

premiums, and second to attempt to discourage new construction in areas in high flood probability rates.

My colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has suggested that a nationwide earthquake insurance program be included in this program. This is a sensible proposal. The 1964 Good Friday earthquake devastated many cities and communities in Alaska. Homes were destroyed, businesses were ruined. Public facilities were made inoperable. More than \$350 million restorative Federal aid dollars were spent to help Alaska rebuild.

Inclusion of an earthquake insurance program in the bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes, would make possible a more orderly recovery following a natural disaster. The partnership of the Federal Government and private industry would facilitate the recuperation of a stricken area. Few insurance companies underwrite earthquake insurance; and where coverage is available, the premiums are so high that the insurance is prohibitive. I am now making a study of earthquake insurance costs.

Private property owners should have an opportunity to purchase earthquake insurance protection—at a reasonable rate—for their possessions.

I have long supported the concept of flood and earthquake insurance programs and will continue to do so, and commend my colleagues for their perseverance.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the adjournment of the Senate this evening until noon tomorrow, the Secretary of the Senate be permitted to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the Vice President, the President pro tempore and the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 18, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 17, 1967:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1967 (reappointment).

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Lawrence C. McQuade, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Richard B. Kellam, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Virginia to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

John A. MacKenzie, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Virginia to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

Robert R. Merhige, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, vice John D. Butzner, Jr., elevated.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 17, 1967:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Simon F. McHugh, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring April 9, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 17, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Ephesians 6: 10.

O Thou whose spirit is truth and whose heart is love, we would bring our little lives to Thy greatness, our weakness to Thy strength, and our ill will to Thy never failing good will. As flowers open to the sun, as children turn to their parents in moments of need, so we come lifting our seeking souls unto Thee praying that we may feel about us the power of Thy life and the peace of Thy love.

We pray for our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this body. With pressures which tax their resources to the utmost, with duties which demand their attention and absorb their time, with criticisms which come from minds that do not understand, may our people begin to think of these men and women more and more with sympathetic hearts, understanding minds, and supporting spirits; and less and less with provincial prejudices, fruitless fault finding, and carping criticisms.

So we, the leaders of our people, bow before the altar of Thy presence and pray for a greatness of spirit, a purity of heart, and a will to serve Thee and our country with all our being. In the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 13, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10509. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 10509) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1320) entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes," request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. FONG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 25. An act to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during this legislative day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object; as a matter of fact, I wholeheartedly concur with the unanimous-consent request made by the distinguished majority leader—I would like to ask the majority leader, if this request is granted, it is only for the purpose of reconvening the House for the purpose of consideration of any legislation concerned with the railroad situation?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for the purpose of answering his question, the gentleman has properly stated the situation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT REFORM

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous constant 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce my support of H.R. 4769, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the bill on agricultural employment reform introduced by our colleague the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA]. I also wish to commend and support Secretary of Labor Wirtz for his strong stand on this legislation.

Recent extreme abuses of Texas farmworkers who have been attempting to organize a union, crystallize the need to bring all such U.S. employees working on large food and fiber agricultural complexes under the protective provisions of H.R. 4769.

Many farmworkers in the United States today are like disinherited inmates, stranded on an island of poverty, surrounded on all sides by an ocean of plenty. For 30 years, while other sectors of America have made startling progress, largely through the pioneering efforts of labor unions, farmworkers have been left behind—denied such basic rights as social security, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, minimum wage, and membership in unions.

Farm laborers are currently being paid wages as low as 45 cents an hour, while many other laborers and tradesmen receive tenfold the amount. Who can possibly live in human decency at this shameful wage? This is the time to set right a great wrong and erase the blight that has crippled many of our deserving citizens for so long. I urge Congress to pass H.R. 4769 with dispatch and at the earliest possible date.

UNITED STATES CONTINUES TRAINING OF PERSONNEL FROM ANTAGONISTIC NATIONS

Mr. WOLFF. 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. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly disturbed by a report in Sunday's Washington Star that the United States has continued to train pilots and ground personnel from the Air Forces of Saudia Arabia, Jordan, Morocco, and the Sudan despite the anti-American posture taken by these nations during the recent Middle East crisis. The continued training of military personnel from these countries is a wanton and inexcusable disregard of our national security. These countries are being supported militarily by Russia. Our continued training of personnel from these countries provides nations antagonistic to the United States with access to confidential military information. Aiding and abetting one's adversaries is foolhardy, irresponsible, and unjustifiable. An explanation of this policy by the Sec-

retary of Defense must be sought and an end to such practices must be secured.

[From the Washington Star, July 16, 1967]

USAF TRAINING ARAB AIRMEN, MAJOR CONFIRMS

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—The Air Force Air Training Command has confirmed that pilots and ground personnel from Arab countries are being trained here under the military assistance program.

The announcement, first made public in an article in Aviation Week magazine, was reiterated Friday by Maj. Paul C. Holter, information officer with Air Training Command at Randolph Air Force Base.

Under the program, pilots and ground personnel from Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Morocco and the Sudan are receiving flying and technical training at Air Force training installations throughout the nation, including Randolph and Lackland bases here, and bases in Wichita Falls and Amarillo, Tex., and in Colorado, and Illinois.

Holter said no directives or orders have been issued to suspend such training, in light of recent Middle East hostilities, and "business is proceeding as usual," with training in technical fields as well as flying.

U.S. POLICY IN AFRICA

Mr. GUDE. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, last week, 54 of my Republican colleagues sent a letter to the President, which I feel pinpoints a great deficiency in our foreign policy. There seems to be an unexplained reluctance on the part of the administration to fill key diplomatic positions in Africa. The danger of such a course is evident. The Arab-Israel crisis and the Congo incident make it both more apparent and imperative that we maintain active diplomatic relations with all the recognized nations of the world.

I would like to commend my colleagues for their initiative and to read the letter to all Members of this body.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We would like to bring to your attention that there are no less than nine United States Ambassadorial vacancies in the African countries south of the Sahara—and to urge you to nominate envoys for these posts at the earliest possible moment.

Recent events in the Congo underscore a continuing difficulty in United States foreign policy: Policy is conducted in a crisis atmosphere in which we seem always to be responding to events rather than anticipating them. In some measure this reflects a failure to maintain progressive relations with the African States in order to shape the future rather than merely to await it. The unfortunate tendency to avoid filling Ambassadorial posts when they become vacant is a symptom of this policy failure.

Maintenance of stability in Africa requires constant attention at the highest levels of United States government, which in turn requires high level diplomatic representatives on the scene. The continuing danger in the policies of South Africa, the perils inherent in the situation in Rhodesia, the hostilities in Nigeria, the reports of activist Soviet and Chinese Communist diplomacy in Africa, as well as events in the Congo all attest to the need.

The failure of the United States to have an Ambassador in the United Arab Republic for the ten weeks preceding the recent crisis

in the Middle East obviously must have had an adverse impact on the effectiveness of U.S. diplomacy. The lesson for U.S. policy in Africa is clear.

At the present time the United States has no Ambassador in Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chad, The Gambia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, and Togo. Furthermore, no Ambassador has been appointed to either Botswana or Lesotho, the two newly independent governments surrounded by the territory of the Union of South Africa. (In addition, the United States has no Ambassador in the Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville). This case, however, apparently reflects an intentional policy decision not to maintain direct relations with that government.)

The recent trip of Undersecretary of State Katzenbach to Africa was a welcome beginning to an effort to convince the African States of the continuing United States concern for their security and progress. Any good will emanating from that trip might be dissipated, however, by a continuing reluctance to fill U.S. Ambassadorial vacancies on that continent.

I include herewith the list of signers of the letter to the President:

Mark Andrews, of North Dakota.
John Ashbrook, of Ohio.
James P. Battin, of Montana.
Alphonzo Bell, of California.
Edward G. Blester, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
William S. Broomfield, of Michigan.
Clarence J. Brown, Jr., of Ohio.
Garry Brown, of Michigan.
James T. Broyhill, of North Carolina.
William T. Cahill, of New Jersey.
Tim Lee Carter, of Kentucky.
James C. Cleveland, of New Hampshire.
William C. Cramer, of Florida.
Edward J. Derwinski, of Illinois.
Robert Dole, of Kansas.
Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey.
Jack Edwards, of Alabama.
John N. Erlenborn, of Illinois.
Marvin L. Esch, of Michigan.
Paul A. Fino, of New York.
Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey.
James R. Grover, Jr., of New York.
Seymour Halpern, of New York.
James Harvey, of Michigan.
Frank Horton, of New York.
Theodore R. Kupferman, of New York.
Dan Kuykendall, of Tennessee.
Donald E. Lukens, of Ohio.
Robert C. McEwen, of New York.
Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota.
William S. Malliard, of California.
Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland.
Chester Mize, of Kansas.
F. Bradford Morse, of Massachusetts.
Charles A. Mosher, of Ohio.
Alexander Pirnie, of New York.
Robert Price, of Texas.
Ogden Reid, of New York.
Ben Rifeal, of South Dakota.
Richard L. Roudebush, of Indiana.
Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois.
Herman T. Schneebeli, of Pennsylvania.
Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania.
Fred Schwengel, of Iowa.
Garner E. Shriver, of Kansas.
Joe Skubitz, of Kansas.
Robert T. Stafford, of Vermont.
J. William Stanton, of Ohio.
William A. Steiger, of Wisconsin.
Robert Taft, Jr., of Ohio.
Vernon W. Thomson, of Wisconsin.
Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Ohio.
John W. Wyder, of New York.
Louis C. Wyman, of New Hampshire.

SEQUOYAH COUNTY OFFERS MUCH TO AMERICAN TOURISTS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the Members of the House of Representatives and their families to the Annual Fire Dance at the Red Bird Smith Stomp Grounds north of Vian, Okla., during the first week in August.

The Annual Fire Dance is one of Oklahoma's most colorful Indian festivals and has gained national recognition as an event the entire family is certain to enjoy.

While in eastern Oklahoma's scenic Sequoyah County, out-of-State visitors may also wish to take advantage of the recreational facilities offered at Tenkiller Lake. Tenkiller is one of the State's most beautiful lakes and enjoys a national reputation as an angler's paradise.

A trout fishing tournament is planned on the Illinois River south of the Tenkiller Dam later this summer. The river was recently stocked with thousands of trout as an added incentive to fishermen.

On August 10 through 12 the county will host the Sequoyah Annual Rodeo which has also acquired widespread recognition as a favorite with out-of-State visitors.

Oklahoma is rapidly becoming a mecca for tourists and a visit to beautiful Sequoyah County would certainly prove worth while and enjoyable.

INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE LOOKS AT MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 pro tempore. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, led by Subcommittee Chairman HAROLD JOHNSON, of California, has just returned from a field hearing and project inspection in Oklahoma.

The subcommittee, at the request of our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. TOM STEED, was directed by Committee Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL to hold a public hearing in the city of Altus and to take a firsthand look at the mountain park project, which was recommended to the Congress by Secretary of Interior Udall in May of 1966.

The subcommittee heard testimony from both U.S. Senators MIKE MONRONEY and FRED R. HARRIS, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman STEED, and Congressman JAMES V. SMITH, and 15 civic officials and community spokesmen in the area. Almost all enthusiastically endorsed this fine project, which is urgently needed to meet the water needs of Altus and Snyder and the U.S. airbase at Altus.

The subcommittee, which included the

gentleman from Texas, Congressman RICHARD WHITE, the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman GEORGE HANSEN, and myself, in addition to Chairman JOHNSON, was highly impressed both by the testimony given and by the firsthand inspection of the project area. This is a project which should receive a high priority rating in the Congress.

MCCARTHY RIDICULES ANTIRIOT BILL—CALLS ON CONGRESS TO ACT ON FIREARMS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the House this week undoubtedly will pass an antiriot bill of little value. The Attorney General said yesterday he has uncovered no evidence indicating that rioting in Newark and elsewhere was spawned by an interstate conspiracy.

