for 3 additional years. It would authorize the appropriation of up to $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for fiscal 1969, and $250 million for fiscal 1970.

We have now had considerable experience with food-stamp programs. During the years between 1939 and 1943 a program was operated under the authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress, which provides for diverting surplus commodities from the normal channels of trade. This program was suspended during World War II when our surplus stocks were used up. After the war there were many proposals for reinstitution of the program, and in 1961 a pilot operation was undertaken, again under section 32. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 was adopted in August 1964, providing authority for appropriation of up to $75 million for fiscal 1965, $100 million for fiscal 1966, $200 million for fiscal 1967, and such sums as Congress might thereafter authorize for subsequent years. The pending bill, as requested by the Department of Agriculture and introduced, would have provided permanent authority for the appropriation of such sums as might be necessary. The committee felt, however, that even with the experience accumulated to date, the program is still an expanding one, and some limits should be imposed to be sure that it is kept within bounds, while maintaining orderly growth. Appropriations for 1965, 1966, and 1967 have been, respectively, $60 million, $100 million, and $139.5 million. Provision of up to $200 million, $225 million, and $250 million for 1968, 1969, and 1970 should permit continued orderly development.

The program, which has been well received, provides low-income families with more adequate diets and expands our markets for farm products. It utilizes the existing channels of trade and commerce and existing welfare agencies to assure efficient and effective program administration. It is purely voluntary, operating under State-approved plans.

Whenever a State desires to participate in the program, the State agency which administers federally aided public assistance programs submits a plan of operation to the Secretary, specifying the political subdivisions to be covered, the effective dates, standards for approval of applicant households, and other details. When the plan is approved the State agency has responsibility for certification of the households eligible to participate in the program and for issuance of coupons.

Eligible households are restricted to those where income is a substantially limiting factor in the attainment of an adequate diet. After their eligibility is determined, they may purchase food coupons in the amount required to provide them with a more nearly adequate diet. They do not pay full face value for these coupons, but a lesser amount, equivalent to their normal expenditures for food. Thus, the purpose is to supplement, rather than substitute for, their normal expenditures, and to provide them with better, more healthful diets. The program does not free recipients' own funds for other purposes, nor does it transfer relief program responsibilities from the local governments to the Federal Government. Local governments are specifically prohibited from decreasing welfare grants because of program participation, and since the program requires participants to use their normal food expenditures for coupon purchase, it does not increase the feasibility of a reduction in welfare grants.

Coupons are redeemed for food by local merchants so that participants in the program are able to shop with convenience and dignity, obtaining those foods which they need and prefer. They are not restricted to a few commodities, such as cornmeal or other starches, but they may obtain some protein, vegetables, and other foods necessary to health and well-being. Coupons may not be used for tobacco, alcoholic beverages, imported meats, other products identified as imported, or any nonfood items.

Local food stores, in turn, cash the coupons at their banks. Use of the regular channels of trade strengthens those channels, as well as giving the program the advantage of the efficiency and experience of the regular distribution system.

Thus, the program involves the joint efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments, local stores and banks, and the participants themselves. By providing a better diet for low-income families in a manner which requires them to maintain their own efforts, the program contributes substantially to the health and welfare of the Nation.

In addition to controlling the growth of the program through the continuation of ceilings on appropriations, the committee amendment limits the use of funds for the program to those specifically appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury for that purpose. The budget for fiscal 1968 proposes that the act be carried out with funds appropriated under section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress. The committee felt that the use for this purpose of funds appropriated for another purpose is not advisable. Funds are appropriated by section 32 to be available when necessary for carrying out that section. Its purpose is to protect markets for perishable agricultural commodities and to protect the producers of those commodities. Perishable commodities cannot be held by producers until the market improves. They must be marketed when ready for market, and if the market is glutted, the producer may face financial ruin. There is not time then to appropriate funds. They should be there, available to the Secretary when needed, for the diversion of surplus stocks from the market as they are brought to the market.

Mr. President, at this point I depart from the text which had been prepared for the use of my distinguished chairman, Senator ELLENDER, to say that, inasmuch as I come from a State where the great majority of our agricultural products are perishable, I am particularly interested in the safeguarding of

section 32 funds. Those funds, derived from 30 percent of the tariff receipts of the Nation, are earmarked particularly to take care of surplus production in perishable crops that are nonprice supported—for instance, beef, pork, poultry, fruit, vegetables, and other highly perishable crops.

I have felt that the Budget Bureau has been exceedingly unwise in repeatedly trying to raid section 32 funds for use in this food-stamp program. This year, it has actually recommended raiding section 32 funds to the extent of $195 million for the carrying on in fiscal year 1968 of the food-stamp program.

So the committee unanimously has urged the Senate, in the committee amendment, which I hope will be adopted, to require that the food-stamp program be carried out only with funds appropriated for that specific purpose. This action is consistent with the provision of the basic legislation which characterizes the program as a welfare or social program to be carried out with welfare funds, rather than an agricultural program to be carried out with agricultural funds.

The food-stamp program is a growing program. Where $60 million was appropriated for 1965, $139.5 million was appropriated for 1967, and the committee amendment contemplates the appropriation of as much as $250 million for 1970. When the program is fully operative, it is contemplated that it will take about $425 million. Whether Congress ever agrees to its going to that figure is, of course, a question for Congress to determine. The section 32 fund is similar to an insurance fund. If we begin to use some of it first for this purpose and then for that purpose, we may well find that we do not have it when it is needed.

I have one more comment about section 32 funds. At this time, when we all know that the tariff revenues are due to be diminished by reason of the going into effect of the so-called Kennedy plan figures for reduction of tariffs, we are particularly anxious that no further encroachment upon section 32 funds be inadvisedly made.

Mr. President, I now move that the committee amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say upon this matter. As I have already announced, I am simply handling it in the absence of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who could not be here. I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who wishes to discuss this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting floor manager of the bill what amounts, as provided in the measure, are recommended by the committee for each of the 3 years over which the program is being extended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Those amounts are $200 million for fiscal 1968, $225 million for fiscal 1969, and $250 million for 1970.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I ask whether or not the committee, during its deliberations on this measure, considered authorizations of higher figures than these which have just been stated by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from West Virginia, that this bill was handled in committee by the chairman of the committee, himself. The Senator may recall that the Senator from Louisiana was the father of the original food stamp bill. He himself suggested and insisted upon the figures which were placed in the bill, in the committee amendment which is now before the Senate—that is, the $200 million, $225 million, and $250 million figures for the 3 years covered by this program. He was quite insistent upon that, and I know that is his conviction.

The Senator from West Virginia will see, from the list of States affected by this bill, that the State which the Senator from Florida represents in part is not affected at all. We have no food stamp program in our State.

But the Senator from Louisiana, by reason of his paternity of this bill, and for other reasons, has been very active in its furtherance; and I would not feel justified in departing from the figures which he insisted upon in the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I had had some indication from the Department of Agriculture that higher authorizations might be justified for fiscal years 1969 and 1970. Perhaps I should ask this question: How will the authorizations of $225 million and $250 million for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, respectively, compare with the amounts that have been appropriated for the program in the past 2 fiscal years?

Mr. HOLLAND. They are much greater than the amounts appropriated for the last 2 fiscal years. I shall give the last 3 fiscal years, since that covers the entire period of the operation of the bill: $60 million in 1965, $100 million in 1966, and $139.5 million in 1967.

I might add that in no year was the Department able to commit and use the entire amount appropriated. For instance, in fiscal 1965, though $60 million was appropriated, the Department used only $35.6 million. In 1966, though $100 million was appropriated, the Department used only $70.5 million. We were told in committee that though $200 million was authorized and $139.5 million appropriated for 1967, it appeared that the total amount used this year would be somewhere between $120 million and $125 million.

So the amounts appropriated today are not only greatly under the amounts which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana requested be placed in the bill as limitations for 1968 and the 2 years to follow, but it also appears the Department has never been able to use the amounts actually appropriated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is saying that the amounts authorized in this bill for the 3 fiscal years of fiscal year 1968, fiscal year 1969, and fiscal year 1970, are in excess not only of the appropriations that were made in each of the past 3 years, but also in excess of the expenditures and in excess of authorizations for those years.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. For the present fiscal year 1967, $200 million was authorized, $139.5 million was appropriated and between $120 million and $125 million, we are told by the Department, will be expended during this year. The making available in this authorization of $200 million for 1968, $225 million for 1969, and $250 million for 1970, in the opinion of the Senator from Louisiana, as stated to us with great conviction in the committee, was more than adequate, he thought, to cover the future growth of this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Did the Department, during the hearings, attempt to justify any higher authorizations than are included in the bill before us?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Department attempted to justify appropriations without limit; in other words, an open-end authorization. I believe that the Department later talked to the Senator from Louisiana about some specific figures which were larger than these. But the Senator from Louisiana, who, as I say, has a very great interest in this program and naturally would, because he was the father of it, felt that these amounts were adequate and that they should be put in here to guarantee against growth that would be too quick a growth in the 3 years covered by the bill.

I will say to my distinguished friend that if we should find a need for greater appropriations we always have the possibility of amendment of the authorization bill, and if the Department has some new development not communicated to us, this bill has to go to the House of Representatives. I hope that the author of this bill, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], will accept the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana as to the soundness of this program and allow the bill, as included in the committee recommendations which have already been adopted, to be passed by the Senate today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I understand that it is the judgment of the Senator from Florida, and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee, and the judgment of the committee that the authorizations provided in the bill before us will be ample to permit an efficient and judicious expansion of the food stamp program into areas not now participating in the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was certainly the statement and conviction of the Senator from Louisiana. I joined him in it. The committee unanimously approved it in the bill which is now recommended by the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as the sponsor of S. 953, the bill to

amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for operations of the program for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending this June 30, I have been greatly encouraged by the well-nigh unanimous support of the extension of the Food Stamp Act beyond June 30. In reading records of testimony during hearings here in the Senate, and in the House on legislation of a similar nature, I have been impressed by the wide expression of views that the food stamp program is a vital, well-administered, and effectively designed Federal program.

I had previously made my own observations as to its effectiveness of operations in my own State of West Virginia, having been closely associated with its development from the inception of the pilot program in McDowell County in 1961 to its present coverage of 48 out of West Virginia's 55 counties.

From my personal observations of the program operations in my State, and from reports on its operations in other areas of the United States, I wish to concur with the estimate expressed by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman—the food-stamp program is a success.

The program has more than lived up to the expectations under which it was undertaken. It has provided a new channel for the wise and provident use of this country's great abundance of foods to improve the diets and health of our low-income families. It has not only expanded food markets for our farmers, contributing to an increase in farm income, but it has also stimulated local economies in the areas in which the program is operating.

As a special merit of the system used by the food-stamp program—through the issuance of bonus coupons—this program has not degenerated into a system of handouts. It requires participating families to use some of their own income to purchase food. It has served to provide those who most need improved diets with an opportunity to purchase more and better food for less money. And the program has proved the wisdom of its design, in that it has been singularly free of corruption at the varied levels of its administration, according to reports available in the Department of Agriculture.

I feel that action to provide the continuation of this program and to insure an increasing availability of funds for effective expansion over the next 3 fiscal years is well considered and timely.

With regard to the views of some people that there should be matching funds required of the participating States for bonus coupons, I am convinced that this suggestion, as a minimal disadvantage, would cause a totally needless complication in what has heretofore been a smooth operating program.

I had looked into this matter prior to introducing S. 953. And I had discussed it with responsible officials within West Virginia. I concluded that such a matching requirement—which would be in addition to the costs the States now bear—would put the program out of reach of many States.

I want to go on record as approving the committee's action in deferring any consideration of State matching requirements under the food stamp program.

I believe it is important to recognize the basic concept of the food stamp approach. We are putting a national resource to work to assist the States to improve food consumption levels among the needy. This national resource is our abundance of food. It is the Federal Government that has this national resource at its disposal—not the States.

The free food coupons that the recipients receive are but a means to put that food abundance within the reach of our low-income families. These coupons represent the added food purchasing power that moves our food surpluses into consumption rather than into Government ownership under price support and surplus removal programs.

Thus, if we were to require States to match part of the cost of the bonus coupons, we would be taxing nonexistent resources within the States—for our abundance of food is a national—not a State resource.

It is also important to remember that the States now share the cost of administering the program. The cost of carefully qualifying applicant families is a considerable one—but a necessary one to insure against waste and abuse. And the States finance the costs of safeguarding and issuing the coupons.

These State costs represent about 7 percent of the value of the Federal subsidy. So, the States are sharing in the costs.

Finally, I believe the record of the hearings clearly indicates that a State matching of the bonus coupons may likely kill the program. I know that it would pose an additional burden in West Virginia, and other Senators have testified that it would seriously threaten the program in their own States.

Many States are now hard pressed to finance basic welfare programs and the Congress is constantly called upon to consider legislation to raise the amounts provided for such programs. In the face of these facts, some States may likely, however reluctantly, decide to switch back to the surplus donation program because that program requires no State matching of the value of the surplus foods made available by the Department of Agriculture.

If we kill the food stamp program, now, with a State matching requirement, we are forcing a return to the less effective and less sufficient surplus donation program. We are forcing States and low-income people to give up a more dignified, self-help program for the poor—one that has won wide acceptance, approval, and support; the use of a program that operates through commercial channels rather than in competition with them; the economic stimulus the bonus coupons provide to the local economies of hundreds of communities throughout the country.

It is important to note that the administration has recommended that the Congress permanently extend the food stamp program.

As with any ongoing program, it is necessary for the agencies involved to plan ahead. The present provision for appropriations for the next 3 fiscal years would provide the assurance of orderly progression. It will protect and maintain the administrative organization necessary for effective action.

I urge that the Senate pass the bill before it now—S. 953—the extension of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, and I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for having patiently answered the questions I have propounded. I also express gratitude to Senator ELLENDER and the Committee on Agriculture, and to Senator JORDAN, of North Carolina, and his subcommittee, for the prompt and effective action in reporting this bill for Senate consideration in ample time to avoid a lapse of funding authority.

Mr. HOLLAND. The committee felt that the subject matter was sufficiently important to require the early action we took.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, first, let me compliment the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the work they have done in reporting S. 953, and on its predecessor, the Food Stamp Act of 1964. The present legislation represents the continuation of a giant step forward in raising the dietary standards among the poor in the Nation.

Food stamps have now proved themselves in 3 years of national use—during which, I might add, the results have been carefully studied and open to public scrutiny.

The facts are in. They demonstrate that this is an effective program and that it can be operated at an acceptable level of Federal expenditure.

States and localities must request participation. Costs to the States and localities are such that no new areas will come into the program unless there exists a clear need. Expansion to date has been gradual and orderly.

No county is permitted to operate the food stamp program simultaneously with the commodity distribution program. So, when an area shifts to the food stamp program, there is an offset in some of the Federal costs.

I am especially pleased to see that the committee provided for another 3-year extension. This will give the States and localities time for proper planning. At the same time, Congress will be in a position to review progress and determine if the additional 3 years of experience will then require any legislative modifications.