What the House undoubtedly will not pass this week is legislation that could dampen the hot climate of violence abroad in the country today and prevent some of the bloodshed. I refer to a firearms control bill.

The pattern of the riots—whether in Newark or Buffalo or Plainfield—is clear: guerrilla warfare in the streets with snipers sending deadly gunfire from roofs and windows above.

Among the reactions to this appalling trend is the stepped up arming of frightened whites. More and more Negroes and whites take advantage of what the New York Times yesterday called the Nation's insanely lax laws on firearms and buy pistols, rifles, shotguns, and other weapons. Merchants of death—arms manufacturers and importers protected by the gun lobby—sell their "long hot summer specials" to anyone who will buy them.

Mr. Speaker, how can these people—certainly the Americans among them—live with themselves?

As the Times also observed:

The threat of confrontation between negroes and whites in the United States today is the most serious problem the nation faces, more serious even than Vietnam.

The newspaper called on the Congress, the President, and responsible leaders in every community to give this problem top priority. The Times said:

The challenge and the need are clear. The next few weeks and months may well be critical in determining whether or not the people of the United States can face up to this gravest of their responsibilities or whether, bemused by the distractions and the violence of the moment, they will continue to drift blindly down the road to racial catastrophe.

Measures to create jobs within cities, build better housing now and improve urban school, and curb the gun traffic—these are at the top of a long list which shows H.R. 421 near the bottom.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE REPORT ON THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

THE LAND AND FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the newest and most effective agencies assisting all communities, large and small, in the development of good economical public facilities, particularly water and sewer facilities, is the Land and Facilities Development Administration. This relatively small group of community development specialists, ably led by Mr. Arthur A. Davis, performs effectively in many ways dedicated to making our communities a better place in which to live.

Mr. Davis—although young in years, 45—is a thoroughly experienced career employee of 20 years' service. He brings to his position as head of the Land and Facilities Development Administration a rich academic background, an M.S. in forestry from Yale, combined with distinguished service with the Bureau of the Budget, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Outdoor Recreation and Review Commission, and the open space program of HHFA. The fine accomplishments of this agency, established in 1966 as a vital part of the organization of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, are in large part due to Mr. Davis' quiet, steady leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to bring to the attention of our colleagues an article entitled "HUD's Helpful Hand," by Mr. Davis, appearing in this month's issue of Nation's Cities. This agency, working closely with the Water Pollution Administration of the Department of the Interior and local governments, will increasingly lead the way in the construction of comprehensively planned water and sewage systems upon which the future growth of both urban and rural America is greatly dependent.

Mr. Davis' article follows:

HUD'S HELPFUL HAND

(By Arthur A. Davis)

Until recently, Hennepin, Ill., had no sewerage system, Triana, Ala., had no water system and Martinez, Calif., was faced with a severe pollution problem.

Now, the three communities couldn't be happier. Their mayors tell their story—one of major effort and improvement through a cooperative venture with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Through its basic sewer and water facilities program, HUD has assisted communities of all sizes help themselves. Hennepin, Triana, Martinez are just examples.

Mayor Frank Biagi of Hennepin says his area's industrial expansion is the "biggest thing that ever happened to the area. It couldn't have gotten off the ground without the grant from HUD."

Mayor Clyde Foster states that "the water project has given us a new life. We hope we can live up to the expectations that you and other fellow Americans might have for the township of Triana."

And Mayor John Costanza of Martinez says "the HUD grant is a big help because we were desperate for a way to aid the city and its citizens."

Since April 1966, HUD grants for water and sewer facilities have helped 326 localities with a total outlay of more than \$160 million. These HUD grants make it possible for cities, large and small, to attack both urban sprawl and decay and make better communities.

HUD's sewer and water facilities program provides up to 50 per cent grants to local public bodies and agencies to construct new water and sewer projects, or to enlarge or improve existing facilities.

The grants make it possible for localities to build much-needed facilities for the supply, treatment, and distribution of water, and the collection and disposal of waste. Additional grant assistance is available to pay the cost of relocating persons and organizations displaced from land acquired as a site for the facilities.

The chief aim of this highly successful HUD program is to help areas whose need is most urgent—areas that, even today, have no water or sewerage systems. The HUD grants serve the very direct and immediate purpose of improving the health and living standards of the people in these areas.

Equally important is HUD's emphasis on the development of water and sewer facilities as part of comprehensive area planning. With such comprehensive planning, communities can eliminate waste and unnecessary costs which result from unplanned and haphazard construction; and avoid duplication of costs from having to replace inadequately planned facilities at a later date.

To be eligible, communities must show that their projects are part of areawide water and sewer planning, and that this is consistent with comprehensive planning and programming for development of the entire area. As Charles M. Haar, HUD's Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, put it, "No community can afford to be an island to itself . . . By coordinating community facilities, local governments can make their scarce revenue dollars go further."

Naturally, with such a popular program, applications come in at a rate much greater than we are able to fund. In our first year, for example, requests for assistance ran 25 times the money available—\$2.5 billion requested—\$100 million budgeted!

A project rating system was developed and, to date, HUD had said "no" to some 1,900 applications falling to pass our evaluation. Factors taken into consideration are the extent to which the proposed project implements area-wide comprehensive planning and programming, relative urgency of need, economies of scale, scope of benefits, consistency with the intent of the law creating the program, and other national objectives.

Incidentally, Congress is acting favorably to President Johnson's request to increase the appropriation for the basic sewer and water program to \$165 million for the new fiscal year beginning July 1.

More than 75 per cent of the HUD projects under this program have been in communities under 50,000 population, and 34 per cent in communities under 10,000. This is where the need is most urgent. In fiscal 1966, the first year of the program, out of total grants of \$90 million, \$58 million went to communities under 50,000, and \$21 million to communities under 10,000 population.

HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver states the reason for this: "the preservation of an economic base can be a life or death question to a smaller city." Secretary Weaver spoke about the small town's problems before Congress, to the House Committee on Small Business, on March 21, 1967.

He noted that, "when a new major activity—industry, highway project, or defense installation—comes to a small city, it frequently creates problems that the smaller city is unable to manage. The new schools, sewer and water provisions or extensions, streets, sidewalks, traffic equipment—which are needed to accommodate the new influx—may be entirely beyond the ability of a small city to provide. Many of the HUD programs are helping small towns with this challenge."

Hennepin, Ill., is a good example of a small town with big problems that HUD is helping solve. Hennepin received a water & sewer facilities grant of \$319,000 to help build a new public sewerage system and to improve and expand the village water system. The project will be completed by fall 1967 at a total cost of \$830,000. County Attorney Durley Boyle notes that "Without HUD, the area would have been in terrible shape. There was no sewer system at all, only septic tanks that were creating health hazards."

Why was this grant so important to Hennepin? Mayor Frank Biagi explains: "We couldn't have handled Jones & Laughlin without it." Jones & Laughlin is building a large new steel mill in Hennepin. With the HUD grant, Hennepin will provide Jones & Laughlin with a potable water system and a sewerage system for the new mill." When J & L is at its peak, Mayor Biagi says, "5,000 people will be employed there and in steel-related industries which we expect J & L's presence to bring to the area."

Hennepin demonstrates how a region can be saved by building a core population area with a central attraction.

Previously, Hennepin had been in a dying rural area; the young people were leaving. Now the population is expected to grow from 300 to 2,500 with a total of 8,000 in the surrounding small towns of LaSalle, Peru, Spring Valley, Henry, and McMann.

The town of Triana, Ala., is 148 years old, has 250 residents, no running water. Residents have had to buy their water at \$1 per barrel from trucks that brought it from a well two miles away, and supplement this by rain water collected by primitive roof drain methods. Mrs. Madge Barnes, who lives there, said, "We know we're drinking impure water but we can't do anything about it."

HUD could and did. A \$26,000 water and sewer grant and a \$44,000 public facility loan were awarded to help construct a water system for Triana. When completed, it will be one of the nation's smallest organized water systems, but one of the most appreciated. Triana has its second Negro mayor, Clyde Foster, and an integrated town council. Mayor Foster commends HUD for "the exemplary spirit of cooperation shown."

In Martinez, Calif., a \$732,000 water & sewer facilities grant will help the region achieve an economy of scale by consolidating area waste disposal and thereby preventing water-front pollution. The \$1.6-million sewer development project will link the sewer facilities of Martinez and Contra Costa County. Mayor John Costanza says that the project will eliminate sewerage discharge to a water-front area being developed for recreation, business and residential use, reduce operat-

ing cost, and increase sewerage service to a 17,000-acre area.

Economy of scale is also being demonstrated in Vancouver, Wash., where a \$795,625 grant is aiding in the construction of trunk sewers. One trunk, the Burnt Bridge Creek line, will intercept sewage from a portion of the Hazel Dell Sewer District.

Kinloch, Mo., a Negro community of 6,500 in the St. Louis metropolitan area, has no sewerage system. In January, Kinloch received a \$684,500 grant from HUD to build one. Ninety-eight percent of the people of Kinloch are at poverty level. HUD's Assistant Secretary Haar says, "The Kinloch project will stimulate economic growth and industrial development in the city, creating many job opportunities. . . . It is also expected to generate a considerable number of jobs for Kinloch people in related follow-up work."

Community enterprise, with help from HUD, is producing a significant improvement in the quality of American life. Among the areas benefiting are Springfield, Mass., with a \$1.5-million grant for a water development project to increase supply to the Lower Pioneer Valley; Mammoth Lake, Calif., where a \$225,000 grant will help curb pollution of the Los Angeles water supply from the northern part of the state; Houston with a \$1-million grant for facilities in an all-Negro section which has none; Cedar Lake, Ind., where a \$974,000 grant will help restore Cedar Lake for recreational use.

HUD wants to help cities to help themselves. Assistant Secretary Haar says, "The initiative is still with the local area to develop its own plan." Haar emphasizes that the Federal Government is not trying to impose its will, or any master plan, on local governments.

The cities are warming up to what President Johnson calls "the benefits of creative federalism." HUD is getting fan letters from the mayors, but, more important, many American communities are becoming better places to live, and many Americans are living better.

DUMPING OF JAPANESE WALL TILE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Customs advised me yesterday that a significant decision has been reached following an investigation of charges that the Japanese tile industry has engaged in widespread dumping of wall tile in violation of the Antidumping Act. The investigation confirmed that, in a majority of transactions examined, the Japanese industry, which operates as a giant cartel, had indeed been guilty of dumping.

Assurances have now been given by the Japanese firms that they will not engage in dumping in the future, and the investigation has been disposed of on the basis of these assurances. For the present, the Bureau will continue to withhold appraisement of all wall tile imported from Japan.

It is gratifying that the Bureau of Customs has succeeded in bringing to a halt these widespread dumping activities. Both before and during the 18-month investigation, the injuries inflicted upon U.S. workers and tile companies, most of which are small business

firms, have been far reaching and devastating. I have every confidence that the Bureau will continue its vigilance and that the Japanese firms will be held strictly accountable for any future violations.

I have expressed my view to the Commissioner that the responsible Japanese firms should not be permitted to benefit in any measure from their past wrongdoing. It seems to me that any tile shipped earlier to the United States at dumping prices, which still remains in warehouses in this country or otherwise in transit should not be permitted to enter commercial channels at prices below levels currently prevailing in the Japanese home market. The public interest clearly requires that dumping in this or any other form be stopped without exception.

It would also be my hope that the appropriate Japanese officials will take cognizance of the promises made to the Bureau of Customs by Japanese nationals and institute all appropriate steps in Japan to assure future compliance with the Antidumping Act and other applicable statutes of the United States. In particular, notice should be taken of the fact that dumping is not the only improper activity pursued by Japanese tile firms. Indeed, I am advised that the Department of Justice is currently investigating other unlawful practices under the Sherman Act and that the Tariff Commission is examining still further distribution methods under section 332 of the Tariff Act.