In summary, then, the program is attaining its objectives; it has enjoyed good administration; the expansion has been well planned and orderly. The passage of this bill will further that expansion to new areas of need. I favor passage to accomplish that purpose, and I urge all Senators to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 953) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is deeply indebted to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for so graciously agreeing to handle this measure, which extends the food stamp program over the next 3 fiscal years. In managing this bill, Senator HOLLAND stepped in for the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, whose absence today was occasioned regrettably by a death in his family. Though called upon at the last moment to handle this vitally important measure, Senator HOLLAND performed the task in the truly outstanding manner that has characterized his many years of public service to the Nation. His articulate explanation of the bill assured its overwhelming approval by the Senate. We are most grateful.

We are grateful also for the contribution of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. His penetrating analysis is a welcome addition to the discussion of any measure.

Finally, the Senate may be proud of another achievement, obtained with dispatch and with full consideration for the views of every Member.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

At 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. MANSFIELD].

AMENDMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT OF 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, President Johnson on May 25 submitted a highly important message for improving and strengthening our political process. I am very much pleased with the message. It is not only sound, thoughtful, and comprehensive, but will be significant, I am sure, in the ultimate resolution of the difficult and vexing problems in this area.

The President speaks not only as the Chief Executive, but also from a wellspring of knowledge acquired as a seasoned and experienced political campaigner, and from 30 years of distinguished public service as a Representative, Senator, majority leader of the Senate, Vice President, and President.

After the searching and sometimes spirited debate which was recently conducted in this Chamber, I think it can be fairly stated that all agree that the time for action is at hand. The President's thoughtful proposals will guide our way to the achievement of our common purpose.

Briefly, here is the substance of the President's message:

First, he makes basic and fundamental proposals to revise and give new life and meaning to the laws regulating the conduct of Federal election campaigns. These proposals would place meaningful limitations on the total amount of political contributions which any individual could make, and would put teeth into the rules relating to the disclosure of contributions received and expenditures made by Federal candidates and political committees supporting such candidates.

In substance and principle, the need for these reforms is uniformly recognized. The President has given the cause of honest elections new vigor and leadership. I am confident that this Congress will enact these vital measures. Our conscience and our constituencies demand no less.

Next, and of great concern and interest to me, are the recommendations involving campaign financing. The President has called two areas to our specific attention.

First, that public financing of presidential elections should be pursued as the best means of insuring the financial independence of presidential candidates and making certain the full and free flow of issues and ideas to the voters.

Second, that Federal action is needed at other levels of the election processes to sustain and make more viable these election campaigns.

I am gratified that after the thorough consideration which I know the President has given to this matter, he has concluded that the framework and philosophy of the Long Act should be retained. Modifications and improvements are, of course, suggested. I have suggested them myself. These are comprehensive, well reasoned, and thought provoking. I know that they will be earnestly considered in our deliberations.

Moreover, I find that this message charts a course which not only is in harmony with the general approach that I have advocated, but also lies within the boundaries of the recommendations made last week by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. My respected colleague would provide for the public funding of Federal election campaigns. I am encouraged to find increasing agreement from all quarters that a system of direct public financing of presidential election campaigns has a significant role to play in our political processes.

The area of agreement is large. We must now strive together, with the guidance of the President, to work out the details and mechanics of implementing the best system in the interests of all Americans. I look forward to working with all Senators in the days ahead, so that this problem can be resolved quickly though deliberately.

I wish to thank President Johnson for again demonstrating his deep concern for the integrity of our electoral process. I pledge myself to every effort in order that his inspired leadership and wise counsel will bear fruit before this session of Congress has completed its work.

I now introduce a bill which provides the guidelines and proposals on political campaign financing suggested by the President in his message. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] has already introduced two bills that implement other recommendations in that Presidential message. Quite rightly, those bills were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The bill I introduce today pertains only to the President's proposal for public financing of presidential elections. This bill and others already before the Committee on Finance were to be the subject of hearings by the committee which were scheduled to begin this afternoon. I understand that there has been objection, Mr. President, to holding hearings on political campaign financing this afternoon, so there will be no hearings for that purpose until tomorrow.

I ask that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1883) to amend the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of the conference report on the investment tax credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the report by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, at the time that this bill was initially before us, we felt that there was a need for it in order to encourage investment and to fulfill a commitment, that when the need for the legislation had subsided, the President would recommend that the investment tax credit and the accelerated depreciation be reinstated, and

that they should be placed into full operation in even a more favorable fashion for business than they had been before. That is what the conference report before us would do.

Senators know that I feel very strongly about the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, and Senators know that I fought very strenuously against any weakening of that act. I believe that we should move forward rather than backward, and that we should not in any wise weaken that act unless we have something better to put on the books in its place.

It was not easy for me, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, to have to take to conference a Senate bill which contained the very type of provision I had fought so hard against.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND ACT

I report to you now that while the conferees on the part of the Senate were not able to persuade the House conferees to accept all the Senate amendments, they did persuade the House conferees to recede on the Senate amendment regarding the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. In all candor, I must admit that I personally wish the House conferees had been more adamant or that I and my colleagues had been less persuasive.

The situation with regard to the Campaign Fund Act stands as it did at the conclusion of the lengthy Senate debate. The conferees agreed to the Mansfield motion as amended to include the Gore provision. Under the terms of the conference agreement, no funds can be appropriated and disbursed under the act until guidelines governing their distribution are adopted by law.

While I am on this matter, however, I want to point out that the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act has not been repealed. It remains on the statute books. The Finance Committee is ready to study guidelines under the instructions it received from the Senate. Hearings were to begin today in the committee. I have every confidence that they will lead to the development of guidelines which will satisfy a majority of the Senate. In the meantime, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Advisory Board can be appointed, and with the Board's help the Comptroller General can begin—as I hope he will—to develop regulations for administering the act.

Now let me turn to the investment credit provisions of the bill. Three such provisions were considered by the conferees.

SUSPENSION PERIOD PROPERTY

The first investment credit provision dealt with the basic problem of defining the types of property which are to be denied the investment credit as a result of the suspension period. The conferees on the part of the House were adamant that the conference accept the definitions contained in the House version of the bill. In fact, I have never seen them more adamant on any provision. While we on our side tried hard to convince them to accept the Senate provision, the House conferees refused to yield. It was only after a difficult, long, and spirited discussion that any sort of compromise on this point was reached.

The Senators will recall that under the version of the bill approved by the Senate, the investment credit would not have been available with respect to property ordered during the suspension period or with respect to property whose construction was begun or ordered by the taxpayer during the suspension period. The only exceptions to this rule were cases in which the taxpayer had entered into a binding contract before the beginning of the suspension period.

The conferees on the part of the House felt strongly that the investment credit should be made available with respect to property acquired after the end of the suspension period regardless of the time when it was ordered. They argued that the administrative problems would be formidable if the Senate version were enacted. They argued that it would be impossible to distinguish between cases in which taxpayers canceled orders and reordered after the suspension period deliberately to evade the intent of the law and other cases in which a similar cancellation and reorder were unrelated to tax consequences. They also argued that some taxpayers were required by circumstances beyond their control to place orders or begin construction during the suspension period.

As the Senate well knows from the colloquy I had with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] last Thursday, I was not pleased with the agreement we reached on this particular provision in the conference, but after long discussion of the point, and after considering the attitude of the House conferees on this point, we concluded that we must, in large part, on this point accede to the wishes of the House if we were to obtain a conference agreement. The compromise we reached, which I will describe in just a moment, represents the most that we could obtain from the House conferees on this point. You will note that it picks up $150 million in revenue over the House version, and this, I believe, is at least one reason for favoring the conference agreement.

Under the terms of the compromise that was finally arrived at, the investment credit is denied property ordered during the suspension period—that is, before March 10—only if it was acquired before May 24, 1967. This compromise takes the House at least a short step toward the Senate provision. Property ordered during the suspension period, but delivered on or after May 24, will be eligible for the investment credit.

In connection with this basic rule, the investment credit—and in this case also, the accelerated depreciation provision—will only be denied in the case of property that is constructed if the construction was begun during the suspension period or if an order for the construction was placed during the suspension period and actual physical construction was begun before May 24. In these construction cases, the investment credit or accelerated depreciation will still be available with respect to the portion of the construction which takes place on or after May 24.

LIMITATION ON THE INVESTMENT CREDIT

Let me now turn to the remaining decisions of the conferees. Both the Senate and the House approved an increase in the existing limitation on the amount of investment credit which may be claimed by a taxpayer in any one year. Presently that limit is an amount equal to the first $25,000 of tax liability plus 25 percent of the remaining tax liability. Last year, at the time of the suspension of the investment credit, provision was made for increasing this limit to the first $25,000 of tax liability plus 50 percent of the remaining tax liability, as of the end of the suspension period. Both the House and Senate versions of this bill deal with the time when this 50-percent limit is to be put into effect.

Under the bill we approved in the Senate, the 50-percent limitation was to be available for taxable years ending after December 31, 1967. Under the House bill, the limitation was to be effective beginning March 10. The conferees on the part of the Senate receded on this matter of the effective date. The House conferees apparently felt that this earlier effective date for the 50-percent limitation was important because of concern over segments of the transportation industry, which are among the chief industries affected by the provision.

VIETNAM AIRLIFT

On the final amendment, the House conferees receded and agreed to the Senate provision which extends the investment credit to certain aircraft operating outside the United States. This is the so-called Vietnam airlift amendment. It will apply to certain aircraft operating under contract with the Defense Department to carry troops and supplies between Vietnam and foreign countries.

CONCLUSION

As for the revenue aspects of the conference report, the bill as agreed to by the conferees will involve a loss of revenue of $625 million in the 4 fiscal years 1967 through 1970 as compared to the bill as passed by the Senate. The decision regarding the definition of suspension period property reduces revenues over the 4 fiscal years by $420 million, while the change in the effective date of the 50-percent limitation will reduce revenues by $205 million. Of the total revenue loss as compared to the Senate bill, $175 million will occur in the fiscal year 1967 and $360 million will occur in the following fiscal year.

Mr. President, while the number of provisions at issue in this conference was small, the conference was one in which the issues were warmly debated—perhaps as much so as any I have participated in. Moreover, the Senate conferees acceded to the wishes of the House on the one point relating to orders and deliveries further than I wish had been necessary, but I am convinced that there was no other alternative if there were to be a conference agreement.

I urge the Senate to give its prompt approval to this report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not know whether the

minority leader wishes to be here before the report is adopted, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has a statement he would like to make, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE UNITED STATES MUST PRESERVE THE PRINCIPLE OF FREE, UNHINDERED INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING THROUGH THE GULF OF AQABA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the ominous events in the Middle East during the past weeks, indicating a rapidly approaching crisis there, is of deep concern not only for the nations of the Middle East but for all the nations of the free world, especially the United States.

The Middle East has for far too long been under constant threat of violence instigated by dictator Nasser of Egypt, as well as the dictators of many other Arab countries.

For many years I have urged successive administrations of our Government to stop giving material aid to Nasser since such aid has enabled Egypt to carry out his openly proclaimed threat to destroy Israel, the only oasis of true democracy and civilization in the Middle East desert of backwardness and of ruthless dictatorships.

Heeding repeated congressional pleas both by myself and many of my colleagues, the Johnson administration has finally and properly cut off all aid to Egypt.

In this hour of crisis, I hope the United States will stand firm in resisting this latest Nasser threat and will not attempt to buy him off through a resumption of economic aid. There can be no compromise with blackmail or blackmailers.

The United States should insist that the international waters of the Gulf of Aqaba be kept truly free for all shipping, including ships flying the Israel flag.

When Egypt closed the straits leading into the Gulf of Aqaba except to shipping of which it approved, it committed an act of aggression not only against Israel but against the shipping of all maritime nations. The United States cannot stand idly by and permit its flagships to be searched by Egypt on the high seas.

Nor can the United States stand idly by and permit Egypt to starve Israel for the United States has definite commitments to Israel—commitments given repeatedly in no uncertain terms by Presidents from President Truman on.

I have for years on the Senate floor opposed the U.S. unilateral intervention in the civil war in Vietnam on behalf of a succession of inept, corrupt, and coup-imposed dictatorial governments of South Vietnam—governments enjoying no popular support and maintained in office only by the Armed Forces and lavish funds of the United States. On behalf of those governments the United States has unilaterally committed almost 500,000 ground troops to fight a ground war in an area which many who should know is not vital to the security of the United States, and which in his campaign pronouncements in 1964, President Johnson repeatedly indicated he would not do.

But, in recent weeks, when the security of Israel has been threatened by the aggressive actions of the Arab States, the United States, despite its many prior commitments to Israel to defend its territorial integrity, has been insistent that any action in the troubled Middle East be in concert with other nations.

That is a commendable spirit on the part of the United States. It is too bad that the United States did not exhibit a similar spirit before it escalated its involvement in Vietnam.

As the New York Times has put in its leading editorial this morning:

> In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.

There can be no doubt that the United States stands overcommitted in Vietnam. But, as the New York Times states, if Washington "Now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, there would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam."

There is not time for delay. The recent meetings of the Security Council of the United Nations show clearly that on a final vote—if it should come to that after days of futile debate—the sentiment will be for a breathing spell—which will give the Arab nations time to consolidate their positions while Israel starves.

As the noted historian Barbara Tuchman stated in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post on May 30, 1967:

> Meanwhile let us at least stop pretending; let us stop using the words Peace and Freedom as nice white verbal bandages to cover the gangrene underneath. I for one have had enough of hearing these words mouthed by administration spokesmen as an incantation to bewitch us into supposing that carnage in Vietnam is "freedom" and scuttle in the Middle East is "peace."

Therefore, if the other free nations should refuse or abstain from joining the United States, then the United States should not hesitate unilaterally to honor its pledges to guarantee the freedom and independence of Israel for the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba by Egypt can be viewed only as an act of aggression against that freedom and independence.

To fulfill its pledges to Israel, the United States should deploy at once the necessary units of its Armed Forces to protect all shipping desiring to pass through the Gulf of Aqaba en route to Israel, regardless of cargo and without inspection or harassment by Egypt or its allies.

As noted columnist James Reston stated in his column in the New York Times this morning entitled "Geneva: Europe's Second Thoughts on the Cold War":

> What the allies in Europe are watching now is whether the United States, which is committed to freedom of maritime commerce and the security of Israel, will apply these arguments to the Middle East crisis as Johnson has to the Southeast Asian crisis, and the paradox of it is that many of the Europeans who have been most critical of his use of force in Southeast Asia are now afraid he might not follow this line in the Middle East.

There is no other honorable course for the United States to follow than to use its forces not only to uphold the principle of freedom of the seas but also to honor its many commitments to preserve and protect the integrity of Israel.

It would be my hope that both Jordan and Saudi Arabia would immediately be warned by the United States that the military equipment which the United States gave them was for the purpose of fighting Communist aggression and not for the purpose of fighting an aggressive war against Israel.