The U.S. tile industry asks only that the giant Japanese firms and trading cartels compete fairly and obey our laws when they come to our market. This condition has not prevailed in the past. I hope that the action of the Bureau of Customs will comprise a first step toward restoration of normal competitive conditions.

The text of the decision follows:

[Department of the Treasury, Office of the Secretary: Antidumping—ATS 643.3(b)]

CERAMIC GLAZED WALL TILE FROM JAPAN: NOTICE OF INTENT TO DISCONTINUE INVESTIGATION AND TO MAKE DETERMINATION THAT NO SALES EXIST BELOW FAIR VALUE

Information was received on December 9, 1965, that ceramic glazed wall tile imported from Japan was being sold at less than fair value within the meaning of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended (19 U.S.C. 160 *et seq.*). This information was the subject of an "Antidumping Proceeding Notice" which was published pursuant to section 14.6(d), Customs Regulations (19 CFR 14.6(d)), in the Federal Register of December 30, 1965, on page 16272 thereof.

On July 15, 1966, the Acting Commissioner of Customs issued a withholding of appraisal notice with respect to such merchandise, which was published in the Federal Register dated July 19, 1966.

Purchase price was found to be lower than adjusted home market price in a majority of the comparisons made.

Promptly after the commencement of the antidumping investigation, price revisions were made which eliminated the likelihood of sales below fair value. Assurances were given that, regardless of the determination of this case, no future sales to the United States will be made at prices which could be construed as being at less than fair value within the meaning of section 201(a) of the

Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended (19 U.S.C. 160(a)). There appears to be no likelihood of a resumption of prices which prevailed before such price revision.

In view of the foregoing it appears that there are not, and are not likely to be, sales below fair value of ceramic glazed wall tile from Japan.

Unless persuasive evidence or argument to the contrary is presented within 30 days, a determination will be made that there are not, and are not likely to be, sales below fair value.

Any such evidence or argument should be addressed to the Commissioner of Customs, 2100 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20228, in time to be received by his office not later than 30 days from the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

This notice is published pursuant to section 14.7(b)(9) of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR 14.7(b)(9)).

TRUE DAVIS,

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION VERSUS GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF RAILROADS

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

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to railroad strike legislation, I find myself on the horns of a dilemma because I am opposed both to Government seizure and, likewise, to compulsory arbitration. Meanwhile, I have been awaiting the long-promised recommendation of President Johnson for a peaceful means of settlement of all nationwide labor disputes that involve the national interest. Meanwhile, too, I have hoped the House-Senate conferees would agree on a compromise plan for the railroads, whereby any arbitration decision would not be final at least without congressional action or without approval by the President.

As I see the parliamentary situation it boils down to this. The House-Senate conference has failed to reach an agreement. Now, the Senate will probably pass a bill and then the House will either accept or reject the Senate version.

This is no way to legislate. It forecloses the House working its will. The leadership has let this issue drift, and now, with a strike in effect, we are sitting on a time bomb, so to speak, and working under pressure.

I, for one, do not intend to lend my support to unwise remedial action if I can help it. I will wait and see what the Senate does later today. But, in so doing, again I call on the President to make good his promise and send Congress his long-awaited recommendation for settlement of all nationwide labor disputes effecting the welfare of the entire Nation.

THE M-16 RIFLE PROCUREMENT SCANDAL

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

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United Auto Workers strike against Colt Firearms, Hartford, Conn., sole producer of the M-16 rifle, today officially began cutting into production of this vitally needed weapon for American and allied forces in South Vietnam.

Technically, the strike against Colt, which began at 12:01 a.m., July 1, is already more than 2 weeks old. But the union—in an apparent effort to exert "strike" pressure without immediately threatening the war effort—did not walk out until 1 minute after Colt had closed down its production line for its annual 2-week vacation.

Production of M-16's, all destined for Vietnam, was scheduled to resume today—but the strike continues. So the war effort is now, officially, suffering.

This latest incident in the troubled history of the M-16 strikes me just short of incredible. Here we are, in the midst of a war in which more than 11,000 American men have been killed. And yet the sole producer of the single, most vitally needed weapon for combat—a weapon seriously in short supply by allied forces—is permitted to take a 2-week vacation.

This sad, unconscionable action exemplifies the halfway measures we are using to fight this war, the "ho hum," "business-as-usual" attitude still displayed by much of our Government and many of our people, despite the sacrifices that American and allied troops are making in Vietnam.

Colt's contract now calls for minimum production of 25,000 rifles a month—although the Army is now taking every M-16 that Colt turns out, which runs up to 27,500 a month.

It is true that Colt was to accumulate a sufficient backlog in prior months so that its 2-week vacation would not interrupt the 25,000-a-month delivery rate.

But such a "justification" for this 2-week vacation in time of war is totally without merit, for two reasons:

As I will detail further below, production from Colt's already overstrained facilities has not been and is not now sufficient to meet all demands by U.S. and allied troops in Vietnam—so every 2 weeks' worth of production, every one of the 10,000 to 12,000 guns that might have been produced in that time is badly needed.

More important, the Army has only recently started incorporating into the M-16 added modifications designed to reduce malfunctions in this rapid-fire weapon. That includes changing the "buffer group" to reduce the rate of fire somewhat, and chrome-plating the bore to prolong barrel life and reduce trouble-causing corrosion.

The current production of M-16's, then, is hopefully more "jam resistant" than the ones now in the field. These, it would appear, are the M-16's we should be getting to Vietnam at top speed, possibly to replace earlier, less reliable models now in the hands of combat troops.

But what happens instead? The sole producer goes on a 2-week vacation. And then the union continues to interrupt production with a strike.

That picture appears even less excusable against this added background.

Back in March, when I protested Colt's plans to sell 20,300 of these weapons to the neutralist government of Singapore, a top Colt official came to my office to assure me that the production for Singapore would not interrupt Colt's 25,000-a-month commitment to the Army.

During this conversation, the Colt official also revealed that to speed up delivery of the guns to Singapore, Colt was planning to forego its usual 2-week summer vacation so that entire 2-weeks' production would make possible the Singapore delivery.

Later, that plan apparently was discarded. But instead of devoting that badly needed production time to output for U.S. and allied troops in Vietnam, Colt went on vacation.

I emphasize that this production was badly needed, because it has now been documented beyond reasonable doubt that the 25,000 to 27,500 guns a month, all Colt is capable of turning out, is inadequate to meet the demands of Vietnam, even though the Department of Defense does not choose—for face-saving reasons—to formally acknowledge this fact.

Anyone who doubts the shortage of M-16's in Vietnam should consider these facts:

Our 75,000-man Marine contingent is only now getting the last of its M-16's. And the Marines did not get the first of their M-16's until March, although the decision that they should have the weapons was made in early August 1966.

The hard-fighting, 45,000-man South Korean contingent has only just now received the last of the 16,000 M-16's it has been allotted—all that we can spare at the moment.

Rear echelon American troops—which are the bulk of our fighting men in Vietnam—still do not have the gun, despite the fact that in this guerrilla war, there is really no rear echelon, and every fighting man may find himself under attack at any time, in any place—and in need of an improved M-16.

The South Vietnamese, with an Army of more than 400,000 men, are now receiving some 12,000 M-16's.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's comments last week, after his return from Saigon, spotlight this shameful situation. Mr. McNamara said that the South Vietnamese were going to have to bear a greater proportion of the war. Before he left Saigon, earlier in the week, he was quoted as saying that to utilize better existing forces, more South Vietnamese Army units would now have to be integrated into combat operations.

This is a laudable, commonsense goal—letting the South Vietnamese do more of the fighting for their own country, as well as handling the vital "pacification" program, now the ARVN's main mission.

But with what good grace can we urge more South Vietnamese troops to

join American units in combat when all that we give them to fight with, for the most part, are outmoded World War II, M-1 rifles and carbines?

Out of an Army of more than 400,000 men, we can give them—so far—only 12,000 modern rifles.

And yet Mr. McNamara maintains there is no shortage of M-16's in Vietnam.

That situation is particularly inexcusable when it is remembered that a decision was made that the South Vietnamese troops should have had the M-16 as far back as 1963. That fact was only recently revealed in a report on the M-16 by the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee—a real eye-opening report that all House Members who feel a responsibility for the course of the war would do well to read.

Why is it that we still have only one source of production for the M-16? And why cannot Colt turn out more weapons than the peak of 27,500 a month?

It was not until June 30 of this year—ironically, the same day as the Colt strike—that the Army finally bought manufacturing rights to the M-16 from Colt, for \$4.5 million, which will at last make possible M-16 production by other manufacturers.

What took so long? The Army has never—never—come up with a detailed explanation. And Congress, as well as the American people, are entitled to have that explanation.

The Army first started procurement of the privately developed M-16 in 1963. And it did so then, reluctantly, only under orders from the Department of Defense and the White House, as the Senate subcommittee report also reveals. The Army's reluctance to buy the M-16 was based on its unwillingness to jeopardize production of the M-14 rifle, which went through a long, hectic, universally criticized development period before volume production finally got underway in 1960-61.

So in 1963, when the first 100,000 M-16's were bought, the Army said there was no point in going to the added expense of acquiring the manufacturing rights from Colt because the 100,000 was to be a "one-time-only" buy—no more of the guns were to be ordered.

That rationale is debatable.

But there simply is absolutely no room for debate on the Army's inexcusable failure to acquire later those manufacturing rights once high volume procurement of the M-16 was begun, for our forces in Vietnam, in December 1965.

Why were not the rights acquired then, and a second source set up at that time?

The Army testified before the select House Armed Services subcommittee, investigating the M-16 procurement, that the Pentagon received an "urgent" request for M-16's from Gen. William Westmoreland on December 6, 1965, and awarded the contract to Colt the next day, December 7, 1965.

Although it was not officially stated, the Army appeared to be offering that history as an explanation for why there purportedly was not time, at that point, to negotiate with Colt over manufacturing rights.

But such a proposition, if it is put forward by the Army, would be ridiculous.

First of all, it is an insult to the intelligence of Congress to ask us to believe that, "out of the blue," a request from General Westmoreland was received one day, and a letter contract was awarded the next. Military procurement on major contracts simply does not operate that way, as every Member of Congress knows.

Actually, I am told, General Westmoreland began discussing the advisability of procuring more M-16's, for use in Vietnam, as far back as August of 1965. But a final decision on his request was blocked for 4 months and the block occurred at a level higher than the Department of Defense.

However, even if this lame excuse of insufficient time were to be accepted, as a reason for not acquiring the rights and setting up a second source in December 1965, it is no explanation for why that action was not taken later.

That December 1965 contract was for 100,000 guns, with options for more. By December of this year, more than 400,000 rifles will have been produced under that contract. And by next March, when production is scheduled for completion on the last of the M-16's now funded, nearly 500,000 will have been turned out.

Why, then, was not that December 1965 contract held down to the original 100,000 rifles, and negotiations begun on the acquisition of manufacturing rights, so that a second source could have been set up to share in production of the remaining hundreds of thousands of weapons?

No answer has ever been provided to that question. Therefore, while the Army had three producing sources of the M-14 rifle in 1961-63, when we were not at war, turning out guns by the tens of thousands monthly, we continue to have one source for the M-16, turning out a mere 25,000 to 27,500 a month while we are in an expanding shooting war and faced with an insufficient supply of these weapons.

If that is not a "scandal" in the literal sense of the word, I would like to know a better definition.

Furthermore, the Army estimates that it will not be ready to take bids to set up the second M-16 source until December 1967 or January 1968, and that first production from that second source will not start coming in until 1 year from that date—18 months from now.

Unfortunately, this inexcusable failure to set up a second source has had other effects in Vietnam.

The chairman of the House select investigating committee—and others as well—have raised the possibility that one of the contributing factors to the jamming of M-16's experienced by the marines shortly after they began using the gun was insufficient training on this "hot" new gun—a deficiency caused by the lack of extra guns available for training purposes.

It has also been suggested that the lack of competition fostered an attitude of complacency toward the M-16 on the part of both the Army and Colt, so that the badly needed minor modifications, designed to abate the jamming problem,

were not initiated until hundreds of thousands of the guns had already been turned out and put into the hands of combat troops.

Only now are those modifications being made. It is almost certain that if there had been one or more other sources for this rifle, vying for the position of prime supplier, the competition to turn out the best possible weapon would have led to more, earlier modifications.

As a result, American lives would have been saved—just as they would have been saved if there had been more M-16's for better training.

Furthermore, marine combat officers, after the famous, bloody battles of Hills 881 and 861, were quoted as saying that without the high firepower from the M-16's, they could not have taken the hills.

How many other objectives could they have taken quicker, more easily, at less cost in lives, if the Marines had had M-16's sooner?

How many lives might have been saved in the South Korean contingent if it had received the M-16 sooner—as its commanding general had been begging for months?

How many South Vietnamese troops might better survive in the vital, hazardous pacification program, or in added combat assignments, if they were armed with M-16's, to counter the increasing flow of Russian-designed automatic weapons into the hands of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese?

These are questions to which the American people deserve answers.

I am hopeful that either the Pentagon, or the House select subcommittee investigating the M-16 will provide those answers.

CONGRESS MUST STAND BEHIND OUR FIGHTING MEN

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

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, many in this House have—at one time or other—stood on a battlefield.

If we have not been there as combatants, we have at least been there as congressional observers.

We have seen the determination of our fighting forces. We have been moved at their morale. We have been proud of their bravery.

If there is any message we have brought to our men at war, it has always been that as Congressmen we would see that they got every last measure of support that they require.

Well, today is a day we must deliver on that promise.

This rail strike—whatever be its origin, or however tangled be its issues—simply must come to an end.

And it must come to an end now.

It must come to an end now because it is choking, disrupting, and simply shut-

ting down our supply lines to the battlefield in Vietnam.

Let no one in this House be in any doubt about that.

Rolling stock is lying idle, crammed with war materiel.

Ammunition, tanks, armored personnel carriers—even Polaris missiles—to say nothing of thousands upon thousands of other items, are stranded at countless yards around the Nation, unable to proceed to the ships that are waiting for them.

Let us not waste precious time arguing here who is to blame for this situation.

We must share the blame if we do not end the situation.

The American people want leadership. The American people want decision. The American people want action. We must fulfill our responsibility.

Moreover, we have a commitment to our fighting forces. That commitment comes first. They are risking their lives for this Nation.

Let us reflect that we are risking their lives if we do not take action to end this strike—and to end it today.

THE RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. STAGGERS submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

THE NECESSITY FOR A REAPPRAISAL OF OUR POLICIES IN THE FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter on the necessity for a reappraisal of our policies in the fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the tortuous progress of the war in Vietnam has created misgivings at home, even among vigorous supporters of the administration's war effort. The high casualty lists and the apparent standoff in the fighting in recent weeks require a reappraisal of our policies.

To me, there is clearly no choice but to win. However, our forces are following prescribed ground rules which limit their effectiveness. Presumably, any changes in strategy must follow these same ground rules. Even so, it appears to me that there are areas where improvements can be made. First is a more effective utilization of South Vietnamese forces to lessen the pressure on American forces. Next is securing and pacifying the productive coastal and delta regions which still are in Vietcong hands. Third is to stop fighting over the same ground time after time, particularly in mountainous or nonproductive areas which have little importance on the outcome of the war.

Fourth is to place greater stress upon the development and use of new weapons which help to offset enemy numbers.

The fighting now in progress is bringing us closer and closer to pitting man against man in jungle warfare, with Americans doing most of the fighting for the allied side. This is the type of war which can go on for years with an insatiable appetite for men, materiel, and money. The American public will not put up with this kind of war through another election.

U.S. military strategists have warned time and time again against involvement in a land war in Asia. The frightening aspects of a war of attrition in jungle terrain against unlimited manpower, halfway around the world, make the reasons obvious.

The difficulties which we have encountered in overcoming Communist guerrillas and the forces of small, unimportant North Vietnam makes one shudder to think what a bigger war in the area, involving other powers, would be like. The administration has carefully sought to avoid such a major war. And, as a result, has been criticized for its caution.

In the main, the North Vietnamese are operating north of Saigon and south of the DMZ, while the fighting around Saigon and in the Mekong Delta is principally by the Vietcong. The coastal and delta regions are where the bulk of the South Vietnamese population lives. There the Vietcong infrastructure is elaborate, complete, and complex. They have been working to gain control of the countryside for 20 years. It takes time to root out that type of influence. Resupply for the guerrillas is no problem. They are able to harvest a substantial part of each rice crop, and this they share with the North Vietnamese. This territory must be taken and held.

The increased number of casualties in recent weeks in the areas south of the DMZ point to enemy buildup and ready availability of heavy infantry weapons—flame throwers, rocket launchers, and a new antitank gun. The North Vietnamese regular forces there are first-class troops and they have been fully equipped with modern Russian and Chinese weapons. Supply routes there are short. As a result, the marines are hard pressed to hold their own. Army forces previously assigned to the Mekong Delta have been rushed northward to offset the growing threat from Communist forces moving across the DMZ. The fighting is some of the heaviest of the war and the overall picture is far from clear.

Secretary McNamara has stated there is no stalemate in Vietnam. Possibly it could be described more accurately as a standoff. Neither situation is acceptable. A way must be found to regain the initiative and to reduce the casualty lists. A number of possibilities are apparent. A landing behind the DMZ could lead to the destruction of a substantial part of the North Vietnamese regular forces and block the entrances to the Ho Chi Minh trail. This, however, has been ruled out because of the possibility of bringing Red China into the conflict. A barrier of cleared ground with fortifica-

tions along the DMZ itself has been suggested. It would be very costly, construction would be long drawn out, and it still would not deny the use of neutral Laos as an avenue of supply and reinforcement. There does not seem to be any shortcut to victory.

If we are to carry on the type of fighting we now are doing in the hope that Hanoi will recognize the futility of prolonging the war, there must be a better utilization of forces and a clearer definition of objectives. North Vietnam obviously is being hurt and hurt badly. Pressure should be maintained and intensified through bombing. But in South Vietnam, new policies may be in order.

It is inescapable that we are fighting over the same ground too many times. Too many lives are lost in capturing the same terrain time and again only to give up as soon as the operation is concluded. This is indicative of stalemate and we cannot afford stalemate. If the ground is worth fighting for, it is worth holding. If we do not have the manpower to hold it, we should not fight for it until we or our allies have the strength to stay.

It is difficult to conceive that a situation exists where we have insufficient forces to hold territory which is of value to the allied cause. We have nearly a half million of our own forces in Vietnam. The number of South Vietnamese forces is even greater. There are nearly 50,000 Korean forces and a scattering of other nationals. The fact that we are not holding hard-won territory can be indicative of a lack of effectiveness in the utilization of forces. It appears inescapable that this is true of the situation with many of the ARVN forces. Despite a vigorous U.S. effort to train and equip effective ARVN forces, they have not responded in an effective way. In many areas they have failed to serve capably even as pacification forces.

The South Vietnamese are of the same blood lines as the North Vietnamese. Yet the fighting qualities of the North Vietnamese are superb. The Vietcong are also effective. This means that something is wrong with either the training methods or with the leadership of the ARVN forces. More and more the U.S. forces are having to fight the war for the Vietnamese. We must find a way to more effectively utilize the services of the 600,000 trained and equipped South Vietnamese. It has been suggested that this be done through placing ARVN units in the line side by side with American units as was done with great success in the Korean war.

Secretary McNamara has called for more efficient use of existing forces in South Vietnam. This, I assume, is to be construed as recognition of the fact that the fighting has fallen more and more on American shoulders. Full and efficient utilization of South Vietnamese forces might well eliminate the necessity for additional American units.

Increasing numbers of Soviet manufactured surface-to-air weapons and the increasing effectiveness of antiaircraft weapons in Communist hands indicate a need for changed tactics in attacks on North Vietnamese targets. Losses of U.S. pilots and aircraft are mounting.

Witnesses at Appropriations Committee hearings have stated there is a need for more naval gunfire support. This is obtainable. We have in inventory the Pershing missile which is now deployed in Germany. When equipped with conventional warheads, the weapon may have a useful capability in Vietnam. A new surface-to-surface weapon, the Lance missile, is soon to be in inventory. Substitution of these and other weapons would bring many North Vietnamese targets within range of attack without unnecessary risk of pilots and planes. Other weapons are being tested which are designed to help offset enemy numbers. There has not been enough emphasis on the development and use of this type of capability.

Winning territory is very essential. There is no other way to fully deny the enemy a base of operations. But winning territory is only half the battle. The job of pacification obviously is not proceeding satisfactorily. In Vietnam it has been found necessary to take the job of pacification out of civilian hands and entrust it to the military. We must look forward to the time when U.S. forces can be withdrawn from South Vietnam or at least greatly reduced in numbers. When that time comes, the fighting and the deaths will all have been in vain unless the people themselves want a democratic form of government. The importance of rallying the people themselves to the Government's side has been subordinated to the effort to defeat the Communist forces, and this is understandable. However, the bulk of the populace is under the control of Government forces. By whatever means is necessary, the work of pacification should be proceeding full-scale in those areas which are under Government control.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Pursuant to the order heretofore granted, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, and the bells will be rung 15 minutes before the House reconvenes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further 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 amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res.

81) entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees," with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 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. 169]

Anderson, Tenn.	Fino Ford,	O'Hara, Mich.
Ayres	William D.	O'Konski
Bell	Gallagher	Passman
Brinkley	Gardner	Pucinski
Burton, Calif.	Gray	Rarick
Burton, Utah	Halpern	Resnick
Carey	Hansen, Idaho	Robison
Cederberg	Hays	Rodino
Celler	Hébert	Roudebush
Clausen,	Hungate	Roybal
Don H.	King, Calif.	St. Germain
Cleveland	Kupferman	St. Onge
Conte	McClure	Scheuer
Cowger	McEwen	Steed
Cramer	Miller, Calif.	Taft
Daddario	Minish	Whalley
Davis, Wis.	Moore	Whitener
Denney	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Edwards, Calif.	Morris, N. Mex.	Zion

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO THE RAILROAD SHOP CRAFT DISPUTE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 17, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am sending this letter to you in response to your request for a review of the meeting we had yesterday and the current rail strike situation.

In the early hours of Sunday morning, the threat of a railroad strike became a grim reality. Affecting first the West and Midwest, the strike has now spread throughout the entire country, snarling our lines of commerce and leaving chaos and confusion in its wake.

By noon today, the Secretary of Transportation informs me that 80 to 90 percent of the Nation's rail lines will be down. By tonight, the stoppage will be total and rail paralysis will be complete.

As this crisis unfolded, the Secretaries of Defense, Transportation, and Labor, the Attorney General and I met yesterday afternoon with the bipartisan congressional leadership and the chairman and ranking majority and minority

members of the appropriate congressional committees. We discussed the action that must be taken to end the ruinous strike and to resolve finally the underlying dispute.

The consequences of the day-old strike—the first nationwide railroad strike in over 20 years and only the second in the last 45 years—are already becoming clear to every American:

This morning, hundreds of thousands of commuters found it difficult or impossible to get to their jobs.

Four hundred thousand carloads of freight have already been stranded.

Shipments of fresh vegetables, meats, and other perishable foods have already been halted.

Mail deliveries of packages and parcels, magazines, and newspapers, have already been embargoed by the Post Office.

Secretary McNamara has reported the strike is having "an immediate impact on the movement of ammunition and heavy equipment to ports of embarkation for Vietnam. Ammunition cars—a thousand each week—must move without interruption to support our fighting men in Vietnam."

Every minute and every hour the strike continues will create ever-increasing damage to our economic well-being and America's national security.

The Nation has been more than patient.

The dispute is more than a year old. The parties have attempted unsuccessfully to reach agreement among themselves. Three labor boards have worked diligently and skillfully with the parties:

The National Mediation Board, chaired by Francis O'Neill, the most experienced member of the Board.