In view of the belligerent attitudes expressed in recent days by both these Arab countries and their mobilization actions, the United States should immediately stop all military aid shipments to these countries. It was a tragic mistake for the United States to supply them with arms at all. The consequences of that folly were foreseeable.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial from the New York Times of May 31, 1967, entitled "Middle East and/or Vietnam," the column by James Reston in the New York Times for May 31, 1967, entitled "Geneva: Europe's Second Thoughts on the Cold War" and the letter to the editor of the Washington Post, printed on May 30, 1967, from Barbara W. Tuchman entitled "Guns of May?"

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]

MIDDLE EAST AND/OR VIETNAM

The issues in the Middle Eastern conflict are being confused by some commentators and critics with the very different issues involved in Vietnam. Just as spokesmen for the Johnson Administration have drawn false parallels between appeasement of Hitler and what was described as appeasement of Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung, so now the terms "hawk" and "dove" are being loosely applied to the Middle East as if they had the same connotation as in Vietnam.

It is neither accidental nor illogical that many of the same Americans who are calling for descalation and unconditional negotiations in Southeast Asia also call for firmness on the part of the United States in insisting on freedom of passage to the Gulf of Aqaba and on honoring American commitments to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel.

The United States had no such commitments with regard to South Vietnam, least of all to fight a virtually unilateral and major war on behalf of Saigon. In 1954, when the SEATO treaty was signed, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles specifically ruled out "unilateral armed intervention." While SEATO's economic and defensive commitments were indeed extended in a protocol

to South Vietnam, along with Cambodia and Laos, Saigon was not even a party to the SEATO treaty.

The other major document sometimes cited by the Johnson Administration as a commitment to Saigon was a letter from President Eisenhower to President Diem of South Vietnam on Oct. 23, 1954. In it General Eisenhower wrote of aid to Saigon, the purpose of which would be "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." However, this aid was made dependent of President Diem creating a Government "enlightened in purpose and effective in performance." Diem failed signally to do this, as virtually every Vietnamese from Premier Ky down now recognizes.

President Kennedy just before his death and President Johnson as late as 1964 both insisted—in Mr. Johnson's words—that the war in Vietnam "ought to be fought by the boys of Asia," not by Americans. Israel is not asking the United States to fight for her. There is no commitment to do so, and in present circumstances no need to do so.

But there are commitments, which can be documented precisely, by every American President since Truman to defend the sovereignty and independence of Israel, and there are also commitments by Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson in favor of upholding the right of free passage through the Strait of Tiran into the Gulf of Aqaba.

In terms of American interest—as well as commitment—the Middle East is to be differentiated from Southeast Asia. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world, between Asia and Europe. It has been a strategic goal of Russia since Peter the Great. A reminder of this came only yesterday with the news that Russian warships are going to pass through the Black Sea Straits into the Eastern Mediterranean.

In its great-power aspect the Middle Eastern crisis shapes up as a confrontation of the Soviet Union versus the United States. As the British and French were gradually forced out of the area following World War II, the United States took their place. The region is now of paramount strategic importance to this country, whereas until escalation of the Vietnam war, Southeast Asia was only a marginal power factor for the United States.

The Persian Gulf area produces 27 percent of the world's petroleum and has proved global reserves of 60 per cent. American firms have a gross investment in the region of more than $2,500,000,000. There is nothing comparable in American interests that can be said of the Southeast Asian peninsula.

The American position has now reached the ironical stage where virtually every argument advanced for the Vietnam war—commitments, honor, security, interests, consistency, the self-determination of small nations—could be used in favor of helping Israel. However, it is not necessary nor is it valid to make such comparisons. These are two separate problems calling for different solutions, but they are alike in that they both require major policy decisions in 1967.

If Washington now argues that it cannot afford to take on two crucial commitments at the same time, this would be another good reason to say it is time to deescalate the war in Vietnam.

[From the New York Times, May 31, 1967]

GENEVA: EUROPE'S SECOND THOUGHTS ON THE COLD WAR

(By James Reston)

GENEVA, May 30.—The vicious Middle East controversy has startled our old friends and allies in Western Europe. They have been saying the cold war was over in this part of the world (blaming Washington for not knowing it), but now they are not so sure.

The Arab-Israeli crisis is a little nearer Europe than Vietnam. It is in an area where Britain and France still have important interests. Moscow is backing the Arabs and Washington is sort of backing Israel, and this has produced some interesting reactions.

All the Western European governments are playing for time. They are talking about Four-Power conferences, appeals to the World Court, and resolutions at the United Nations—all of which meet with objections from one side or the other—and they are waiting for a lead from President Johnson, who in turn, and not unnaturally, is waiting this time to see who will be with him if he challenges Nasser's blockade.

THE GATEKEEPERS

Europe has a special interest in the key issue in this Middle Eastern conflict. It is a sea-girt continent trading in the world. It is full of vast inland seas whose waters wash the shores of many lands but narrow down into gateways that could be controlled by other nations standing at the gate.

The nations of Europe, despite their ancient enmities, live too close together to accept Nasser's assertion that he has the right to close the gate to the Gulf of Aqaba just because he happens to dislike the Israelis who live inside. On that basis, Finland, Poland and even the Soviet Union couldn't get out of the Baltic, and the Black Sea powers, including the U.S.S.R., might not be able to enjoy "free and innocent passage" past the Turkish guns at the Dardanelles.

JOHNSON'S DILEMMAS

The legalities in the Arab-Israeli dispute at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba may be different, but the basic point is the same. Nasser is claiming not only the right to blockade Israel but to destroy her, and even Europe in her present mood of isolation and wishful thinking is not prepared to minimize Nasser's challenge.

Accordingly, the allies are turning to President Johnson, and he couldn't possibly be in a more difficult position, for all his arguments in defense of his Vietnam policy apply with even greater force in the Arab-Israeli dispute.

He has argued that he must keep his commitments in Vietnam or all his other commitments and hopes of world order are worthless. He has asserted that the United States must keep its international contracts even if the other parties to those contracts fail to do so. He has set out to block the expansion of Communist influence in areas vital to the interests of the United States. And he has said, in effect, that great risks and sacrifices must be taken in Vietnam in order to avoid greater risks and sacrifices elsewhere later on.

What the allies in Europe are watching now is whether the United States, which is committed to freedom of maritime commerce and the security of Israel, will apply these arguments to the Middle East crisis as Johnson has to the Southeast Asian crisis, and the paradox of it is that many of the Europeans who have been most critical of his use of force in Southeast Asia are now afraid he might not follow this line in the Middle East.

EUROPE'S MOOD

This is obviously a devilish dilemma for a President who has over half a million men engaged in a war in Southeast Asia and a quarter of a million standing guard in Europe, while France leads a campaign against American influence in Europe and American intervention in Asia.

"The United States," says The Telegraph in London, "is unequivocally committed to defending Israel against aggression, and Egypt, by closing the Gulf is equally clearly committing an act of aggression. Britain has only a secondary role to play in this drama. She can, in essence, only either help or hinder the United States. It is time the [British] Government made its intention clear. It would be only to compound the error of Suez to allow any sense of guilt about that operation to stand in the way of clear and decisive action now."

The former British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, has been more precise. "The proper course is for the United States and Britain . . . to declare boldly that they will assert the right of free passage of their ships into the Gulf of Aqaba, whatever their destination and whatever their cargo. If that right is disputed, military force will be used to sustain it. I believe a clear declaration of that sort is the best way to keep the peace. . . ."

The rest of Europe is less bold, but the mood in this part of the world is much sterner than it was a month ago. The Middle East crisis has not yet reunited the allies, but it has made them question their optimism of the past, and President Johnson is obviously waiting to see what action they intend to take to back up their bolder words.

[From the Washington Post, May 30, 1967]

GUNS OF MAY?

In the crisis in the Middle East we have come to a moment of truth for this country and for the community of Western democracies. Aqaba is the crux. If the President of the United States can state as a principle that the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway and that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal, and thereafter not only do nothing to implement the principle but stand by while it is violated, then we have indeed reached the ultimate paralysis of power.

This is not a process new in history. It happened to the dinosaur, it happened to the Dreadnaught and it can happen to us.

With regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict it has been a creeping paralysis for the past 10 years. After Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai peninsula, under American pressure and on the promise that her maritime outlet through the Gulf was assured, President Eisenhower engaged to use American influence and best efforts for the reopening of the Suez Canal to Israel's ships. No such efforts were ever made or even attempted by his or by succeeding administrations. We can take no comfort in being a major power if we cannot exercise the will and the strength that goes with the status.

This is—or should be—an American, not a Jewish issue. It is the American reputation that is at stake. If the United States in this crisis fails to support its stated position, because of involvement in Vietnam, then the uneasy rationale—called "resistance to aggression"—of our battle over there collapses hollowly and publicly. While we claim to fight for it in the Far East, it is nullified in the Near East, closer to home.

Israel represents the land and the nation which were the source of the Judaeo-Christian tradition to which we and the other Western nations belong and which, presumably, we uphold. As such it seems to me obvious that its integrity and security, not to say its survival, is a closer concern of ours than that of South Vietnam. To sacrifice the land of our spiritual birth, the land as an Englishman said "to which we all turn our faces in the grave," while we fight for that great democrat, Premier Ky, is an extreme of absurdity.

Yet the crisis could be our opportunity—if we met it with the nerve and firmness of intent that served us in the Cuban missile crisis. It could be used to restore the prestige we have lost, not by futile fiddling in the U.N. but by straightforward independent action, the only kind that can be effective.

To wait for multilateral action by the so-called family of nations is useless; as far as

concerns ability to act jointly and effectively for the maintenance of security, the family of nations is an illusion with which we comfort ourselves like a teething-ring. The meetings of the Security Council, as anyone knows who has attended or listened to them, have become a cynical farce.

Independent action in support of our stated policy is not intervention, nor is it something to be afraid of. Taken with courage and conviction it is what the world is waiting for—from us. It could win back the world's respect and, what is more important, self-respect.

Aqaba is the test from which the Arab nations, and behind them all the nations of Asia and Africa who are watching the performance, will take their cue. If we fail to act to confirm the principle of freedom of navigation, every person in every one of these countries will take note.

The sacrifice of Israel will not buy us time—and certainly not honor, though that is perhaps beside the point. Rather it will hasten the time that is closing in. If the Arabs, with Russia at their back, are successful in this challenge which U Thant's precipitous collapse so unexpectedly widened for them, then the period remaining to us, that is to the Western democracies, is shorter than I had supposed.

Meanwhile let us at least stop pretending; let us stop using the words Peace and Freedom as nice white verbal bandages to cover the gangrene underneath. I for one have had enough of hearing these words mouthed by administration spokesmen as an incantation to bewitch us into supposing that carnage in Vietnam is "freedom" and scuttle in the Middle East is "peace."

BARBARA W. TUCHMAN.

COS COB, CONN.

RESTORATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO MEET DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW — UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to sit and to conduct hearings, if need be, tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, let us wait and see what the business is tomorrow. Perhaps we can work it out. After all, we cannot be in both places. I think it will be all right tomorrow. I understand the committee is meeting tomorrow morning. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; it is intended that the committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We can see what the business of the Senate is tomorrow.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana tell us when he thinks we will have hearings on the debt ceiling, which expires the end of this June? Will that be before taking up the question of the censure of the Senator from Connecticut or afterward?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am in no position to say at this moment when I will suggest hearings on the debt ceiling. It would be my thought that we would definitely conduct hearings and we will have completed our action well before the debt ceiling expires, if I have anything to say about it. This bill is not expected to be passed by the House of Representatives, however, until June 7 or 8. We could not meet before that time. It would be the thought of the junior Senator from Louisiana that we would conduct hearings sometime after the House has concluded its hearings and that we would attempt to bring the bill before the Senate with sufficient time for adequate debate.

I am well aware of the record Senators have made on the subject. I shall conduct myself in light of the views of Senators and in light of the statements which I have made on the floor concerning this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator insist on his request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, Mr. President, I believe it was objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 112 RELATING TO SENATOR DODD

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader further with respect to committee hearings beginning 2 weeks from yesterday; namely, the 13th of June, when we take up the resolution relating to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the time limitation on the bill now being considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare expires on the 19th of next month. It would be my hope—and this is in accord with the notice given to the Senate—that there would be no committee meetings of any kind beginning on June 13 for the duration of the consideration of the Dodd resolution. This would apply also to the Appropriations Committee.

It would be my further hope—and I assume that the Senate would agree with me—that we would stay with the resolution, S. 112, which would be the pending matter at that time, until it is disposed of, and that we will come in early and stay late.

I believe we already have an order for the Senate to come in at 10 o'clock on the morning of June 13.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN VETERANS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 16, for its disposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 16) to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967".

TITLE I—PENSION BENEFITS

ENLARGING WIDOWS' ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

SEC. 101. (a) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of sections 302(a), 404, 532(d), 534(c), 536(c), and 541(e), title 38, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(2) for one year or more; or

"(3) for any period of time if a child was born of the marriage, or was born to them before the marriage.".

(b) Subsection 103(a), title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "cohabitated with him for five or more years immediately before his death," and inserting in lieu thereof "cohabited with him for one year or more immediately before his death, or for any period of time if a child was born of the purported marriage or was born to them before such marriage,".

PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY AT AGE SIXTY-FIVE; AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE FOR PERSONS IN NURSING HOMES

SEC. 102. (a) Subsection (a) of section 502 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "disabled if he is" the following: "sixty-five years of age or older or".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 502 is amended by inserting "(1) a patient in a nursing home or (2)" immediately after "if he is".

EXCLUSION FROM ANNUAL INCOME

SEC. 103. (a) Paragraph (7) of section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "amounts paid by" the following: "a wife of a veteran for the expenses of his last illness, and by".

(b) Paragraph (9) of such section 503 is amended by inserting "(A)" immediately after "amounts paid" and by inserting the following immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof: "or (B) by a widow or a wife of a deceased veteran for the last illness and burial of a child of such veteran".

(c)(1) Such section 503 is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) payments of annuities elected under chapter 73 of title 10."

(2) Section 415(g)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended (A) by inserting "and under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959" immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (C), (B) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and (C) by

adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(M) payments of annuities elected under chapter 73 of title 10."

(3) Section 1441 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "except section 415(g) and chapter 15 of title 38".

PENSION INCREASES FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 104. (a) The table in subsection (b) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
$600	$600	$104
1,200	1,200	79
	1,800	45".

(b) The table in subsection (c) of such section 521 is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income				
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
$1,000	$1,000	$109	$114	$119
2,000	2,000	84	84	84
	3,000	50	50	50".

(c) Subsection (e) of such section 521 is amended by striking out "$35" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40".

PENSION INCREASES FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF WARS BEFORE WORLD WAR I

SEC. 105. Sections 531, 532(a)(2), 534(a)(2), and 536(a) of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "$65" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such section "$70".

PENSION INCREASES FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 106. (a) The table in subsection (b) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
$600	$600	$70
1,200	1,200	51
	1,800	29".

(b) The table in subsection (c) of such section 541 is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
$1,000	$1,000	$86
2,000	2,000	67
	3,000	45".

(c) Subsection (d) of such section 541 is amended by striking out "$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "$16".