A Railway Labor Act Emergency Board headed by David Ginsburg, a distinguished Washington attorney, with Frank Duggan, professor of law at Georgetown University, and John W. McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire, as members.

The Special Panel appointed by the President, chaired by Judge Charles Fahy, with Dr. John Dunlop of Harvard and Dr. George Taylor of the University of Pennsylvania as members.

Despite the efforts of these three Boards, the parties to this dispute have been unable to come to an agreement. In each case, the union rejected the recommendations of the Board.

During the current round of railroad contract negotiation, over 500,000 union members—some 80 percent of the industry—have settled their differences with management through the processes of free collective bargaining. What then can we say of this shop craft dispute?

We are witnessing, in this strike, a complete breakdown of private responsibility.

No man and no institution can stand above the American people and our men in uniform defending our country around the world.

There comes a time when the public interest must be paramount over private interests. That time is now.

On April 10, with all the legal machinery available to a President exhausted and with a nationwide strike im-

minent, I asked the Congress to extend the no-strike period in this case for 20 more days to keep the parties talking in the hope that a solution could be found and a disastrous strike avoided.

On April 28, I again asked the Congress to extend the no-strike period, this time for 47 more days, while the parties searched for a solution.

Congress promptly and favorably responded to both of these requests.

On May 4, after three Boards had worked with the parties and after almost a year of negotiation, I submitted a recommendation to the Congress to resolve this protracted dispute fairly and finally. That was 75 days ago. This recommendation was shaped by the most experienced and skilled labor advisers available to a President. We were all determined to treat labor and management fairly. The recommendation was drawn from the procedures and experience of the War Labor Board which settled hundreds of labor disputes. It was designed to provide a just settlement for the workman and for the railroads, based on the record made by the parties themselves.

The Senate accepted the administration's proposal, by a vote of 70 to 15, while the House struck from its bill that portion which would insure a final resolution to the dispute.

This case has moved slowly through summer and fall, winter and spring—and still another summer—while the parties unsuccessfully tried to reach final agreement. Now the Nation is gripped by a crippling strike, but the parties are no closer to a solution than they were over a year ago.

Simply extending the no-strike period is a prescription without a cure. It will only postpone the day of settlement—already postponed for more than a year—for in 90 days the Nation and its fighting men will be faced again with the prospect of another crippling strike.

The parties to this dispute have tried to reach agreement and failed. Boards and Panels have tried and failed. Congressional chairmen and Members of the Congress, the Secretary of Labor and many other public officials have tried and failed. We are faced with a national crisis. The public interest must take precedence over private interests. The power to act now rests with the Congress.

As a prominent legislator commented yesterday "We have had a year of talk. It is time for action." I believe the American people share that view.

I therefore appeal to you to act swiftly on the proposal overwhelmingly passed by the Senate because of the urgent need to end the work stoppage and to resolve finally the dispute in the interests of the security, health and safety of America.

I assure you if the Congress will promptly and finally act, I will immediately appoint a blue ribbon board—with understanding of both labor and management, but subservient to neither and I feel confident this dispute can be resolved with dispatch and with justice to all.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 81—PROVIDING FOR SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD LABOR DISPUTE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 485)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
J. J. PICKLE,
DANIEL J. RONAN,
BROCK ADAMS,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
DAN KUYENDALL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RALPH YARBOROUGH,
WAYNE MORSE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
GAYLORD NELSON,
ROBERT KENNEDY,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
JACOB JAVITS,
WINSTON PROUTY,
PAUL FANNIN,
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
J. J. PICKLE,
DANIEL J. RONAN,
BROCK ADAMS,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
DAN KUYENDALL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the Senate amendments to the House amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 81 which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

July 17, 1967.

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between cer-

tain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees", with amendments as follows:

On page 3, after line 7, of the House engrossed amendment, insert:

"Sec. 5. (a) If agreement has not been reached by the parties upon the expiration of the period specified in section 6, the determination of the Special Board shall take effect and shall continue in effect until the parties reach agreement or, if agreement is not reached, until such time, not to exceed two years from January 1, 1967, as the Board shall determine to be appropriate. The Board's determination shall have the same effect (including the preclusion of resort to either strike or lockout) as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

"(b) In the event of disagreement as to the meaning of any part or all of a determination by the Special Board, or as to the terms of the detailed agreements or arrangements necessary to give effect thereto, any party may within the effective period of the determination apply to the Board for clarification of its determination, whereupon the Board shall reconvene and shall promptly issue a further determination with respect to the matters raised by any application for clarification. Such further determination may, in the discretion of the Board, be made with or without a further hearing.

"(c) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all suits concerning the determination of the Special Board."

On page 3, line 8, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "5." and insert: "6."

On page 3, line 10, of the House engrossed amendment, after "hereby" insert: "reinstated and".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FRIEDEL

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL moves to concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Florida for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the time required for making the parliamentary inquiry come out of our time?

The SPEAKER. It will.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I have already yielded all my time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask my parliamentary inquiry on my own time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on June 15 when the House considered, and passed, House Joint Resolution 559 I stated before this body that I was voting for this measure reluctantly because I have always felt that labor disputes should be resolved by the process of free collective bargaining. I repeat that statement today.

When I managed this resolution I also stated that we have to face facts, and the fact is that in this dispute free collective bargaining has failed. The combined strike and lockout of the railroad

shop craft unions has resulted in a tie-up of essential service which will have drastic effects throughout the country. We cannot permit this strike to continue because it will adversely affect our efforts in Vietnam by slowing down the delivery of materials required by 500,000 American servicemen.

A railroad strike also affects every person in this country. Three-quarters of a million rail commuters in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia alone must try to find other means of getting to work. Shipments of perishable food to many cities has been stopped and actual food shortages will soon occur. The coal mining industry, with 140,000 workers, must stop operations and many other industries will soon have to close down. Thousands of workers who are not involved in this dispute will be laid off from work.

As one of the House conferees on this legislation, I offered an amendment providing that the first 30-day extension be devoted to intensive mediation efforts by a special five-man Presidential Panel, the next 30 days be used for public hearings and findings by the Panel, and the next 10 days to allow the two sides to consider the recommendations of the Board and advise Congress of their decision. This would have allowed Congress 20 days in which to pass legislation, if necessary, to avert a strike. My amendment was accepted by the House conferees but the Senate conferees would not accept this solution. Both sides might have accepted the findings of a Presidential Panel and we would not now be faced with the problem of voting for so-called compulsory arbitration.

Now that a national emergency exists, we have no choice but to do what is best for the welfare of the public and the economy. We simply cannot afford to let the present combined strike and lockout continue. I regret that labor and management have not been able to reach agreement through free collective bargaining. Now, I feel that we have no alternative but to pass this resolution in the best interest of all our citizens. Therefore, I am reluctantly supporting the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman for the purpose of debate.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman controlling the time whether I may also make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that if the gentleman wants to make a parliamentary inquiry, it is within his time. A parliamentary inquiry will take up the time of the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to be sure the terms of debate are clear, so I make this parliamentary inquiry. Is it not true that the time of the debate will

be 1 hour, and at the end of that period of time there will be no motion to close debate or no motion for the previous question that would open the bill for debate but instead the vote to allow amendment will occur on the motion to concur?

The second question is, if the motion to concur is voted down, then a proposal or a vote may occur upon either the original House version or an amended House version?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that at the end of conclusion of an hour or such period of debate within an hour, if a lesser time is taken, the previous question would be made and ordered. If the motion to concur is not accepted, then any germane amendment would be in order to the Senate amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the Speaker.

Gentlemen and ladies, my colleagues, I do not propose to make any recrimination. I simply propose on behalf of the conferees to report very briefly what happened in the conference and to accept any questions any Members may have about it, and thereafter to resume my seat and to answer later any further inquiries.

I would state, first, the two body's versions were stated and then both were presented to the other side of the conference. The conferees both rejected the other body's proposal. Second, I would state that both proposals will stop the strike this afternoon. There will be no proposal offered by anybody—whether the first one is voted or the second one is voted—that would allow the strike to continue. Third, the proposal that is before us now is the original Senate proposal—in other words, it puts section 5 back into the bill. If it is voted upon, then we will have what has been termed compulsory arbitration.

The House version has never been presented to the Senate. The Senate vote today occurred upon the original Senate version, and it also occurred upon the so-called Javits amendment. I will briefly outline those.

The House version has never been accepted or rejected by the Senate. We could not in the parliamentary situation get it presented to them, because the conferees on the Senate side would never accept the House proposal.

The proposals are:

First. That there would be a 30-day hearing, a 30-day Board, and for 30 days Congress would have the right to put into effect whatever they wanted after the Board reported.

Second. 30-day hearings, 30-day Board, and 30 days thereafter in which either House could propose the legislation to go into effect, using the Reorganization Act proceedings, so there would be a special motion immediately coming before each body to be passed if the parties did not accept the Board determination.

Third. The next proposal was 30 days, 30 days, and during the last 30 days there would be the right of both Houses to veto the proposal of the Board.

Members will notice that in all of these proposals there is finality, but the finality does not occur at the point of the Board's

determination. It would occur only after another action by Congress.

The next proposal was made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] which was to reduce the time to 20 days before the Board on hearings, 10 days for the parties to accept or reject, and 20 days thereafter for Congress to act. Following that, it was proposed there be 20 days for hearings, 10 days for acceptance or rejection by the parties, and 20 days in which Congress could pass a specific bill to put in effect the Board's determination by using the Reorganization Act proceedings.

I would point out the reorganization proceedings are those which provide any Member can move the matter as a matter of high privilege and it comes immediately before each body under rules of limited debate which provide for immediate action.

Many suggestions were proposed and presented by the House conferees. We made one after another after another.

The next proposal was that at the end of 30 days the Board would meet, there would be 30 days of Board hearings, and the Board would make a determination. At the end of the 90-day period the President would have the option, on the 91st day, if the parties had not accepted the Board's determination, either to put the Board's determination into effect, or to seize, or to do both or to do neither.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. The final proposal which was made was that at the end of 20 days of hearings, with 10 days to accept or reject, the two parties would have the right to accept arbitration that would be binding, but they would have to voluntarily accept arbitration.

The final proposal that was left on the table was 20 days of hearings, with 10 days to accept or reject, the right to also accept arbitration and then if none of these things occurred in the final 20 days, the Congress could put into effect the Board's determination, using the Reorganization Act proceedings.

The conference then broke up on a motion to disagree.

In the Senate today there was presented first a vote on the proposal of the two Houses having a veto of the Board's determination.

The next version presented was to reinstate the original Senate version, which is to put section 5 back into the bill.

That is what is now before the House.

None of the House proposals that were made in the conference appeared before the Senate.

I have nothing further to say on these proposals. I hope I have explained them. I will do my best to answer any questions any Member may have. I hope, for the members of the conference, I have legitimately presented their position.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Does the gentleman now in the well share my feeling that we are approaching this matter today on a somewhat unusual basis?

I wonder, considering the fact that it was reported that no less than 25 votes were taken in the conference committee, why it was the conference committee or the House conferees never came back and reported that fact to the House, so that we would have an opportunity to vote on a motion to instruct the conferees. I make that point because I was in the other body today and I heard the point that was made that no rollcall was ever had in the House. Because we failed to stand up and be recorded on the House proposition it was felt that we did not mean what we said.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. I would answer the gentleman if I had time. I hope I will have an opportunity later.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are now at a point where a decision has to be made yes or no. I believe there are legitimate and powerful reasons for arriving at a decision, not a debate, but a decision.

Sixty percent of the rails were not in operation yesterday.

Eighty percent of the rails are not in operation today.

It is my understanding that by this time tomorrow 100 percent of the rails will not be in operation.

What is the effect? I tried to examine it for the largest city in my own district. I do not know whether other Members have done so or not.

I find that in 48 hours—there will be 8,000 people unemployed as a result, and by 96 hours there will be 16,000 people in my largest city, with barely 100,000 people. The 16,000, will include those in several counties surrounding, who happen to work in my largest city. This means that for all practical purposes a very substantial number of people in four out of 11 counties in my district will not be employed.

In another 72 hours this means that all things that are hauled by rail will stop. I doubt if there are many Members in this House who do not have substantial factories in their own districts which do not haul by rail. The result of it is that you are going to have proportionately, I think, the same number of people unemployed in the district which it is your honor to represent that I have in the district which it is my honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, this is only one aspect of it. This is the economic aspect of it.

However, Mr. Speaker, let us go to the second factor and I believe, certainly, even more important than that is what will happen in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Department of Defense told us yesterday at the White House that there are 1,000 carloads of ammunition involved. He said not 1,000 carloads of all types of heavy equipment destined for Vietnam, but 1,000 carloads of ammunition going to Vietnam every day.

Mr. Speaker, this means that as of this moment there are or there will be this number of carloads of ammunition originating on the east coast, on the west coast or on the south coast destined for

points in Vietnam or, whatever it may be, which are being delayed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that we are in the situation where if this lapse of transportation continues for just one more day, it will mean 3,000 carloads of ammunition which will not be shipped and which will not be on the move to Vietnam.

Now, there is a second factor which I feel the Secretary of Defense raised at the White House conference yesterday, and that is the psychological factor.

Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of this country have there been men with such high morale as those Americans which we now have serving in Vietnam. Never before in any war has the morale been higher. And, based upon the independent reports that I can obtain from the Committee on Armed Services, I feel confident that this is true.

As the Secretary so ably put it, it is impossible to explain to a fighting man who is taking a chance of either being seriously wounded or of losing his life, that we back in these United States should be so irresponsible as to keep or prevent ammunition from reaching him.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the fact that that 1,000 carloads of supplies is not going to reach him each day, but it is the fact of its psychological impact upon the individual soldier and upon the situation and upon all of our people in the fighting lines in Vietnam and their inability to understand what we are doing in this country and how we could allow this type of situation to arise.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment upon the congressional situation and our part in this crisis. I will admit that we were at this for 2 or 3 weeks and, sincerely, as I tried to explain it to this House when we were engaged in the debate upon this joint resolution before, the range of what we could do in a conference was extremely narrow. As you know, the real fight in the House of Representatives, as it was in the other body, was over the question of whether there was going to be finality, and whether at the end of the expiration of 90 days we were going to have a situation of finality. In the House, you chose not to take that route. In the conference—and there were many votes held upon this question—many of them were five to four on our side and many of them were six to five on the side of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues in the House will tell you, some of these were very close. But we simply were not able to bridge that gap upon the question as to whether or not we were going back to both Houses with finality or not with finality.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have reserved with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], be granted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield the time to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we simply could not bridge this gap between finality and nonfinality. And, because of this narrow range—and I have never been in a conference before where there could not be any give and take; where we could not take a small part of it and where the other body could not take a small part of it, and compromise the question and, finally, arrive at a solution that all of us thought would prove to be in the public interest. However, in this instance, it simply could not be done. I believe that some of us had this feeling when this joint resolution was pending originally before us some weeks ago, that we were going to come down to the question of whether or not we were going to put finality into the joint resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go to the legislation which brought about this change. The President has assured us that he would appoint to this Commission people who would be fair to both parties.

That is about the only assurance I can give you that when the Commission does meet that it will be fair. I have confidence that the President is going to appoint that kind of a board. If he appoints one like the Fahy Panel or one like the Ginsburg Commission it will be a highly qualified group.

But in all events there will be 30 days for that Commission to hear evidence. They will then have 30 days in which to establish an award, and in the final 30 days the parties themselves may, if they so wish, either adopt the award, or they may negotiate to finality themselves, in which case it will not be necessary for this law to go into effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman in the well is making an excellent presentation concerning the situation we are faced with. In other words, it is not a theory, it is not the fault of the conference committee—they worked hard. The situation was not precipitated by them or anybody in either branch of the Congress. The present situation that confronts us today is because the conference committee could not continue their deliberations.

Furthermore, the President of the United States has exhausted all of his authority under the law, and it now rests with the Congress of the United States whether or not we are going to have the strike continue with all of the disastrous results that will flow, not only to the people of our country but to the national interest of the people of our country.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the responsibility of Congress calls for action today.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the Speaker for his words. I believe he has put it about as simply and as eloquently as anybody could.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position of having said "I told you so," and I certainly do not take that position here. I did have a feeling when this matter was before the House, as you know, less than

2 weeks ago, that very probably it would be back here. Certainly in the conference the conferees worked hard enough. I can say both the conferees on that side of the aisle, and the conferees on this side of the aisle, and the same in the Senate, worked as hard as anybody could, of course, with the limitation to the solutions that could have been presented. We had at least, I would say, eight or a dozen solutions offered, none of which could bridge this question of finality.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the present legislation to enforce compulsory arbitration and Government control upon the U.S. railroads and their employees.

The House is acting on only one proposal, without possibility of change or amendment under this procedure. The six to eight major proposals of the House to the conference, as well as the Pepper amendment I voted for, and the House adopted overwhelmingly, with almost no opposition, have all been discarded and ignored. There is not even the suggestion of any substantial compromise between the positions of the House and the Senate.

I do not mind being ignored. But when the U.S. Senate refuses to yield on any point of any procedure and does not even bother to ignore us in the House, I think I have a real right to stand up and object.

Although I am the only Republican speaking on the House floor against this bill for compulsory arbitration in the railroad industry today, I hope and ask others to join on the final RECORD vote.

This is a historic moment for collective bargaining. Do not let them take away this hard-earned right of collective bargaining of the working people of the United States.

This present proposal places the Federal Government in the field of setting wages and conditions of work in a major basic U.S. industry. This completely destroys the process of collective bargaining. Furthermore this proposal changes wages without changing prices. This is poor economics.

If the U.S. Congress begins to write contract provisions in the basic U.S. railroad industry, the next step would be to impose contract conditions on both management and labor in the other basic industries. The next will require such action for the suppliers. Then Congress will have set the U.S. industrial system so far off that Congress will be making management decisions and controlling the entire market and every large industry as well.

I am from Pittsburgh, Pa., an area which is proud of its strong basic industry. Our industry certainly does not want the Federal Government running our plants, setting our employees' wages, making our decisions. We simply do not want our collective bargaining procedures to be destroyed, and the contract provisions and management to be given to us by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

The U.S. Congress must not stampe-

Congress must not be stampeded in the pressures of the moment to begin the intrusion of the Federal Government into every contract, and every wage negotiation. Every basic U.S. industry can be considered essential to the health, defense, and well-being of our great Nation. If Congress does not show confidence in the collective bargaining process, Congress will have to face a future of "crises" when every basic industry brings its contract problems to the Federal Government to settle.

The railroad employees are striking to bring their wages and conditions of work up to the level already operating in the other basic industries. The demands are not extravagant beyond collective bargaining measures and Congress is certainly not the proper agency to handle collective bargaining procedures on behalf of the parties.

One hundred Members of the U.S. Senate and 435 Members of the House should not act as collective bargaining agents as this introduces politics and logrolling by outside political forces.

Should the postal workers and U.S. Government employees and the railroad workers be held back from progressing with other U.S. workers by such controls as the administration's 3.2 percent limit on pay raises, and by compulsory arbitration? My answer is a firm "No."

When Congress compels the railroad industry and railroad employees to negotiate under compulsory arbitration, Congress destroys meaningful collective bargaining procedures throughout the basic railroad industry. Mark my words, if Congress takes this action for compulsory arbitration now in the basic railroad industry and sets directly or indirectly contract provisions, there will be many more instances in the future when management or labor will prefer Government action rather than negotiations with each other. The Federal Government should set minimums, and set reasonable procedures of fair dealing in industry, labor, management and consumer affairs; but Government should not set the terms of the contracts and agreements by legislation which in effect destroys collective bargaining procedures.

U.S. industry will do better by managing its own affairs. The simple fact is the industry knows more about the particular industry, its operations and production than any Government bureaucrats do. When Congress imposes compulsory arbitration and sets the provisions of contracts in any industry, both management and collective bargaining are thereby set aside, and the employees are forced to work under contract provisions and conditions which neither they individually nor their unions' officers have voluntarily agreed to. What kind of new system for U.S. industry is this?

In times of national emergency, the U.S. Congress has imposed price and wage controls to prevent inflation and to protect the economy under conditions of scarcity. I am now opposed to the imposition of price and wage controls at this time in the Vietnam war. The U.S. Congress by imposing controls on one industry while permitting suppliers and all

other U.S. industries to be free from such control is making a tragic mistake. Railroad management and railroad labor will regret the day that the U.S. Congress imposes compulsory arbitration which will retard progress, take away good management decision and judgment, and force railroad workers to work under conditions imposed upon them by Government edict and authority.

What will happen if the railroad workers won't work without a contract obtained through collective bargaining? What then?

My question is this: What are the economic differences between the parties in this railroad industrial collective bargaining dispute? Second, Did the House really get anything out of the conference committee? It appears to me the conference report is all just the amendments of the Senate and just one of the proposals of the President of the United States?

Mr. SPRINGER. If I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly, the best I can answer his question is that I think we gave full discussion to everything involved in connection with this, and I do not believe—

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It sounds to me as though the House gave up in its position completely to the Senate. Why does the House abdicate completely to the Senate instead of insisting on our position, or at least compromising the positions without imposing forced compulsory arbitration.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say that we did not go into the economic things because that was not before us. The simple fact of the matter is that there were differences between the Senate bill and the House bill, and the attempt was to resolve the differences, and that was all that went on in the conference.

We could not discuss the question of hours, dollars and cents, and the items that involved the skilled work; those issues were not before us. The simple and only question before us was whether or not we were going to enact some form of this legislation, or whether we were not. It was just that simple.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to mention to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the situation now is that we must either take what the other body sent the House, or nothing.

I would like to say, as our Speaker said, and as the gentleman in the well, Mr. SPRINGER, has said that the whole conference was continuous and courteous, but there was no give.

Mr. SPRINGER. In answer to my distinguished chairman, there was no give on either side, may I say. This was not a case of the House having to accept what they did, there was not much give, may I say, in my opinion, on either side, because we just had this one question before us on finality.

All the amendments offered by the Senate and the House hinged around this one question of whether or not there was going to be finality. Some of them were dressed up in one fashion. Some of

them were dressed up in another. But that is in essence what we were faced with: one thing, a final decision.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, as your chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, I report to you on the effect of this strike on your flesh and blood throughout the Far East and other places in the world. From the highest echelons of authority, I assure you that vital cargoes destined for your fighting men are now in the sprawling yards of this Nation standing still while ships waiting to carry these vital cargoes of military materiel and other vital things necessary for your fighting men are now lying idle at the docks of this country. Your ships cannot be filled and your railroads are not moving. Moreover, the wives of those fighting men on Saturday night had to get off trains all over the country because they were not moving.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot recriminate now. We cannot deprecate the actions of the great committees who represented us in conference. This is no day to cast stones. We are faced with a vital question. Debate is over—we must stop this strike now in the interest of our Nation's security and indeed maybe our Nation's survival.

We have heard from our President. He has promised to convene a Blue Ribbon Committee to mediate. Let us take him at his word.

Your responsibility and mine is clear. We must act now. We have no other alternative. This is not a question of your feeling or of mine. It is a question of your responsibility. The Nation is looking at you. The Nation is looking at me. We cannot avoid taking action any longer.

Mr. Speaker, we must act and the time is now.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this body for 6½ months and I have spent slightly over half of the total period of time of my entire congressional career listening to this dispute.

The ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] mentioned the area that we could not agree on. May I point out briefly for the Members of this body the areas in which we do agree.