PENSION INCREASES FOR CHILDREN OF DECEASED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 107. Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$38" and "$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40" and "$16", respectively.

AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE FOR WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

SEC. 108. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

"§ 544. Aid and attendance allowance

"If any widow who is entitled to pension under this subchapter or the provisions of this title as in effect on June 30, 1960, is in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly rate of pension payable to her under this subchapter or such provisions, as the case may be, shall be increased by $50."

(b) The analysis of such subchapter III, after the heading of such chapter, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"WIDOWS OF VETERANS OF ALL PERIODS OF WAR

"544. Aid and attendance allowance."

THERAPEUTIC AND REHABILITATIVE DEVICES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 617 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "to any veteran" and all that follows through the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to any veteran in receipt of pension under chapter 15 of this title based on need of regular aid and attendance."

PENSION FOR "OLD LAW" VETERANS WHO ARE HOUSEBOUND

SEC. 110. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay to a veteran who is entitled to pension under section 521 to title 38, United States Code, as in effect on June 30, 1960, and who—

(1) has, in addition to a disability rated as permanent and total, additional disability or disabilities independently ratable at 60 per centum or more, or

(2) by reason of his disability or disabilities, is permanently housebound but does not qualify for pension under such section 521 based on need of regular aid and attendance,

in lieu of the pension otherwise payable to him under such section 521, a pension at the monthly rate of $100.

AID AND ATTENDANCE ALLOWANCE—INDIAN AND SPANISH AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

SEC. 111. (a) Section 511(c) of the title 38, United States Code, is amended by (1) inserting "(1)" immediately before "Any"; (2) inserting ", except as provided in paragraph (2)" immediately before the period at the end thereof; and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The Administrator shall pay each month to each veteran of the Indian Wars who is receiving, or entitled to receive, pension based on a need of regular aid and attendance, whichever amount is greater (A) that provided by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, or (B) that which is payable to the veteran under section 521 of this title if he has elected, or would be payable if he were to elect, to receive pension under such section pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection. Each change in the amount of pension payment required by this paragraph shall be effective as of the first day of the month during which the facts of the particular case warrant such change, and shall be made without specific application therefor."

(b) Section 512(a)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by (1) inserting "(A)" immediately before "Any"; (2) inserting ", except as provided in subparagraph (B)" immediately before the period at the end thereof; and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) The Administrator shall pay each month to each Spanish-American War veteran who is receiving, or entitled to receive, pension based on a need of regular aid and attendance, whichever amount is greater (i) that provided by subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(1) of this section, or (ii) that which is payable to the veteran under section 521 of this title if he has elected, or would be payable if he were to elect, to receive pension under such section pursuant to subparagraph (A) of this paragraph. Each change in the amount of pension payment required by this subparagraph shall be effective as of the first day of the month during which the facts of the particular case warrant such change, and shall be made without specific application therefor."

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS

COMPENSATION

SEC. 201. (a) Section 310 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "during a period of war" the following: "or on or after August 5, 1964".

(b) Section 312 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "period of war" the following: "or on or after August 5, 1964,".

(c) Section 331 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "during other than a period of war" the following: "or a period beginning on or after August 5, 1964".

PENSION

SEC. 202. (a) Section 501 of title 38, United State Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The term 'Vietnam conflict' means the period beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(c) Such section 521 is further amended by—

(1) striking out "or the Korean conflict" in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (g), and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict",

(2) striking out "or the Korean conflict" in paragraph (3) of such subsection (g), and inserting in lieu thereof ", the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict", and

(3) inserting "(including the Vietnam conflict)" in paragraph (4) of such subsection (g) immediately before the period at the end thereof.

(d) The catchline of section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict"

(e) Subsection (a) of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(f) Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of such section is amended by inserting immediately after "Korean conflict veteran" the following: ", or (D) before the expiration of ten years following termination of the Viet-

nam conflict in the case of a widow of a Vietnam conflict veteran".

(g) The catchline of section 541 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans"

(h) Subsection (a) of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or the Korean conflict" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict".

(i) The catchline of section 542 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans"

(j) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "521. Veterans of World War I, World War II or the Korean conflict." and substituting in lieu thereof

"521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict.";

by striking out the subheading

"World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict"

and substituting in lieu thereof

"World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and the Vietnam conflict";

by striking out

"541. Widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"541. Widows of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans.";

and by striking out

"542. Children of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans."

and substituting in lieu thereof

"542. Children of World War I, World War II, Korean conflict, or Vietnam conflict veterans."

(k) Chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out the subheading "WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT" immediately preceding section 541 of such title, and substituting in lieu thereof "WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THE VIETNAM CONFLICT".

HOSPITAL, DOMICILIARY, AND MEDICAL CARE

SEC. 203. (a) Section 602 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 602. Presumption relating to psychosis

"For the purposes of this chapter, any veteran of World War II, the Korean conflict, or of service after January 31, 1955, who developed an active psychosis (1) within two years after his discharge or release from the active military, naval, or air service, and (2) before July 26, 1949, in the case of a veteran of World War II, or February 1, 1957, in the case of a veteran of the Korean conflict, shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service.".

(b) Subsection (h) of section 612 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Administrator shall furnish to each veteran who is receiving additional compensation or allowance under chapter 11, or increased pension as a veteran of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam conflict, by reason of being in need of regular aid and attendance, such drugs and medicines as may be ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician as specific therapy in the treatment of any illness or injury suffered by such veteran. As used in this subsection, the term 'Vietnam conflict' has the meaning given it by section 501(4) of this title."

(c)(1) Section 601(4)(C)(ii) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veterans of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955".

(2) Section 601(4)(C)(iii) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veterans of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955,".

(d) Section 624(c) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "veteran of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955,".

(e) Sections 641 and 643 of such title are each amended by inserting immediately after "veteran of any war" the following: "or of service after January 31, 1955,".

(f) Sections 5031(a) and 5034(1) of such title are each amended by striking "war veteran population" and inserting in lieu thereof "population of war veterans and veterans of service after January 31, 1955,".

(g) Sections 5032 and 5036 of such title 38 are each amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955".

(h) Section 5034(1) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955,".

(i) Section 5035(a)(4) of such title is amended by inserting "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955," immediately after "war veterans" the first time it appears therein, and by inserting "or veterans of service after January 31, 1955" immediately after "war veterans" the second time it appears therein.

(j) Section 5035(b)(4) of such title is amended by inserting immediately after "war veterans" the following: "and veterans of service after January 31, 1955,".

SPECIALLY EQUIPPED AUTOMOBILES

SEC. 204. (a) Section 1901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

"(b) The benefits of this chapter shall also be made available to each veteran who is suffering from any disability described in subsection (a), if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service after January 31, 1955, and if the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty."

(b) Section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out at the beginning of the first sentence thereof "The benefits", and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the benefits", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b)(1) In the case of any veteran who is eligible for the benefits provided in this chapter by reason of section 1901(b) and who was discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service before the effective date of this subsection, any applicable time limitation contained in subsection (a) of this section which otherwise would have begun to run before the effective date of this subsection shall not begin to run until that date.

"(2) In the case of any veteran whose entitlement to the benefits provided in this chapter first arose by reason of the enactment of Public Law 85-857, application for such benefits may, notwithstanding the time limitations contained in subsection (a) of this section, be made within one year from the effective date of the Veterans' Pension and Readjustment Assistance Act of 1967."

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

SEC. 205. (a) Section 902(a)(2)(A) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "war" the following: "or of service on or after August 5, 1964".

(b) If the burial allowance authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, is payable solely by virtue of the enactment of this Act, the two-year period for filing applications, referred to in section 904 of such title 38, shall not end, with respect to an individual whose death occurred prior to the effective date of this Act, before the expiration of the two-year period which begins on the effective date of this Act, or, in any case involving the correction of a discharge after the effective date of this Act, before the expiration of two years from the date of such correction.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

STATUTORY AWARDS

SEC. 301. Section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one or more creative organs, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, or has suffered complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech, or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction, the rate of compensation therefore shall be $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j) or subsection (s) of this section but in no event to exceed $400 per month; and in the event the veteran has suffered one or more of the disabilities heretofore specified in this subsection, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $600 per month;".

BURIAL FLAGS FOR CERTAIN IN-SERVICE DEATHS

SEC. 302. Section 901 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection "(d)" at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(d) In the case of any person who died while in the active military, naval, or air service after May 27, 1941, the Administrator shall furnish a flag to the next of kin, or to such other person as the Administrator deems most appropriate, if such next of kin or other person is not otherwise entitled to receive a flag under this section, or under section 1482(a) of title 10, United States Code."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED

SEC. 303. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1677. Special training for the educationally disadvantaged

"(a) In the case of any eligible veteran who—

"(1) has not received a secondary school diploma (or an equivalency certificate) at the time of his discharge from active duty, or

"(2) in order to pursue a program of education for which he would otherwise be eligible needs additional secondary school training, either refresher courses or deficiency courses, to qualify for admission to an appropriate educational institution,

the Administrator may, without regard to so much of the provisions of section 1671 as prohibit the enrollment of an eligible veteran in a program of education in which he is 'already qualified', approve the enrollment of such veteran in appropriate course or courses; except that no enrollment in adult evening secondary school courses shall be approved in excess of half-time training as defined pursuant to section 1683 of this title.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to an eligible veteran pursuing a course or courses pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, an educational assistance allowance as provided in sections 1681 and 1682 of this chapter.

"(c) The educational assistance allowance authorized by this section shall be paid without charge to any period of entitlement the veteran may have earned pursuant to section 1661(a) of this chapter."

(b)(1) The analysis at the head of chapter 34, title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after "1676. Education outside the United States." the following:

"1677. Special training for the educationally disadvantaged."

(2) Section 1661(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "subsection (c)" the following: "and in section 1677 of this chapter".

(c) Where the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds that an eligible veteran has since June 1, 1966, and prior to the enactment of this section, received educational assistance while pursuing a course or courses of education to which he would have been entitled under section 1677, without charge to entitlement, he may restore to the veteran any period of entitlement expended in the pursuit of such course or courses.

INCREASE IN RATES OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCES

SEC. 304. (a) The table in section 1682(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I	Column II	Column III	Column IV
Type of program	No dependents	One dependent	Two or more dependents
Institutional:			
Full time	$130	$155	$175
Three-quarter time	95	115	135
Half time	60	75	85
Cooperative	105	125	145".

(b) Section 1682(b)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking out "$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$130".

PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY, WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 305. (a) Section 1712(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "twenty-third birthday" each place where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-sixth birthday".

(b) In the case of any eligible person (within the meaning of section 1701(a)(1) or 1765(a) of title 38, United States Code) who is made eligible for educational assistance under the provisions of chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, solely by virtue of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section, and who on the effective date of this Act is below the age of twenty-six years, the period referred to in section 1712 of such title shall not end with respect to such person until the expiration of the five-year period which begins on the effective date of this Act, excluding from such five-year period any period of time which may elapse between the date on which application for benefits of such chapter 35 is filed on behalf of such person and the date of final approval of such application by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; but in no event shall educational assistance under such chapter 35 be afforded to any eligible person beyond his thirty-first birthday by reason of this section.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 306. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1967.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the rates of pension payable to certain veterans and their widows, to provide additional readjustment assistance for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the message is before the Senate for its disposition.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31, 1967:

TARIFF COMMISSION

Bruce E. Clubb, of Virginia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1971, vice Joseph E. Talbot, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Joe Hodson [redacted], Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, [redacted], Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Assistant Judge Advocate General, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3442, and 3447.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, having designated him for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of that section.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

District of Columbia Crime Reduction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, recent, shocking crimes here in the Nation's Capital have made it apparent that new legislation is needed now. Washington plays host to millions of foreign and American visitors each year. It should be a model city.

I have today cosponsored with my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the District of Columbia Crime Reduction Act of 1967. This bill would reduce and improve criminal procedures in the District of Columbia.

It would embody the proposals of the President for combating crime in Washington and is the result of a recommendation by the President's Crime Commission that a sweeping attack be made on crime across the country, starting here in Washington.

According to the terms of the bill I have cosponsored today, the District of Columbia Police Department would be expanded and reorganized. The U.S. attorney's and corporation counsel's offices would be expanded. There would be expansion and procedural reorganization of criminal trial sections of the District and District of Columbia sessions courts. Criminal law would undergo reform both substantively and procedurally. Correctional institutions and probationary departments would be reorganized and expanded as would social rehabilitation programs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the 90th Congress will realize the urgency involved in passing this bill.

Archbishop John J. Krol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the entire Cleveland community and the citizens of Ohio join in rejoicing at the nomination of Archbishop John J. Krol, of Philadelphia, as one of the new cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church.

Archbishop John Krol is a native of Cleveland, Ohio, and a longtime resident of my congressional district where he was born. His appointment as a cardinal comes as no surprise. We in the Cleveland area have long known of his dedication and devotion to his religious duties and his support of community

endeavors. His career as a priest, a bishop, and an archbishop has been an inspiration to the entire community and to the vocations.

Archbishop Krol, since his ordination at St. John's Cathedral in 1937, has devoted his life to the cause of the common man. He has sought to promote religious freedom, tear down the source of tyranny and oppression, and develop a spirit of religious brotherhood. He has remained steadfast to these high purposes through his work as a teacher in canon law.

The people to whom he ministered in the Diocese of Cleveland found in Cardinal-elect Krol an extraordinary warmth and humility which exemplifies his dedication and his devotion to his religious calling and to the high principles for which he has stood throughout his career. These qualities have now been recognized by His Holiness Pope Paul VI.

The appointment of Archbishop Krol to cardinal comes at an early age and at a time when men of such understanding and vitality are needed to carry forth with fervor the changing role of the church in our troubled society.

On behalf of a grateful community, I want to express heartiest best wishes to Cardinal-elect John J. Krol on this memorable occasion.

Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, when the House considered the Elementary and Secondary Education Act my colleague from Iowa, FRED SCHWENGEL, gave a speech which supported the Quie amendment.

FRED SCHWENGEL's remarks were to the point. They constituted a formidable argument for the Quie amendment and the need to return control of education to State and local officials.

FRED SCHWENGEL is well qualified to speak on the topic of education. He served in the Iowa House of Representatives for 10 years. His record on education while serving in the Iowa Legislature was remarkable. For 8 years he served as chairman of the schools and textbooks committee.

Under FRED SCHWENGEL's leadership the principle of State aid to education was first established. He led the fight for both general and supplemental aid for the schools of Iowa.

He led the fight for teacher security in Iowa.

He began the fight which took the superintendent of public instruction out of politics.

He fought for a better retirement system for schoolteachers in Iowa.

He fought for minimum salaries for teachers in Iowa.

FRED SCHWENGEL also fought for adequate funds for the State colleges and universities in Iowa.

The late Dr. Virgil Hancher, who served as president of the University of Iowa, has been quoted as saying, "Education in Iowa has had no better friend than FRED SCHWENGEL."

As a former member of the Iowa Legislature I can attest to the fact that FRED SCHWENGEL provided constructive and forward-looking leadership in education for Iowa. He has continued to provide that kind of leadership in the Congress.

Your Opinion, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for several years it has been my custom to take samplings of public opinion in my congressional district.

For each Member of the Congress, keeping aware of the thoughts and beliefs of his constituents is his foremost duty, yet it is not an easy one.

In addition to the thousands of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls I receive, I appreciate the opportunity for personal contact with the voters. Obviously, we cannot contact them all as frequently as we would like and the opinion poll is a useful supplement.

I have found such questionnaires to be helpful to me in measuring public interest and attitudes on important matters before the Congress. This year I am again asking for "Your Opinion, Please."

The Vietnam war affects the life of every American, and debate on what we should do becomes more widespread daily. Is this a time to "build bridges" with the Communist bloc? Should we recognize Red China? How should the Federal Government pay its bills?

It is hard to select the right questions on foreign and domestic policy and phrase them so the answer is not influenced by the question. I have tried to pick the best possible questions and, in addition, have also asked what the individual feels is our major problem today.

The replies will be tabulated, the results inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and a copy of the results sent to those who have been polled. Following are the questions I am asking this year:

DO YOU FAVOR

1. In Vietnam: (check one)
   (*a*) doing whatever necessary to win.
   (*b*) continuing present course.
   (*c*) holding present position and trying to negotiate.
   (*d*) withdrawal.
2. Increased trade with European Communist countries?
3. Recognizing and trading with Red China?
4. Federal Government meeting its expenses by: (check one)
   (*a*) Increasing Federal taxes.
   (*b*) Cutting domestic spending.
   (*c*) Deficit financing.
5. Sharing Federal tax revenues with States?
6. Developing nation-wide anti-missile defense system?
7. Continuing space program to land a man on the moon by 1970?
8. Individual income tax credits for higher education?
9. U.S. policy in the Middle East should be: (check one)
   (*a*) Direct military intervention.
   (*b*) Economic and political measures only.
   (*c*) Refer the matter to the United Nations.
   (*d*) Strict "Hands Off" policy.
10. What do you think is our major problem today? (check one)
   (*a*) Vietnam.
   (*b*) Crime.
   (*c*) Inflation.
   (*d*) Other _____

Buckeye Sugars Seed-to-Market Agricultural Program for El Salvador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the Congress is being asked to appropriate huge sums for foreign aid projects whose merits may not always be as clear as we could wish, the House will be pleased to hear of the imaginative new project developed by a company in my district for El Salvador called the seed-to-market program. The initial allocation for a positive program of agricultural development on behalf of our great Central American partner in the Alliance for Progress, El Salvador, is but $8,750 and deserving of attention and study. This self-help program could relieve us of the necessity for endless expenditures in this part of the world.

As conceived and presented by the management of Buckeye Sugars, Inc., of Ottwa, Ohio, I am told the seed-to-market project developed by the company in cooperation with our outstanding rural development officers in El Salvador and prepared for the U.S. AID mission there will:

First, train Central Americans in the complete spectrum of modern agricultural marketing; and

Second, demonstrate modern agricultural marketing processes to Salvadoran farmers.

I am advised the company plans to use a prototype plant already built with U.S. AID to help but never operated because of lack of competent supervision. It will also use lands owned by the school of agriculture of the Government of El Salvador to demonstrate methods of growing commodities for market, starting with the soil and carrying through the entire marketing process.

Technical personnel of Buckeye Sugars, Inc., will cover each phase of the pro-

gram with specialists. International Vice President John B. Coke is already in El Salvador, prepared to act as liaison officer and project administrator. President James A. Yuenger has just returned from a 6-week tour of planning and preparation in Central America.

The initial allocation of $8,750 has been formally requested by Buckeye Sugars, and I am informed approved by the USDA rural development officers in El Salvador, with enthusiasm. The Minister of Agriculture and the superintendent of the school of agriculture have made their formal request for this project to U.S. AID/El Salvador. The initial sum is to be used to structure the entire 3-year program, prepare cost estimates, and provide preliminary estimates of project requirements for personnel and equipment. In order to meet budgetary deadlines of the Government of El Salvador, this initial fund will have to be allocated at an early date.

When Is a Drug Handbook Not a Handy Book?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a book entitled "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs," written by Dr. Richard Burack, has been referred to in connection with the current drug hearings being conducted by the Monopoly Subcommittee, Select Committee on Small Business. This "handbook" includes what purports to be a list of approved drug suppliers for the Armed Forces. Since this conflicts with my own understanding of the Defense Department's procurement program, I initiated an inquiry with the Defense Supply Agency. In response to my inquiry, the Defense Supply Agency suggests that "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs" is usually not a very handy book at all. Both letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1967.

MR. HAROLD J. MARGULIS,
Acting Deputy Executive Director, Procurement and Production, Defense Supply Agency, Alexandria, Va.

DEAR MR. MARGULIS: A book intitled "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs" by a Dr. Richard Burack, has come to my attention. I understand it has been published during the past few days. In it, the author has provided what purports to be a list of *approved* drug suppliers for the Armed Forces. I am enclosing a copy of the pertinent pages.

It has been my understanding that your organization does not, in fact, have an "approved" drug bidders list, as such. From previous inquiries, I have learned that eligibility to enter bids for drug contracts is determined in each instance, in which bids are sought, I am, therefore, at a loss to understand the assertion by Dr. Burack, and the list which purports to be "official", and will appreciate your prompt clarification of the matter for me.

In addition, I would be grateful if you would, in looking over the enclosure, check to see whether the firms named have in fact been either qualified or disqualified, to bid on any Defense contracts in the past two years.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Committee on Armed Services.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY,
Alexandria, Va., May 18, 1967.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALL: In reply to your letter of 2 May 1967, your understanding is correct, in that the Defense Personnel Support Center, which purchases medical material for the Armed Forces, does not maintain a list of approved drug suppliers. It is noted that the list of firms appearing in "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs" is similar to the bidders mailing list which was furnished to Senator Gaylord Nelson, Chairman, Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business in September 1966. It is noted that Dr. Burack states in his book that the list he used was supplied by a member of the staff of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

In furnishing the bidders list to Senator Nelson, it was clearly pointed out that the inclusion of a firm's name on the list denotes only that the company is a potential bidder for one or more items of drugs and medicines, and that in accordance with the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation (ASPR) 1-902, responsibility of a firm with respect to any individual contract is established at the time the contract is placed. To further clarify this point, eligibility to bid does not constitute eligibility to receive a contract award.

Unless a firm has been debarred, suspended or determined ineligible in accordance with ASPR Section 1, Part 6, any drug firm may request inclusion on the bidders list and receive solicitations when they are published. A review of the firms listed in Dr. Burack's book does not indicate that any have been debarred, suspended or determined ineligible to bid.

Maj. Gen. EARL C. HEDLUND,
U.S. Air Force,
Deputy Director.

Fino Introduces Bill To Keep Lindsay From Harassing Small Homeowners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Federal housing law to block Mayor Lindsay and Buildings Commissioner Moerdler from implementing their gestapolike plans to inspect one- and two-family homes while slums fester.

Recently, the Lindsay administration has decided to revise the New York City housing and maintenance code to require inspection of one- and two-family homes. According to Lindsay and Moerdler, this action is necessary before New York City can continue to receive housing code enforcement grants from the Federal Government.

The amount in question is not $75,000,000, as the city claims, but at most a few million dollars. The $75 million figure is the Federal sum available for code enforcement throughout the entire United States. New York will only be able to qualify for a few million at best. As a matter of fact, New York City—under the Lindsay administration at least—has been so reckless with code enforcement and urban renewal funds that it has already used up its fiscal year 1967 allocation and is now tapping a safety-valve fund. Because of this extravagance, HUD—the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development—will not approve any more code enforcement or other New York urban renewal project applications until after July 1, 1967.

HUD Secretary Weaver, in construing the intent of Congress in enacting the appropriate Federal legislation, has recently—in a May 4 statement—denied any intent to have the code enforcement program applied to one- and two-family homes in New York. The Secretary's exact words are as follows:

> We would, therefore, expect that enforcement of a housing code in a city such as New York would be concentrated on the types of structures where violations are most frequent and detrimental to the health and safety of occupants. Normally, this would not be the single and two family structures.

Obviously, the Lindsay administration attempt to blame the Federal Government for Lindsay-planned household harassment is a phony. Only a few million dollars are involved, and besides which, HUD has indicated its flexibility interest in emphasizing multiple unit dwelling code enforcement. In line with Secretary Weaver's statement, I have drafted legislation to exclude one- and two-family homes from required inclusion in code enforcement programs receiving Federal subsidy. This way, Mayor Lindsay could no longer claim that he was taking his actions because of Federal requirements.

Of course the real reason for the Lindsay-Moerdler plan is the power hunger of the incumbent city administration, which revels in the idea of this new leverage over the small homeowners of our city. Besides which, Lindsay will no doubt want 27 new deputy commissioners to plan, guide, and enforce the program, just as in his hospitals department proposal. My bill, however, which I intend to try to add to the upcoming omnibus housing bill—H.R. 8068—would keep Lindsay from harassing New York City small homeowners.

Representative Reid Reports on Illinois Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I sent to the people of

the 15th District of Illinois my third annual legislative questionnaire on issues facing the Congress. Once again, the enthusiastic response has been most gratifying; and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the results of this survey of my district, since I know these views will be of interest to other Members of Congress as well.

The following percentages are based on approximately 30,000 opinions of those responding. In summary, it will be noted that a large majority favored a more positive "win" policy in Vietnam, a tax-sharing plan to return certain revenues to the States without Federal controls, the rescinding of controversial Supreme Court rulings which limit police interrogation of suspects and the use of confessions in criminal trials, and 2 years of military or civilian service for all young men. On the other hand, a substantial majority did not approve of the President's proposal to expand trade with the Communist nations of East Europe, Federal restrictions prohibiting discrimination in the sale or rental of housing, an increase in Federal income taxes, and replacing the present draft system with a national lottery plan. Then, too, a large majority expressed concern that our foreign aid program has not been effective, and that the war on poverty has not been achieving expected results. The only question on which those responding seemed to be about evenly divided was regarding the placing of Federal restrictions on the sale of firearms.

The complete tabulation is as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No answer
1. Vietnam: Listed below are some of the alternative courses of action being discussed. Which do you favor? [1]			
(a) Continue the administration's present policy	11.6		
(b) Expand efforts to win the war, including stepped-up bombing of strategic targets, supply routes, and quarantine of Haiphong Harbor	81.2		
(c) Stop bombing without prior commitment from North Vietnam that infiltration of men and weapons into South Vietnam will cease	3.3		1.8
(d) Withdraw our military forces to small coastal enclaves for purely defensive action	3.4		
(e) Complete withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam	7.3		
2. Do you approve of the President's request for a further expansion of trade with Communist-bloc nations in East Europe?	25.2	70.4	4.4
3. Do you feel our foreign aid program has been effective?	13.1	78.8	8.1
4. Do you approve of the President's request for a Federal prohibition against racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing?	24.8	69.5	5.7
5. Do you favor the administration's proposal to impose a 6 percent surtax on all Federal income taxes?	8.1	87.7	4.2
6. Do you think that the majority of the war on poverty programs have been effective?	10.0	84.0	6.0
7. The President has asked for an additional $25,600,000,000 to finance poverty programs. Do you feel this amount is:			
(a) About right?	8.4		
(b) Not enough?	3.4		8.3
(c) Too much?	79.9		
8. Do you favor a tax-sharing plan which would return a certain percentage of Federal tax revenue to the States without Federal control?	69.4	23.1	7.5
9. Do you favor Federal restrictions on the sale of firearms?	50.4	46.1	3.5
10. Do you believe the Congress should take legislative action to counter Supreme Court rulings which limit police interrogation of suspects and the use of confessions in criminal trials?	80.1	16.0	3.9
11. Do you believe the present draft system should be replaced with a national lottery system?	32.2	57.1	10.7
12. Do you favor Secretary McNamara's proposal that all young men be drafted for 2 years of Federal military or civilian service?	54.0	40.1	5.9

[1] The total for this first question is more than 100 percent since some respondents selected more than 1 choice.

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the committee on the Judiciary has been represented at every session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration since that international organization came into existence in 1951.

ICEM was founded as a result of the initiative taken by members of this committee and ever since the operations and activities have been scrutinized and evaluated by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The 27th council session of ICEM was of particular significance inasmuch as the paramount item on the agenda was a resolution offered by the United States calling for a review of ICEM's scope of activities. In the course of the debate on the resolution, the leadership position of the United States was challenged. I am proud to say that the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., speaking for himself and for the Honorable CLARK MACGREGOR, representing the committee, responded to this challenge and joined with U.S. representative, Ambassador James Wine, in clarifying the leadership of the United States. I know that the House will be interested in the remarks of Congressman RODINO and I am pleased to insert them in the RECORD at this time:

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

Mr. Chairman, it is always heartwarming for me to come here among you, the members of a Committee which I have learned to respect and admire for all the good it has been doing, and I thank you for the privilege of having been permitted to address this session of the Council and to make some pertinent observations.

Regretfully, the legislative schedule in Washington curtails my participation and that of my Congressional colleague, Representative Clark MacGregor, in this session's deliberations. However, we want to assure you that our limited visit here should not be construed in any way as a lessening of our interest in and dedication to the work of this fine Committee.

Within the framework of the United States Constitution, the Legislative branch of the Government shares with the Executive branch responsibility for United States participation in international organizations. Appropriate committees of the Congress have the power to recommend appropriations, authorize appropriations, and the obligation to see that they are enacted into law and spent in accordance with legislative intent. As a consequence of this responsibility, members of the committees on the Judiciary in both sides of the Congress have consistently attended ICEM sessions since this Committee was conceived over fifteen years ago. The visits to the Council sessions and the constant contact with ICEM activities, as well as consultations with United States delegations to ICEM form the basis for Congressional evaluation of Committee activities. The co-operative relationship between the Department of State and the Congressional Committees has resulted in a definite unity of purpose regarding the role of ICEM.

I come before you today to reaffirm first of all the interest of the Congressional delegation on behalf of all three of the basic, fully co-equal sectors of ICEM's activities: refugee resettlement, assistance for national migration, and development of Latin American programmes.

I am now as I have always been, convinced that there should be a *parity* and not a *priority* between the three authorized functions of ICEM. These functions must, in my judgment, be kept in proper balance.

Of course, recognizing that *within* each of the three basic sectors of ICEM's activities there are areas which may require urgent attention and thus receive a priority over another area which can be programmed over a longer period.

References were made last week to alleged, and I quote, "discrepancies" between the political support ICEM enjoys and financial contributions, often deemed to be inadequate. We personally have some difficulty in agreeing with that assessment or evaluation. One must discern between the political support which—as far as the United States is concerned—is *constant*, and I emphasize constant, and the financial support which may of necessity undergo fluctuations of a temporary nature. That constant support for reasons well determined inside and at the highest level of the United States' executive and legislative branches *is present* although exigencies of a *temporary* nature might cause temporary reductions in the financial support. The two elements, however, must not and should not be confused, but should, however, be recognized as facts which are subject to change, and hopefully I believe a change may come for the better in the not too distant future.