The overwhelming testimony of the people who testified before the committee and the overwhelming agreement in committee and in conference has agreed on these things:

That there is a national emergency;

That there can be no strike;

That there should be some sort of legislation.

They agree that the parties themselves will never agree and they agree that there should be a Board appointed.

All parties in this conference agreed that the parties involved should have a period of time to determine whether or not they accept the decision of this Board.

The parties in this conference agreed

that ultimately after deciding whether or not they should accept the decision of this Board, that the parties should in the end be forced to go back to work.

Gentlemen, what is the difference?

The difference here, gentlemen, is only whether we are going to make that very distasteful decision now or whether we are going to wait until mid-October to make that very distasteful decision.

That is the only area of disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, in early May when we first began hearing this case, I was determined to oppose final compulsion in this case, regardless of the circumstances. Since that time with great regret, I have changed my mind.

I place no blame on single parties. I place blame on both parties.

I declare no partisanship for either management or labor.

I have simply and regretfully determined that the interest of this country, and of all of its people, and our survival, come before the economic interests of either the ownership of the railroads or the people who work on the railroads.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote accordingly.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say I support action to support the amendments of the Senate.

We all know the arguments here. We have gone over them very thoroughly.

The House committee itself has recommended basically this action. But the House decided not to take that action, as you may recall.

The situation now is brought about because, as has been said, we are in an emergency. It has actually occurred. So the decision has now been shifted from the parties to the Nation. It is now incumbent upon the Congress to take the responsibility and make the decision that the national interest must come ahead of all other considerations. I urge concurrence in the amendments which the Senate has attached to the House amendment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry, if I may.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PEPPER. If the motion to concur in the Senate amendments should be voted down, would then a motion to disagree to the Senate amendments be in order?

The SPEAKER. It could be, under the rules, any germane amendments. Did the gentleman ask specifically as to any amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. If a motion to disagree to the Senate amendments were made, in case the motion to agree to the Senate amendments were voted down, would it be in order?

The SPEAKER. It could be.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate that some of the labor unions have come now to working in collaboration with those who all along have

been trying to force upon this Congress, particularly upon this House, the enactment of a compulsory arbitration statute.

Awhile ago the gentleman from Tennessee stated the question rather fairly, I believe. The question is not whether a strike is to be permitted, for the House bill, with section 5 out of it, provided that a strike would be prohibited for 90 days. All the Senate had to do was to concur in the House amendment and a strike by this legislation would have been prohibited for 90 days, during which time the Board provided for by this legislation would have been mediating for 30 days and holding public hearings for 30 days, and at the end of the 60th day, would have made its recommendations, which for an additional 30 days would have been before the President, before the parties, before the Congress, and before the country. Had the stubbornness of the Senate conferees not prevented, this Board in the last 30 days could have been mediating instead of nothing being done.

So we are not here to perpetuate a strike. I am willing to stay here all this night. But if we accept the Senate amendments, which provide nothing but sending us back section 5, which we conscientiously struck out, we shall have established an ad hoc procedure of compulsory arbitration which will haunt this Congress the rest of the years ahead of us.

The other day the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] said that he wanted to know when the administration was going to send a bill down here providing for a permanent method of settling these controversies. I will say to the able gentleman that one will not be sent down. There will be no need to send one, because with the establishment of this legislation, by the enactment of this legislation, we will in two instances have provided an ad hoc compulsory arbitration settlement of railroad disputes, and hereafter, when any matter affecting the public interests, whether it be in transportation, steel, or anything else, arises and it cannot be settled under the procedures of the Railway Labor Act or the Taft-Hartley Act, and the executive department cannot settle it satisfactorily, it will come down here and we will again be faced with exactly the painful alternative that we face here this evening of either countenancing a strike before the country or voting for compulsory arbitration.

This is it, Mr. Speaker. I think we ought not to take this step unless it is inevitably in the public interest that we do it, and it is not if we can convince the other body that we mean what we say when we do not now want to accept that painful alternative, at least without one more try. That is all we have asked.

The Senator has never given us the courtesy of a vote. I heard the chairman of the conference committee on the other side plead with the Senator from Oregon:

Let us vote on the House amendment. Let us vote on my motion to concur in the House amendment.

He refused and offered his own

amendment to send us back section 5, as if we had never voted upon it.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the point is this—and the gentleman is so right: The President said 18 months ago that he would send us a bill, not on specific things, but on general things. Then when this came up, the promise was renewed again, and the President said he would send us that general bill. We in this House backed him completely. I said to the gentleman from Illinois, "What did we in the House get out of this?" We were trampled on and we were being ignored.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman now in the well is saying this: If we had a record vote in this Chamber today against the motion to concur in the action taken by the Senate, that the House conferees, thus equipped with that, then could go back and assure the Senate, the other body, that what we did on the 15th of June we meant.

Mr. PEPPER. It would not go to the conferees, it would go right back to the other body. All they would have to do would be to recede from their amendment and concur in our amendment, and the bill could be in the White House in 15 minutes.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, twice in the last 3 months the Congress has responded to the President's request for a postponement of the threatened railroad strike. We have given the parties a chance to adjust their differences at the bargaining table.

Regrettably, these postponements have not proved fruitful. And now this Nation is in the midst of a railroad strike that will have a devastating effect on its economy, its health, and its military security.

I am most concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the serious consequences of an interruption of rail service on our defense production and on our military activities in Southeast Asia. I need remind no Member of the magnitude of our present defense needs.

The railroad strike threatens to disrupt our defense efforts from the ports where supplies are loaded for our soldiers in Vietnam to the small plant which makes a small but vital component of a strategic missile. This is intolerable and must not occur.

Forty percent of the total freight shipped by the Department of Defense is moved by the Nation's railroads. This week alone 900 carloads of ammunition for Vietnam are scheduled to arrive at dockside for shipment overseas. Every day about 625 carloads of defense products are moved on the Nation's railroads.

It is not a question, Mr. Speaker, of providing alternate means of transportation, for there are many defense products that can be shipped only by rail.

Shipments of essential raw materials, such as sulfuric acid, a basic ingredient for ammunition, and heavy military equipment, such as tanks and armored personnel carriers used in Vietnam, depend entirely on rail transportation.

The availability of countless additional products essential for our national security depends upon uninterrupted rail service. The impact of a railroad strike on defense production will be drastic because the need for military equipment and supplies reaches all sectors of the economy. We cannot permit this strike to continue.

I vividly remember the stirring address by the commander of our forces in Vietnam, General Westmoreland, and his expression of gratitude to the Congress for, in his words, "the unprecedented material support" which the Congress has provided. I don't think the Congress wants to end that support today. We have a responsibility to General Westmoreland and his vallant men in Vietnam to continue this support by restoring full and uninterrupted rail service.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, 30 days ago many well-intentioned Members of this House wanted to and voted to postpone the day of reckoning, hoping that some fairy would come along and help us or that the parties would agree. That situation has changed. We have a strike on our hands now, and, as the President said, it is a matter of grim reality and we have to do something about it.

I want to say that your conferees—and I was one of them—worked as hard and worked as regularly and worked as consistently as we could. There were 21 roll-call votes on one amendment or the other. The Senate had about eight. But it is not a matter of just balancing one against the other, although often one motion was made and the other side voted it up or down. Some of the motions had great substance, and some of them, perhaps, were not that involved.

Some of them did not have any finality—and, of course, the Members can see why there would not be agreement.

Some of them had seizure, and obviously that would be the subject of a point of order, because it was beyond the points of disagreement between the two Houses.

It is not unfair, and it is somewhat unseemly, for some one Member to say the House has been trampled on. The House stood for its position and the Senate stood for its position. There was just as much give and take on both sides—there was as much on one side as on the other.

To say we could come running back and tell the House that we could not agree, and let the House vote, just does not measure up to the reality of the situation.

Nobody had much doubt about what was going on. If he wanted to know, he could have asked and found out, and that was no big problem. But it does no good to make an accusation about who is at fault. It is not a matter whether one is

for or against labor or for or against management.

I cannot really answer why we have a strike today. I have my personal opinion, but we have kept personalities out of it. I believe it is best to keep it that way. Each of us, though, is entitled to his own opinion.

I do say, though, that the issue before us now is one which affects the American public.

It is a matter of the public interest that we do something about this railroad strike.

I would say in conclusion, this is not something we are all jumping up and down and clicking our heels about in joy, because we regret we are faced with it. There are no happy warriors here today, Mr. Speaker.

There really is no one to whom we can point our finger, to blame one person or to criticize. The matter simply is that the parties will not agree. For over a year they have not agreed.

We can engage in wishful thinking, but when the parties will not agree, and we have given them every opportunity in the world, somebody has to make a decision when it affects the national interest. That is the situation facing us today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will concur in this matter. We must remember that it was the Senate bill which was considered in the conference. It went back to the Senate. This is just the vehicle. It is about the only way we can get to a vote. I hope the House will concur.

Let us be done with this, and meet our responsibility.

The most important thing is that we look to the future. We have reached the point in our history that we cannot have a strike in national transportation, in those matters which affect the rails and the trains. We must find some other answer, other than our present laws, in dealing with these work stoppages.

I say this is the only way we have to protect and preserve collective bargaining. I am just as sincere as I can be in saying we do need to have other permanent legislation.

Many of the people who have been saying, "Why have we not considered permanent legislation?" and who, have been very, very timid in advocating any position, I hope will have time and will join us in finding some kind of a course to correct our laws, to help us preserve and protect collective bargaining.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that not only do the railroads and the laborers get into stubborn positions, but also, from what I hear today, we need some compulsory arbitration between the House and the Senate.

The Senate takes a position and stands pat. The House takes a position and stands pat. Yet we are asked to vote on one position, and that is the Senate position.

Two questions I ask all Members at this point.

Can any Member at this point say which industry in the United States today, in the great economic complex of production, would not be a national emergency? Are we not indeed voting for compulsory arbitration for the automobile workers within 30 days or 60 days, and for the rubber workers unless they go back at the end of the week, and for the steel workers if they should call a strike?

If we do that, it should be done in good conscience and not under the guise that this is only for transportation.

Again, if they do not go to work, who will make them go to work?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe we should recognize that we are not dealing only with a strike. We are dealing as well with a series of lockouts.

The issue here is not caused by one side but by two, and yet the remedy proposed by the other body would apply pressure only to one side.

As to those who try to bring into this very discomfiting issue the question of the defense of this Nation, let me point out that the men and women who work in the railroad industry have sons and brothers and fathers in the war just as much as any other group in this Nation, and they have committed themselves to move any essential cargo.

They were available for conferences with the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor, and those conferences were not held in any meaningful sense of the word. There was no effort made to define the type of cargo which should continue to move regardless of a strike or lockout condition which might prevail.

So to place upon these people who have not been permitted to have collective bargaining work since 1924 the onus of blocking the war effort of this Nation is a grossly unfair act.

We have here the same principle we had when we last debated the issue. If the House was right then—and I believe it was—we should reject the motion to concur in the Senate amendment and send the matter back to the other body and let them know that at least somewhere there is a middle ground and that we do not intend to permit them to dictate our last course of action.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we are told that the question here is one of finality or lack of finality.

Let me begin by pointing out to my colleagues two actions on the part of the other body which we are asked to swallow today, whole, without chewing but which do not provide for finality.