As one of my official duties I also serve as a member of the "Select Committee on Western Hemisphere Immigration", a committee which was established by the Immigration Act of 1965. This Committee, composed of members of the Senate, the House, and officials of the Executive branch, has great latitude within its mandate to review and study all aspects of migration relations between our good neighbours of Latin America and the United States. I intend to propose

at the next meeting of this Commission that a liaison be developed with ICEM so that there can be an exchange of ideas and knowledge.

The notable results of ICEM's Selective Migration Programme of Latin America are already known and I commend the Committee wholeheartedly for the increasing success in recruiting, transporting, and helping in the adjustment of skilled workers. This *"Brain Gain"* to Latin America is a threshold for a new economic era.

Mr. Chairman, I now reiterate the words of our Ambassador, the Delegate to this Committee. We came to this session hoping that the Council would adopt a resolution calling for a review of the scope of ICEM's activities. The proposed resolution had been well received in the Congress and was a predicate for renewed support by the appropriate committees. The thought prevailed that a review would focus attention on new techniques, greater collaboration and coordination between governments and between programmes.

Notwithstanding the will of the Executive Committee to defer a review resolution, we will, however, leave this session knowing, since I see the tenor, that the Member Governments had an opportunity to express their respective positions on this question; and we are understandably grateful that the Administration of ICEM will undertake a "self-analysis", if you please, which when completed will be made available to all Member Governments. We feel that this analysis will certainly be the basis for future judgment and evaluations.

We shall return to Washington impressed with what we witnessed here and shall report accordingly to our colleagues in the Congress.

Connecticut Firm Marks 50th Anniversary With Plant Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut has long been distinguished by the originality and inventiveness of its artisans. It holds a proud position in the economic history of the United States, especially in the manufacturing of machinery and machine tools. The products of Connecticut factories craftsmen make a very significant contribution to our defense effort, as well as to the continuing economic growth of this country and other nations of the world. It is, therefore, always a pleasure to note the growth and development of a Connecticut company and join with it in celebrating a significant milestone.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the J. C. Barton Co., of East Hampton, Conn., which manufactures tools and dies and performs all manner of special machine work. The town of East Hampton is located in my congressional district and is about 20 miles south of our State capital at Hartford. It is in close proximity to the largest natural lake in Connecticut, and can rightfully be called a "typical New England town." East Hampton is an excellent place to live and work, and a most enjoyable area to visit.

For over two centuries several East Hampton factories have manufactured many types of bells and this has given the town the well-deserved nickname of the "Belltown of the World." In 1917, Mr. J. C. Barton organized a company to serve the tooling needs of the bell industry, specializing in precision tool work, job manufacturing and, more particularly, the design and manufacture of progressive dies. This industry has continued to grow and thrive under the leadership of its current president, Mr. Edwin A. Barton. Today the firm specializes in the design and building of precision tooling used in the manufacture of intricate contoured parts.

On its 50th anniversary and as an indication of the firm's growth and prosperity, the J. C. Barton Co. has begun construction of a 30,000-square-foot addition to its main plant. I believe that this company typifies the smaller but highly efficient machine and tool builders of this country who play such an essential part in the industrial development and vitality of our Nation. I am pleased to extend my best wishes to this firm, its officers and all its employees on their golden anniversary. I wish for them continuing expansion and success in the years to come.

Communications Workers of America Scholarship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago it was my privilege to draw the names of the first winners in a new international scholarship program established by the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO, to honor the late Ray Hackney, a vice president of that union.

It was entirely appropriate that the Communications Workers set up a scholarship program as a living memorial to Ray Hackney, because he and the union he served so faithfully have long been dedicated to the cause of education for all.

Ray Hackney, whose memory the scholarship program honors, took the lead in strengthening our Nation's ties with the people of Latin America. He worked on behalf of his union and from his own strong convictions to foster education and training for those at home and abroad who might have gone without that education had it not been for the valiant efforts of CWA and Ray Hackney.

It is eminently fitting, then, that one of the scholarships established by his union went to a young man from a Latin American nation. The other to a high school graduate in this country who is the son of a CWA member.

At the ceremonies to select the scholarship winners, Joseph A Beirne, the president of CWA, who is an ardent advocate of education for all, declared:

> The only real threat to our democracy is the possible failure of our people to understand how it works.

This is not only true, but needs saying again and again. Our form of government is the best in the world—but it is also complex—and its complexity demands understanding.

There were several hundred applicants for the first Ray Hackney scholarships including a substantial number from Latin American countries. On their application form the young men and women who applied were asked to define their goal upon completion of their college work.

It was heartening for me and all the others present at CWA's selection ceremony to learn that so many of these young people want to enter the field of service to their fellow human beings.

An overwhelming proportion of the applicants—almost one-fourth of the entire 700—named teaching as their No. 1 choice.

The field of medicine came next on the list of preferences; then, international affairs, the Peace Corps, social welfare work, religion, government, politics, the law, research, engineering, the space program, the Armed Forces, the computer field, photography, other forms of art, and library work.

While I cannot name each of the choices, several intrigued me.

Two applicants wanted to study archeology. Three wished to go into the field of atomic science. Nine chose home economics. Four would like to study marine biology. One prefers wild life management. And one ambitious young applicant defined his goal as "to work to become president of CWA."

I am deeply impressed by the evident desire of these young men and women to make the most of an opportunity to go to college. Of major significance is the fact that so many of these young people want to go abroad and to work in the interest of humanity. And we should view with special interest, and seriously question, why none of these youngsters express a clear-cut interest in going into business.

All of us know that many substantial scholarships are available. I single this one out for special mention today because it represents a major effort by a major union to provide educational opportunities for those who might otherwise have been deprived of a chance that might some day make a significant impact on our world and times.

For making this opportunity possible, I salute CWA, its officers and its membership. I wish fervently that more groups were as devoted so completely to the cause of democracy and equality of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the survey conducted by the CWA is tremendously interesting in that it gives us a good idea of what young Americans desire in the way of a career.

The list follows and indicates the number of youngsters who selected each category:

Teaching	137
Uncertain	90
Medicine	66

Travel	52
Peace Corps	28
Welfare (social)	20
Research engineer	20
Electric engineer	16
Business administration	14
Law	13
Armed Forces	11
Accounting	10
Home economics	9
Research chemist	8
Writing	8
Computers	8
Space program	7
Music	7
Veterinary medicine	7
Journalism	7
Medical missionary	6
Government	6
Telephone work	6
Secretarial	6
Architect	6
Politics	5
Airline stewardess	5
Artist	5
Airline pilot	4
Ministry	4
Merchandising	4
Marine biology	4
Television (broadcasting)	3
Atomic energy program	3
Languages	3
Archeology	2
Wild life management	2
FBI	2
Play sports	2
Advertising	2
Librarian	2
Public relations	1
Bell laboratories	1
Priesthood	1
Build golf courses	1
Fashion design	1
Repeal 14(b)	1
Construction	1
Ranching	1
Automotive design	1
Insurance	1
Photography	1
President of CWA	1
Crime research	1

Medicare Should Include the Cost of Medicines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of the original Medicare Act, I have been extremely interested in following the development of the administration of this act. Medicare has enabled our older citizens to face their retirement years secure in the knowledge that if they should contract serious or prolonged illness their life savings will not be lost, that they will not become a burden to their friends and relatives, or become wards of the State.

This law offers incalculable peace of mind and security to those who have worked hard to make this country what it is today. Illness is never a pleasant occurrence, but when it strikes the aged and is combined with the prospect of creating financial obligations which can never be met, then it becomes unbearable.

The signing of the Medicare Act represented the culmination of years of hard work, determination, and frustrating debates. It was the realization of the dream of all those who had sought to eliminate the specter of financial destitution, because of medical expenses facing our older citizens. Medicare has been hailed by many as a declaration of independence for the aged against the threat of economic ruin from sickness.

In spite of the great promise which medicare offers, however, there remains one important area not covered by the original legislation. This is the inclusion of the cost of prescription drugs, which for many of the aged and chronically ill may represent a substantial portion of their medical expenses. Persons over 65 pay about $700 million for prescription drugs each year. Many times those who can least afford drugs often need them most. For instance, 86 percent of the elderly people living on annual incomes of $2,000 or less suffer from chronic illnesses. Thus, in the absence of assistance in the payment of drugs prescribed by physicians, the present Medicare Act may be inadequate to help those most in need.

In order to further extend and improve the medicare program, and allow it to fulfill the original purpose of protecting our aged from the anguish and financial ruin of illness, I am introducing a bill to include the cost of drugs requiring a doctor's prescription under the provisions of the Medicare Act. The need for congressional action has been widely recognized and endorsed. President George Meany of the AFL–CIO recently stated before the House Ways and Means Committee that labor union health centers dealing directly with retired workers, "express concern over the large number of the aged who have chronic diseases, requiring the continuous use of expensive prescription drugs, which they really cannot afford to buy."

Mr. Walter J. Sheerin, executive director of the New York Labor-Management Council of Health and Welfare Plans, Inc., speaking before the House Ways and Means Committee, said:

> Most of the aged have chronic ailments that do not require hospitalization, but require continuous use of expensive drugs. This financial burden is borne by the aged. Medicare should round out its program by filling this great need of providing drug prescription coverage.

In a statement before the same committee, Dr. Charles I. Schottland, president-elect of the National Association of Social Workers, pointed out as follows:

> Prescription drugs take about 18 cents out of every consumer dollar for medical care services. When one considers the serious limitations on incomes of the aged, it becomes evident that their health is being harmed by not having such a benefit as part of the program. Studies over the years have shown that very substantial numbers of physician prescriptions remain unfilled largely because of the costs involved. If it is the intent of Congress to approach comprehensiveness of health care for the elderly, as we believe it is, payment for prescription drugs cannot continue to be an exclusion.

The legislation which I have introduced will help stimulate the drug industry, as well as generate additional business for pharmacists. Our entire older population, which requires drugs in such large volume, will be able to purchase the medication they need. The pharmacist will be able to collect his professional fee, the drug industry will benefit from the larger demand, and most important of all, our older citizens will receive the medicines to ease their pain and suffering and allow them to spend their retired years in the best possible health.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the years to come the Medicare Act will prove to be one of the greatest legislative accomplishments in the history of Congress and of the Nation. The humanitarian goals that it will achieve and the mental well-being and security that it will give our older citizens, will provide our Nation with an even more durable foundation on which to go forward to meet the many challenges of the future. However, in order to secure these ideals, we must complete the job and bring the payment of prescription drugs for our older citizens under the provisions of the Medicare Act.

Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the 25th anniversary observance of Zionist Day in Birmingham, Ala., this past weekend, and I am taking the privilege today of including in the RECORD my remarks to that fine organization.

I should like to point out that one seldom meets so thoroughly dedicated a group as it was my pleasure to associate with over the weekend in Birmingham. The officers of the Birmingham District, ZOA, are Charles Kimerling, president; Max Slaughter, vice president; Norman Niren, secretary; Morris Fisher, treasurer, and Mr. Harry Jaffe, who handled the arrangements for my visit to Birmingham.

My remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI AT THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA DINNER IN BIRMINGHAM, ALA., SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1967

Not long ago, Reinhold Niebuhr spoke to each of us when he said, "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy *necessary.*"

We stand here tonight in the name of freedom.

We stand here tonight in a moment of great irony for the world. For as the world pays tribute to the 19th Anniversary of the Independence of Israel, her very sovereignty and existence are being more seriously threatened today than ever before in the past two decades.

For Israel today—despite 19 years of incessant and unyielding harassment by her warring neighbors is not only a free state—Israel is also an ideal.

Nothing is more irresistible than an idea whose time has come.

Ideas, toiling up throughout the centuries leave few milestones by the road.

History remembers, and gratefully, Pericles and the assembly at Athens which traced outlines of beauty.

History remembers Justinian and his code for the idea that law has majesty in itself. For law is the crystallized conscience of man.

History remembers the meadow at Runnymede; the birth of the Magna Carta which freed man from fear of the state.

History remembers the Constitutional Convention; The Bill of Rights—and for years to come, it must remember the rebirth of conscience 19 years ago when the world restored to the Jewish people their homeland and gave a new dimension to human dignity.

Today, as that rebirth of conscience is being seriously threatened in the attacks on Israel by the Arab states, we as Americans and, yes, the entire free world, must recall the firm commitments made toward the principle that an attack against Israel is an attack against freedom itself.

We must recall the words of President Johnson when on August 2, 1966, during the Washington visit of Israeli President Shazar, the President said, "We subscribe to the policy stated by President Kennedy on May 6, 1963, that we support the security of both Israel and her neighbors and we strongly oppose the use of force in the Near East."

We must resolutely recall this same principle enunciated by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on January 5, 1957.

History demands that we also recall the administration of President Truman, when America joined Britain and France in the Tri-Partite Declaration of 1950 which said in part:

"The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unaltered opposition to the use of force or threat of force by any of the states in the area of the Middle East."

If justice and reason are to prevail, we must also recall and remind the nations of the world that in 1956 the United States joined with the other nations of the world in endorsing the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations to send a United Nations peacekeeping force to Egypt.

The whole rationale of that deep-rooted resolution to preserve peace in the Middle East has been demolished with U Thant's hasty agreement to meet Egypt's demand that those same peace-keeping troops must be removed.

If man has any respect for justice, he must recall the impassioned plea of only a few days ago by Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol to Egypt that she pull back her troops from the border of Israel and Eshkol's solemn pledge that Israel would do the same.

Today as Israel's freedom is again threatened, America and the entire free world must use all resources at our command to impress upon Egypt the inherent dangers embodied in Egypt's demand for withdrawal of United Nations troops.

We must, above all, remind our own people here in the United States that the problem in the Middle East today is not a problem involving Israel alone. It would be a tragic mistake to treat this as a "Jewish problem" for, indeed, Israel today stands alone as the bastion in the Middle East against the Soviet Union's bold design to use the Middle East as the gateway for ultimate conquest by the communists of the entire continent of Africa.

It would be even a more tragic mistake to let Israel alone suffer the full brunt of her determination to check Soviet expansion. This is a task for the entire free world and not Israel alone.

We must firmly support President Johnson's unequivocal statement that the Gulf of Aqaba and the straits of Tiran are international water, open to all shipping, including Israeli, and that we shall never agree to any limitations on such shipping for, indeed, America's own national interest is vitally involved in preserving these troubled waters as international waters.

We must support whatever measures are necessary by the United States to impress upon the Egyptian government the dangers of miscalculating America's unyielding and unbending determination to preserve the sovereignty of Israel, which we helped to establish 19 years ago.

There is no more indisputable fact in the annals of civilization than the fact that every single major conflict started by man since the birth of civilization has been started by a miscalculation.

The most tragic miscalculation in the history of man was perpetuated by Hitler when he failed to understand that sooner or later America would come to the defense of freedom against this tyranny.

The lives of 6 million Jews tragically murdered for no other reason than their religious beliefs could have been spared; the great tragedy of World War II and the massive loss of lives on all sides; the destruction beyond a thousand hurricanes could have been spared if Hitler had not engaged in this monstrous miscalculation of the world's stubborn refusal to yield to tyranny.

Finally we must support the use of the full influence and leadership of the United States to halt continuous attacks on Israel and permit that Nation as well as all the nations in the Middle East to develop their resources in an atmosphere of peace and mutual understanding.

If freedom is to survive, the Middle East must not be permitted to become a holocaust of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

For, at the heart of that freedom is the belief that the individual man, the child of God, is the hallmark of value, and all society, all groups, the state itself, exist for his benefit.

The world's population now stands at more than 3.3 billion, double the figure of 1900.

At the present rate of growth, the human race will number 7 billion souls by the year 2,000.

Half of today's world population has been born since the end of World War II.

Of the children entering this life, 85% are born in the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The population of Latin America is tripling every 35 years.

Occupying 6% of the land area of the world and with less than 6% of the population, the United States accounts for one-third of the world's gross national product. Our future is inescapable and burdensome.

Of the world's children under 6 years of age, 70% suffer from malnutrition.

Currently, the world's population is receiving an average diet of 2,100 calories per person per day. By the year 2,000, this will drop to an average of 1,340 calories per person per day. Experts say the absolute starvation level is 1,350 calories per day.

Starvation in May of 1967 is killing an estimated 12,000 people each and every day—four million each year.

Two-thirds of the world's population lives in areas where the per capita income is $160 a year or less.

Forty-five per cent of the population of the world's poorest nations is under 15 years of age.

Horrifying statistics, you think, incredible. Unbelievable, perhaps. But chilling realities to men who have seen The Apocalypse.

Each of us here in this room is confronted with the vision of global problems on a scale so vast no man can hope to ignore them or hide from them.

Our right to express and communicate ideas; to set ourselves apart from the animals in the field and forest; to call governments to their duties and obligations; above all, our right to affirm our membership in society and to the man with whom we share the land and our children's future—all these constitute the very soul of freedom.

This distinguishing freedom of speech goes hand in hand with the power to be heard—to share in the decisions of government which shape men's lives.

The essential *humanity* of men can be protected and preserved only where government must answer, not just to those of a particular religion or a particular race, but to all its people.

Government and law are the armour and sword of individual rights. In our world at this moment, there are forces raging which can destroy forever the hopes of man for perpetuating life on this planet.

"To feed on the past is to bite the dust," Victor Hugo said. The world no longer has the space or the time for dreams of conquest and destruction, for old hatreds and ancient animosities.

Unless we begin anew to work with one another and for one another toward the common goal of survival, we face an extinction of our own making—all of us—poor, wealthy, overfed, underfed, philosopher, philanderer, beggar, and bureaucrat.

In our quest for stability and a lasting, genuine peace on this earth, we must reaffirm our need of idealism, high aspirations and deep convictions.

Honor cannot be a misplaced commodity in our world of modern technology.

There is no inconsistency between ideals and realistic possibilities. There is no separation between the deepest desires of heart and mind and the rational application of human effort in the solution of human problems.

Surely, one of the great examples of man's infinite capacity for growth is Israel itself.

In the 19 brief years since independence, Israel has confounded the cynics, amazed the nonbelievers, and captured the imagination and hearts of men of peace the world over.

Refusing to acknowledge the danger of futility—the belief there is nothing one man or woman can do against the enormous arsenal of the world's ills—the Israelis have set 2 goals for themselves; first of all, to survive; secondly, to insure the survival of Israel.

Each time a human being stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of another, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope to the farthest reaches of our planet.

For the past 2 decades, Israel's reverence for life, for freedom, for the infinite worth of all God's creations has blazed out across the world in waves of hope and light.

Today, this tiny nation is threatened by countries whose long tradition of grinding human souls to powder and sand has been documented through all the centuries of man's existence.

The leaders of what is known as the United Arab Republic, unable and unwilling to face the outrageous deprivation and poverty that characterize the Middle East today, have resorted to violence and threats of violence directed against Israel.

Armies have been mobilized, equipment moved, men and machines placed on alert along the border awaiting the signal.

And all of this to hide the futility of purpose, the total disregard for the impoverished millions who have suffered the unending vanities of conquerors.

Israel is *too* bright a hope, *too* significant an achievement to perish in the flames of war.

The people of Israel *care* too deeply for one another and for the land.

Their lives, however individually poverty-

stricken or difficult, have meaning and attainable goals.

In contrast, the nations of the United Arab Republic have been festering sores on the body of human progress for centuries.

Rather than face their responsibilities to their people, initiate meaningful improvements, and work with one another to harness the resources available to them to improve their conditions, they have chosen to destroy and to trample and to pillage the dreams of dignity which have become a triumphant reality in Israel.

In the current issue of Jewish Frontier, Abba Eban wrote:

"Our eyes are wide open to the barrenness of the Arab policy of enmity. So we offer neighboring peoples an alternative vision: a Middle East distinguished for its diversity, for its many centers of freedom, for a free and separate existence of different sovereignties, a region in which there will be a free ferment of disparate policies, a region whose varying vistas will, together, present a diversified mosaic and not a monolith . . .

"This stretch of earth in which the State of Israel dwells is limited in size, but it is graced by the wonderful attribute of centrality; it is the crossroads of continental communication.

"Israel can open up access to the Mediterranean for Jordan, develop joint resources with it, make a flow of men and goods possible all along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, from the river of Egypt to the north of Syria.

"In a word: In conditions of *hostility*, the Arab mind conceives of Israel as a barrier. In conditions of *peace*, Israel at once becomes a bridge."

My friends, I ask you to consider the wisdom and depth of humanity that would impel a man to reach out with such compassion and offer once more, in this dark hour, the open hand of friendship across thousands of years of bitterest prejudice and persecution, as Abba Eban did in this historic pronouncement.

No one who knows the tenacious heart of the Israeli can doubt he will defend to his last breath his right to stand on his own soil.

His courage is legendary; his skill as a soldier unsurpassed in all the armies of the world.

That is why Nasser and his fellow conspirators have so cruelly abdicated their responsibility to their own wretchedly-deprived countrymen, trusting that a war will unite their people.

Aesop said, "Any excuse will serve a tyrant." And Nasser has proved him correct.

For every 10 men who are willing to face the guns of an adversary, there is only one willing to brave the censure of his colleagues, the wrath of his society. Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence.

Yet it is the one essential, vital quality for those who seek to change a world which yields most painfully to change.

For the fractional fortunate among us there is comfort. There is a temptation to follow the easy and familiar paths of personal ambition and financial success so grandly spread before those who have the privilege of education.

But that is not the only road beckoning to us and it is not the only course marked for our nation.

There is a Chinese *curse* which says, "May he live in interesting times."

Like it or not, we live in interesting times—times of danger, uncertainty, threats of holocaust and pain.

But they are also times more open to the creative energy of men than any other time in history.

And everyone on this planet will ultimately be judged on the effort he has contributed toward building a more human world society—one which is less dependent on terror, more dependent on the gift of self.

I ask you to ponder just a moment. No one quite like you has ever lived before, nor will again. No one who looks just like you, who has exactly the same dreams, talents and aspirations. No one with quite your potential for making a particular mark in a particular field of endeavor.

Understand this great gift of life which is yours to use so freely, with so few restrictions. Understand it, be grateful for it, and *use* it. For you will never have another and your world has great need of you.

Each of us will be judged by the extent to which our ideals and goals have shaped the vision of man free of hunger, free of crippling ailments and death in childhood, free of ignorance and cruelty.

Man has that vision constantly before him. We *can* be what we aspire to be. The charisma of mind, heart and soul that is Israel today has instilled life to that shining miraculous vision.

Only the truly brave know how to forgive. When a man says of the affairs of state, "What does it matter to me?", the state may be given up for lost.

In these "interesting" times, we must strive, seek, find and never yield in our pursuit of the freedom which is each man's right.

I am unalterably opposed to Communism because it exalts the state over the individual and the family, and because of the lack of freedom of speech, of protest, of religion and of the press which is so characteristic of totalitarian states.

But the way of opposition to Communism is not to imitate its dictatorship. Rather it is to enlarge human freedom everywhere on the globe.

There are privileged minorities in every land who believe they serve the cause of that freedom by labeling as "communist" every threat to their privilege. But the denial of freedom only strengthens the very Communism it claims to oppose.

The United States, with its great wealth, great technology, has been called to exercise its influence and strength in Vietnam, in Cuba, in the Dominican Republic, in Korea—wherever the encroachments against self-determination threaten the security of those who desire to choose their own destiny.

We have not hesitated to use our measured strength in defense of liberty. We are fully prepared to assist in bringing stability and peace to the Middle East. We will never abandon Israel.

The rights of the small nations to survive unfettered shall not be forsaken by the United States—surely the most powerful nation in the history of the world.

And what *are* the United States and Israel but people—people who share a vision of what human existence could be. So long as that vision is bright for us, any sacrifice to obtain it for our brothers on this earth is a sacrifice well made.

Many years ago, a wise man wrote to his son: "Let me exhort you to do your utmost to think outside and beyond our present circle of ideas. For every idea gained is a hundred years of slavery remitted."

He might well have addressed each of us. Some time ago, I said our future was inescapable and burdensome. It needs the best of each man and woman and our response must be soon.

Down through our western peaks runs an invisible boundary known as the Great Divide. And down through the range of centuries, an invisible boundary has marred the progress and elevation of man.

Throughout these centuries working together, and believing fervently in their high ideals, the Jewish people have elevated man. In their stubborn defense of human dignity, they have helped mankind cross the Great Divide; they have charted man.

In order to understand why America is determined to defend our noble ally, Israel, we must understand the Jewish people themselves.

There may be some truth to the idea that Jews are like other people—only more so.

The tradition is that every Jewish generation worries and frets—with clucking affection—about the next one.

This deep concern of one Jewish generation over the next one is the mortar which has held these gallant people together.

In more than 4,000 years of unbroken continuity of a magnificent people have been constructed out of that affectionate worry by one Jewish generation over the next Jewish generation.

What a monumental source of pride it must be to a young Jew to know that in his veins flows the blood of a people who have endured and stubbornly survived 4,000 years of the most outrageous attempt to destroy their abiding faith in the glory of man.

Sooner or later every human being must ask himself: "Who am I?"

We didn't grow on a tree; we weren't carved from rock, we were born from man and as each generation of Jews looks upon his background he finds a glorious litany of forefathers who against odds which have destroyed weaker men, have withstood and survived in their tenacious belief in the dignity of man.

No race of human beings has written a prouder record of sacrifice that freedom may find its rich fulfillment in the human community.

The Zionist Organization of America, since its inception has been the catalyst which has brought this fantastic cultural wealth of the Jews into a meaningful form and today the ZOA continues to guide these resources into ever more meaningful service to humanity.

The ZOA has been the chief interpreter of the magnificence of Jewish culture and tradition which has given us these 4,000 years of unbroken continuity of the Jewish people.

Today more than ever before the ZOA needs your help for never before in its existence has this magnificent tradition of Jewish dignity been threatened.

Just as in Israel, where every man is a builder and every man is a defender of the land so throughout our land the ZOA has tried to impress upon not only the Jewish people but all Americans the brotherhood of men.

If the Jews are able today to make a significant contribution to our future generations and keep alive the rich tradition of their past, it is only because the ZOA lights the way.

It has been argued that the social freedom of American life is separating the Jewish youngster from the tradition of his people.

Those who would seek to blame this change on the American environment are, in truth, indicting the spirit of American freedom. For, in a free society, the Jewish community is free to do nothing. Free to wither. Free to disappear.

And the magnificence of a Jewish community in a free society is that it is free to be as vibrantly and creatively Jewish as it wants to be. Free to invest in its future. Free to encourage its youth to a mature awareness of the relevancy of the Jewish tradition in the modern world.

The very freedom of the choice poses the challenge.

There are a great number of Jews in this world who do not have the advantage of making this choice. I am speaking now of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

For the past several years, I have sponsored a resolution in the House of Representatives expressing the sense of Congress that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing per-

sons for alleged economic offenses and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

The Jewish youngster in our American society who is groping for some understanding of his Judaism is also, in a sense, cast into a bewildering world.

There is a Jewish consciousness in the Soviet Union today struggling to stay alive. There is a Jewish consciousness among our youth today, eager to be vibrant and alive, as well.

Against the onslaught of intransigent Communism, our task of preserving this rich Judaic cultural and philosophical inheritance becomes a matter of personal choice, a family decision, a community decision.

Perhaps the special satisfaction that is ours in America is the knowledge that we are seeking in some measure to be active participants in a great enterprise—that which Malachi defined as "turning the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers."

We are responding to a generation of questioning youth, of troubled youth, who are not blind to the great social and moral issues of our times.

We are also responding to a generation of sophisticated youth who want to determine for themselves just what are the modern values of Judaic tradition.

The depth of our response will determine the quality of the next generation.

Today as the whole world wonders can mankind survive; can a free Israel survive, can our rich tradition of freedom survive, yes, can we ourselves survive—let us remember an ancient Jewish philospher who wrote:

"When you have shut your doors, and darkened your room, remember never to say that you are alone, for you are not alone. God is within and your genius is within—and what need have *they* of light to see what you are doing?"

Congressman Horton's Stand on the Mideast Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with the House the remarks of our colleague, Congressman FRANK HORTON, concerning the current confrontation in the Middle East. Monday evening, May 29, Congressman HORTON addressed an emergency meeting of the Rochester, N.Y., Jewish Community Council. In a strong demonstration of concern for the situation, over 3,000 persons attended the Rochester meeting, which Mr. HORTON addressed via an amplified telephone hookup from Washington.

The text of his address follows:

I am grateful for the opportunity to address this gathering. Even from Washington, I can sense the urgency and uneasiness which pervades your meeting tonight. Since 10 days ago when I dispatched my wire to Ambassador Goldberg, I have shared your uneasiness about the explosive confrontation in the Mid-East.

I attended a noon State Department briefing on this situation in the Capitol this morning. To further arm myself for this report to you tonight, I had a special briefing this afternoon with a representative of Secretary Rusk, just as I have been briefed each day since the crisis began.

Let me begin by reviewing the background of this situation. During the past year, Israel's prestige has risen as the result of its punishing retaliation to Syrian and Jordanian terrorist raids. In the first encounter, an Israeli armored column leveled a Jordanian village which has been harboring terrorists who had harassed and killed residents of several Kibbutzim near the border. When the raids continued near the Sea of Galilee, the Israeli air force demonstrated its superiority by knocking out a large proportion of the Syrian jet-fighter force. In all of these actions, you will recall, Egypt's Nasser was conspicuously silent and inactive. With every Israeli triumph, Nasser's falling star in the Arab world fell lower. With serious economic troubles at home, and a vast army hopelessly engaged in Yemen, Mr. Nasser was a long way from accomplishing the leadership of the Arab world he had once envisioned for himself. Even his influence in Syria, once his staunch partner, was in serious question.

Then, in what appeared to be almost a last-ditch effort to renew his campaign for Arab leadership, Nasser precipitated the present crisis. He started innocently enough, maneuvering his own troops across the Sinai peninsula, within Egyptian territory. He followed this sabre-rattling move with what appeared to seasoned diplomats to be a propaganda-seeking demand for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force, which had been deployed along the Israel-Egyptian border since 1956.

To the shock and chagrin of every western, and many eastern capitals, Secretary-General U Thant responded to Nasser's bold demand by ordering the withdrawal of the once-effective peacemaking force, without so much as convening a meeting of the Security Council. Probably equally shocked at this spineless stand of the Secretary-General was Nasser himself. Suddenly he found himself with an unexpected and undeserved victory. At once he took control of Sharm el Sheikh, overlooking the Tiran Strait, and announced that he was closing the Gulf of Aqaba, calling it, in effect, an Egyptian lake. From near extinction as an Arab leader, Nasser had again propelled himself to the top of the heap.

His latest move yesterday was a more or less conciliatory statement in which he so generously offered to seek a non-military solution to the crisis he himself began—a solution which, of course, would leave his 2 strategic victories at the Gaza border and at the Gulf intact. In effect, the little boy has stolen the cookies, and he now generously offers to eat them without a fight.

The seizure and closing of the Gulf of Aqaba is clearly in violation of international waters, and as such, is a clear-cut act of aggression. The world is most fortunate that Israel's government has had the presence of mind to restrain any immediate military response to Nasser's aggression. But Israel will not and cannot long restrain itself if Nasser's moves become accepted as a desirable status quo. While President Johnson warned last week that our country views with seriousness this illegal seizure of international waters, it is important that Nasser's action be immediately and internationally branded as being what it is—out and out aggression. The time to save the Middle East from being engulfed by the flames of aggression is now, not after Arab aggressors light the torch.

After my briefing this afternoon, I dispatched a telegram to U Thant, urging that he lead the United Nations in placing full responsibility for this aggressive act on Egypt's shoulders. Further, I urged him to seek a settlement which would reinstate the status quo which existed prior to the departure of the United Nations Emergency Force—including the unconditional opening of the Gulf.

You and I know that Israel and other nations who stand by her can and will accept nothing less. The United Nations will not succeed in bringing peace to the Near East unless it firmly establishes as its goal the restoration of that status quo. I closed my telegram to U Thant with a plea that he establish a negotiating team composed of representatives of the great powers to achieve this settlement.

Each and every man and woman in this auditorium knows that I have left no stone unturned in my steadfast support for the United Nations in the Congress. I have repeatedly supported plans to beef-up the U.N.'s peacekeeping capabilities, and I have urged U.N. involvement in Southeast Asia. I watched with great interest reports of this afternoon's Security Council meeting on the Near East crisis. All of us hope for the rapid evolvement of an international solution to this crisis. But I could not support any so-called solution which left Mr. Nasser with carte blanche to control the Gulf of Aqaba and to terrorize Israel's south-western border, as he did prior to 1956.

Thus, while I hope for a U.N. solution to the problem, I in no sense favor "passing the buck" on this confrontation to the U.N., if it becomes obvious that U.N. efforts are doomed to failure.

So far, the performance of the United Nations in this crisis has been unpromising—the action by the Secretary General in pulling out the U.N. Emergency Force put the prestige and effectiveness of the U.N. at a new low.

But we cannot abandon the United Nations and the hope we have placed in it because of a single blunder by the Secretary General. Especially now that we are assured of at least some pause in the explosive crisis atmosphere, we must seek from the United Nations a meaningful route to settlement. We must give every chance to this international body to find a solution, at the same time that we make clear our opposition to any solution which would violate the territorial or political integrity of Israel.

You are all aware of the place Israel has in human history. She is a nation whose rate of growth and development—much of it aided by your own efforts and contributions—is unequalled in history. But even more than Israel's significance for Jewish people throughout the world is her significance to all of the world's underdeveloped nations. When I was in Jerusalem for the dedication of the Knesset last August, I was most impressed by the considerable representation of African nations at the dedication. These nations have seen in Israel the antithesis to the teachings of communist revolutionism. They have seen a nation with limited natural resources prosper through planned freedom and democracy. I would venture to say that Israel is one of the principal influences which has turned much of Africa against communist subversion.

The United States, much less the world, cannot afford to allow the sacrifice of this little country to the very forces she has helped to defeat on other continents.

Israel is also to be admired for the determination and strong patriotism of her people. Facing a situation where the blood of countrymen may be spilled, the Israeli's are not deserting the stand of their government. Even those who found themselves out of the country when the crisis began have flocked back to bolster the homeland. This is indeed a lesson in patriotism which other nations might do well to follow.

Let me end this telephone message just as I ended my telegram to Ambassador Goldberg last week:

"Our government has a dual responsibility in this crisis: The protection of Israel

and its people through the United Nations from aggression, and the protection of American lives and vital U.S. and free world interests in the Middle East."

Your own Rabbi Bernstein, a frequent visitor to Israel, will tell you that she is the best representative of freedom in that sector of the world. Our government so far has played a major role in preventing the crushing of Israel in this crisis. A few days ago, I joined 109 other Congressmen in signing a declaration of support for Israel in this situation. With this kind of determination, and with people like yourselves showing concern for the safety of Israel, I think we can look for continued American guarantees of the political and territorial integrity of that nation.

Freedom Sanctuaries in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to address a gathering of my constituents who assembled in the Union Ridge Cemetery in my district, which is one of the burial grounds for Civil War soldiers.

I took the opportunity on this solemn occasion to review with my constituents the situation that confronts the United States at a time when the world is experiencing one of its most serious crises.

I had proposed during my remarks at the cemetery that the United States must make a very hard reappraisal of our military strategy in Vietnam because of America's widespread other commitments throughout the world.

All of us want to see the day when peace with justice and honor will be established in Vietnam.

But the question that we Americans have to ask ourselves at this time is: Can we follow the basic strategy that we have laid out in Vietnam and still meet our other commitments in the world, or is there a more effective way of achieving our basic mission in Vietnam and still be able to maintain our position of leadership throughout the world?

One of the problems that has disturbed me enormously is the fact that our American soldiers are suffering increasing casualties in their seek-and-destory mission into the jungles and swamps of South Vietnam and every time they have the enemy on the run, our enemy slips across the border into either Cambodia or Laos.

These are the conditions under which we are trying to win the war in Vietnam, while our problems all over the world continue to escalate.

There is no question in my mind that while we continue our effort in Vietnam the Communists are starting a series of provocations in other parts of the world and there is no question the Communists are counting on the fact that because of America's involvement in Vietnam we will not be able to effectively stop Communist aggression in other parts of the world.

Thus, it appears to me, that we could continue our present tactics in South Vietnam if, indeed, South Vietnam was our only problem. But with the fantastic proliferation of problems throughout the world, I have suggested a series of new concepts to give America greater flexibility in dealing with these global problems instead of permitting ourselves to be totally bogged down in Vietnam.

I regret that some of the press has interpreted my remarks as changing from my hawklike position in strong support of the President, to a dovelike position.

I have made it very clear that I continue to stand firmly behind the President's determination to bring freedom to the people of South Vietnam, and I strongly support the President in his decisions.

Those who would suggest that my proposals are a shift to a dove position would find little comfort in reading my remarks to sustain their erroneous conclusion. On the contrary, if men are to be labeled, I would say that in proposing alternative solutions to win in Vietnam, I have now become a falcon which is, after all, the most courageous and the most noble of the hawk family.

While I am mindful, Mr. Speaker, that the seek-and-destroy missions do develop a great deal of intelligence for our forces in Vietnam, we, as Americans, must weigh the relativity of all these factors in terms of global needs for American assistance instead of judging them only in terms of what such missions mean in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks delivered in Chicago at Memorial Day services at Union Ridge Cemetery follow:

FREEDOM SANCTUARIES IN SOUTH VIETNAM

I can't think of anything more tragic than to withdraw our troops from Vietnam.

If we were to falter in South Vietnam and fail that little nation's plea for help to retain freedom, the Communists would stage similar "South Vietnam's" in 73 nations of Asia, Africa and South America.

But our commitment to the elusive doctrine of total victory in South Vietnam has cost us 10,000 American lives and has kept all of our resources bogged down in Southeast Asia while the Communists play their options to the fullest in the Middle East; in Cuba, in Korea, in the Sea of Japan and other places where American leadership has suffered because of our total involvement in South Vietnam.

Our forces today securely control the most essential urban and agricultural areas of South Vietnam.

Our basic mission in South Vietnam can now be considered overwhelmingly successful.

When the South Vietnamese first asked us for help, their country was on the verge of total collapse to the Communists.

No village was safe; the government was impotent as a democratic institution and had to rely on the discipline of a dictatorship; her economy was on the brink of total collapse and the Communists were confidently counting the days when the key to Southeast Asia would be totally theirs.

Contrast those bitter days of defeat with the South Vietnam of today when 455,000 American soldiers have helped turn South Vietnam into a land of confident hope for freedom in our time.

South Vietnam, even though it is engaged in a bitter war, has been able to hold elections in which 86% of the population participated to elect a constitutional assembly which has written a doctrine of freedom for its people.

This September a constitutionally elected government will govern this tiny war-torn country; her economy is sound and thriving; her educational system has been restored; two weeks ago free elections for local officials have been held in 1600 villages, and finally, in village after village, the U.S. pacification program is instilling principles of democracy among her people.

I believe the time has come for us to declare ourselves the victor in South Vietnam and use all of our resources—including more American troops if necessary—to establish these hard-won territories as freedom sanctuaries.

There is still a great deal of trouble ahead and one would be naive to fail to recognize the continuing threat to South Vietnam's new won freedom in village after village.

But I would like to suggest that our administration seriously consider using our 455,000 troops in Vietnam along with South Vietnam's 600,000 troops to secure those areas now solidly in allied hands and concentrate on the pacification program in those areas leaving the rest of South Vietnam to the throes of normal attrition among the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops.

I was in Vietnam twenty months ago and already then it seemed to me that allied troops had possession of the best parts of South Vietnam.

I found a great deal of irony in the fact that in some parts of Vietnam our troops were defending huge French rubber plantations whose owners were secure in the comforts of Paris supporting Charles de Gaulle in his attacks on the United States.

I seriously question whether much more can be gained by using our troops and suffering losses in the jungles of Vietnam which are of little strategic or military use to our side serving only as regrouping areas for the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops.

I would suggest we concentrate our troops in a perimeter of defense around the cities and those fertile rural areas now in our possession, then to use our huge resources at great losses to chase the Communists through the jungle.

In other words, I believe we should force the Communists to come to our areas where we can see them and destroy them instead of wasting vast American resources on seek and destroy missions in the hopeless jungles and swamp of South Vietnam.

By firmly securing those areas in our possession and developing their resources, I believe we can afford the risk of suspending the bombing raids over North Vietnam and put the full burden of finding peace in that troubled country on the back of Secretary General U Thant and the United Nations. He has said repeatedly he can find peace if we stop the bombings. Let's test his ability by giving him that chance.

Watching the fiasco of the United Nations in relationship to its withdrawal of peacekeeping troops in the Middle East, I believe the United States should serve notice on the United Nations that if it fails to find a just peace in Vietnam after we have ceased the bombings, the United States should seriously consider withdrawing from the U.N.

We should not fear that by protecting selected "freedom sanctuaries" in South Vietnam—we will somehow lessen our stature and prestige throughout the world.

On the contrary, history throughout the 20th century shows that partial victory has been achieved more often than total military victory in 10 out of 14 major wars in our time.

Since the turn of the century, the following wars have been resolved by partial victory rather than through total victory by one side or the other:

1. Russo-Japanese War, 1904–1905.
2. The First Balkan War, 1912–1913.

3. The Second Balkan War, June 29–July 30, 1913.
4. Soviet-Polish War, April 25, 1920–October 12, 1920.
5. Kashmir War, October, 1947–January 1949.
6. War in Indochina, 1948–1954.
7. Korean War, 1950–1953.
8. Laos, (Intermittent civil war since c. 1953).
9. Somalia-Ethiopian War, 1964.
10. India-Pakistani War, 1965.

In the Russo-Japanese war both sides could have continued fighting, but the war had reached a point of diminishing returns for both sides. The same could probably be said for virtually all the wars cited above; the disputants could have fought to a point of exhaustion of one side, of the other, or of both; but for reasons of national interest opted for other solutions.

I firmly believe that by securing "freedom sanctuaries" and developing democratic principles in those areas of South Vietnam which are now actually holding elections, we can show the Viet Cong the futility of their cause and more important, we can address ourselves to the role of leadership in the many other trouble spots in the world which can become the seeds of World War III if they are not checked through effective American leadership.

Man has never suffered a greater waste of human resources than war.

We as a free people owe it to the men and women we honor today to us all of our resources, all of our ingenuity, all of our military strength, and yes, all of our belief in the nobility and dignity of freedom to find effective alternatives to armed conflict.

Ho Chi Minh once said that Americans do not like long wars. He said he intends to make the war in Vietnam a long one and thus win it.

I submit we must *not* give him this opportunity.

While I am fully mindful that tyranny and subversion continue in many parts of South Vietnam, I believe we have won enough of the important territory to force Ho Chi Minh into a stalemate in South Vietnam on our terms and those terms are to secure those areas we now hold and let them flourish under freedom while we demonstrate to the rest of the country that Communism has no more to offer in South Vietnam than it has offered the rest of the Communist world.

We might as well recognize that in Vietnam, just as in Korea, there will be no ticker tape parade down Wall Street or La Salle Street marking the end of the war.

Hereafter, man's conflicts will not end in formal total surrenders and the sooner we recognize this the sooner we can win partial but important victories in defense of freedom.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou has been our dwelling place in all generations.

For a thousand years, in Thy sight, are but as yesterday, when it is past and as a watch in the night, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants and Thy glory unto Thy children.

And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us: Yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it.

In spite of all the evil that stalks the earth, we thank Thee for human kindness, for hope that shines undimmed, for faith that is dauntless, and for all the qualities of high personality that cannot be bought.

Steel our wills and steady our hands with power, and wisdom, that with eager joy we may dedicate the Nation's strength to throw open the gates of a new life for Thy children everywhere.

As here we face the questions which confront us, and almost confound us, give us to know clearly the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of the world in righteousness and justice.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 31, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON DONATION OF CERTAIN SURPLUS PROPERTY TO THE NATIONAL RAILWAY HISTORICAL SOCIETY, GREENVILLE, N.C.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed donation of certain surplus property to the East Carolina Chapter, Inc., National Railway Historical Society, Greenville, N.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROJECT TO BE UNDERTAKEN FOR NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVES

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on a project to be undertaken for the Naval Reserve Training Center, Ft. McHenry, Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Hydroelectric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1965" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Implied Consent Law for the District of Columbia" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO COLLECTION OF USER CHARGES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize the collection of user charges, to permit any charges for customs services to be collected on a fixed rate of charge basis, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on opportunities for reducing interest costs on refunds attributable to net operating loss deductions, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department, dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of inspection con-