Mr. Speaker, in 1963 we started out on a similar problem and proposal. We were told that it would solve the issue. The answer is that the issue has not been solved, and we can expect that this issue is going to be shortly placed back before

us and the issue supposedly solved by that legislation, will be before this Congress again.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that in 2 years the issue under the Senate bill—the question of pay—will be placed back before this Congress and that there will be no finality. This is due primarily to the activities and the position taken by one of the conferees of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, your conferees met on June 26, 27, May 11, 12, 13, and 17 and we have had some differing reports as to the number of rollcalls which were had during those conferences. However, the clerk of the managers on the part of the House called the roll no less than 15 times and I counted at least eight different proposals which were offered by your conferees on behalf of the House in an effort to try to achieve a meeting of the minds and a compromise between the two bodies. I will tell you, however, that the conferees on the part of the other body never budged from the Senate version but instead offered to us only nonsensical and pusillanimous language such as is contained in the proposal of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I want this body to know that your conferees went to the Senate and we sought to achieve a compromise of the issue between the two bodies. We offered to accept the so-called finality of the Senate, by agreement of the conferees on the part of the House and, therefore, Members on both sides of the aisle joined together, if we could only have some other language adopted which would afford us an option for the President to exercise fair and evenhanded pressure against both parties to this dispute.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear as to the position of and the efforts made on the part of one of the managers on the part of the other body—and I think he had the managers on the part of the other body pretty well terrorized—with reference to achieving the heading off of the strike. However, the gentleman's plan was to achieve something far different.

Mr. Speaker, your conferees on the part of the House had not sat at the table for more than 15 minutes before an amendment had been placed upon the table to the effect that the two bodies were in irreconcilable dispute and that the conferees should report this fact to their respective bodies.

Mr. Speaker, your conferees on both sides of the aisle worked together to achieve some understanding and some meaningful dialog with the other body. I regret to report to the Members of the House that all we achieved was bullheadedness on the part of the other body.

Now, let me go further. Now let me tell you that the question here is not a strike or the acceptance of the Senate bill.

Whether a strike now goes on—and I am as critical as any Member of this body over the unwisdom and foolishness and arbitrariness and capriciousness of those who have brought about this work stoppage at this time—and I would point out that I have warned labor of the dan-

gerous possibilities that they would set loose through a proposition of this kind—but the question here is between further discussion between the House and the Senate, between upholding the decision of these conferees of the House of Representatives—who have voted by a very heavy vote to achieve the position which we are now asked to disgracefully retreat from.

Let me make it very clear to you, the Senate and the administration have placed this body and your conferees—and you, my good friends and colleagues—in an awkward position of having to swallow whole compulsory arbitration, or to continue a strike.

But I say this is not it. We can reject the motion to concur in the language of the Senate, and we can go back to conference, or we can offer language of our own, or we can offer the so-called Pepper amendment. And we will not be voting to place this country in jeopardy for lack of supplies and ammunition necessary to go to Vietnam, and we will not be voting for a cessation of the movement of essential goods, transportation, and supplies for the people of this country, we will be voting, rather, for a continuance of the discussions between this body to head off what is very clearly the most dangerous economic precedent that this body could assume.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is certainly right. We will be voting to uphold the hands of our conferees in the conference. And let me tell you one other thing, and that is—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my friend from Maryland for yielding me the additional time, and I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The point is this: If the Members will notice the time when this expires, it is January 1, 1969, and that is just 90 days after the 1968 elections. So if there was anything political that I ever saw, it is certainly this, because it is just to put this off beyond the 1968 elections.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to add this, that I believe I should tell the Members of the body that as a conferee that the House conferees offered to accept almost in its entirety the position of the Senate, because we thought if it was agreed to we would have the support of the Senate, but something I am afraid to say to my good friends here happened as a result, this compromise that would have headed off the situation we find before us today was rejected by an overwhelming vote by the Senate conferees.

And let me just say this, and repeat this to you: that the question is not a strike, or the Senate version, the question is a compromise of the Senate version or some other version. I say let us

vote to uphold the dignity of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the President has reaffirmed in his communication to the House his strong support for the legislation which faces us today. The other body, by a vote of 69 to 20 a few hours ago, reaffirmed its position in favor of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe that the time for action in this body is now.

Mr. Speaker, this bill may not be perfect, and I would be the first to concede that it is not. But we have gone through a long legislative process, and I do not believe any new or further action on our part today will improve the legislation that is so essential to avert the crisis that this country faces right now.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. I would hate to have the House of Representatives fiddle while the country burned.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought when I came to the Congress 18½ years ago that I would ever in any circumstance, or under any situation, vote for some form of Government interference in a process of free collective bargaining.

I have said repeatedly in communications with my constituents and others, by word of mouth or by letter, that I thought this was a principle that had to be upheld under any circumstances. I inwardly feel that that principle is right today.

But I think we are faced with two competing principles—first—the principle of free collective bargaining—and the need to maintain it to a maximum degree and to obviate interference as much as we can on the part of the Government. But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I think there is another principle that is of a higher order—the necessity of a free government and its free people to protect itself at home and abroad.

When I put these two principles on the scale, I am convinced beyond any doubt whatsoever that we had better vote for this legislation today.

The gentleman from Florida, if I recall correctly, said that those who vote for this bill today will have it come back and haunt them. I respectfully say that those who vote against this legislation may well have their vote come back to haunt them if this strike goes on.

Let me give you one illustration to supplement what my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority Member, said a few minutes ago as to the need to maintain rail transportation.

Yesterday the Secretary of Defense at the White House conference called by the President said that there is a newly developed, highly classified weapon that is vitally important to our troops today in Vietnam. We have a limited supply on hand for the use of our fighting men in South Vietnam and unless we keep the rails moving, that particular item that is so essential to the protection of our national interest in Southeast Asia will not arrive in sufficient numbers when needed. Every day that we delay means

that the strike goes on. Mr. Speaker, I think we had better move and move fast. The clock is moving. Time is of the essence.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there are 500,000-plus railroad employees involved in this overall wage issue. An overwhelming majority of the unions have reached a negotiated settlement with management. Approximately 40,000, led by one man, have not settled and that disagreement precipitated the crisis we are faced with at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think our country should be so affected by one man or even a group of men. I think each and every one of us had better face up to what I think is the overriding public interest, and pass this legislation—and tell a limited few—or a handful of men—or one man—that the President, the Congress, and the people demand that the national interest transcends the right of any individual or group in our society. The vote should be, must be “Aye.”

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I compliment the distinguished minority leader upon his very strong argument and assure the House that I desire to associate myself with the views he has expressed in every particular.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to proceed, however, without saying first that I think the House conferees have done an excellent job. I do not think anybody could have worked harder than the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. HARLEY STAGGERS, has worked. He has tried, and he tried right up to the midnight hour, to get this matter resolved.

Every member of the conference committee on the House side—every member—tried again and again to bring back to the House something which would be acceptable to the House. Vote after vote was taken, if I have been properly advised.

Nor do I think the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, a beloved Member of this body [Mr. FRIEDEL], who has called this matter up and asks that we concur in the Senate amendments, needs to take a second place to anyone in his devotion to the cause of organized labor.

His labor record is an open book. It is a record of devotion to the rights of the workingman.

Mr. Speaker, what we face today is not a theory. We face a factual situation. Every hour that we delay is an hour that is costly to the people of the United States. Every hour that we delay is costly to those who are representing us in the fields of Vietnam. We are up against a situation. The Senate has acted twice on this matter and it has acted both times emphatically. How could we justify ourselves in sending back to the Senate something that the Senate has voted on twice, and twice has emphatically passed? Yet this is not the Senate's proposal. The proposal before us is the proposal of the President of the United States, and it is the proposal that was reported to the House, if

I remember correctly, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the issue was before us just a few weeks ago.

The time for debate is over. The time for action is at hand. We are today experiencing a nationwide railroad strike. The trains are idle. Military equipment is not moving. Perishable goods lie in the rail yards. Passengers are stranded. Hundreds of thousands of American men and women were unable to get to work this morning.

Will the House take the responsibility for continuing a situation of this kind?

It seems to me that it was put as strongly and as correctly as it could be put when the distinguished minority leader said in effect, "This is not the time for talk. This is the time for action." And action, it seems, is required under the circumstances which confront the Congress and confront it now. We must act promptly. The clock is ticking. The hour is late. Vital interests of our country are at stake, and the interests of our country are most important considerations of the Congress of the United States. They are more important than all the other considerations which have been brought to the attention of this body today. Public duty must be our watchword. In the public interest we must act.

I ask that the motion of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland be agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the chairman of the conferees, if the Senate had or would accept the House version, there would be no strike as of this afternoon. Is that not correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. And if the Senate would accept the House version of the joint resolution, after the Board had made a determination and the House and the Senate were given the right to vote that determination into effect, it would be a finality and there would be no strike—and we still would not have compulsory arbitration. Is that not correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak very briefly, because we have heard the issues from all sides.

Compulsory labor is foreign to America. However, it is known in many other lands. Free labor has built America into the great and mighty nation it is today, from the days of Plymouth Rock, to the present.

I cannot vote for this legislation, and, as I have said many times, this is a road America should never take; once we take it there is no turning back. This is a final venture we are going on.

I believe that if it is turned down—and we could pass an amendment and get it back to the Senate—we do not have to go home for a while yet tonight—we could see if they would take an amendment; one that would have some finality in it, and I do not think that would take long.

Under the circumstances, I must vote against this legislation in its present form.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the strike against our Nation's major railroads must be ended. Our economic strength, the necessity of supporting our troops in Vietnam, and the jobs of thousands of people not involved in this labor-management dispute make an end to the strike mandatory.

However, I cannot in good conscience, support the legislation before this House today, and I am voting against it as a protest against its destructiveness of collective bargaining and its one-sidedness. I am protesting the repeated demand that Congress act under 11th-hour pressure and the failure of the administration to propose a permanent solution to the threat of strikes that could cripple this Nation.

I deplore the administration's substitution of compulsory arbitration for collective bargaining in the bill now before us. I fear that it may well set a precedent for replacing collective bargaining with compulsory arbitration in future disputes. In my view, evenhanded pressure on both labor and management would be more equitable and just as effective. I have introduced legislation authorizing receivership as a last resort to reach settlement in disputes where the health and safety of a substantial part of the population is threatened—first in cosponsorship last year with Senator JAVITS of New York, and again this year as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 559.

I am hopeful that this latest crisis will convince the Congress that it must enact legislation to protect the public interest and to avoid the necessity of last-minute action to avert a crisis.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this bill. I cannot look forward to a railroad strike, with everything it implies, without deep concern. But I cannot justify to my conscience a bill which, with the best will in the world, comes to the point of decision by stating to the railroad workers, in effect:

What you give to the railroads—your labor—is their due. What you get in return is negotiable.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is the sum and substance of the bill before us. The railroad strike is a serious matter, and there can be no blinking at that fact. I would wish that the railroad workers and the railroad management had been able to settle their differences amicably and through the normal channels of collective bargaining. But they have not, and the hard question before us is whether or not we are going to take away from an important body of American working men the right to withhold their labor in a concerted fashion because the return

they are offered for that labor is not adequate.

The alternative, Mr. Speaker, is a clear one. If the continued operation of the railroads is so essential to the Nation that the working man must, in effect, be told that he has no choice except to work for whatever management will agree to pay, then management ought to be told, in effect, that they must pay what the worker needs. If the working man must sacrifice in the national interest, then so must management. If the right to strike is to be lost, if what amounts to compulsory arbitration is to apply to the railroads, then there is no reason why the railroads themselves should not be seized, at least until labor and management can freely settle their differences.

We are told that there are constitutional barriers to seizure of the railroads. If that is the case, if the railroad's property rights are constitutionally protected against seizure by the United States, then I submit that the worker's right to strike is also constitutionally protected. What, after all, is a strike, except an exercise of the right to refuse "involuntary servitude", which is specifically forbidden by the 13th amendment?

I am not, Mr. Speaker, arguing the rights and wrongs of the labor disputes at question. There are, I am sure, honest differences of opinion as to that. But I am arguing that the right to strike ought not to be subjected to legal limitations, unless the right of management to its profits and, yes to its very income, are also limited for the same period.

I would rather not see either right limited. I am no enthusiastic fan of public ownership. I suggest it only because it seems to me that throughout this controversy the fundamental argument seems to assume that the only question is whether or not the workers are going to work. The question of whether or not the owners are going to bargain in good faith—the responsibility of the railroads themselves to the national interest—these things seem to be assumed to be unnegotiable.

"What's mine is mine—what's yours is negotiable." President Kennedy once pointed out that that is no slogan under which diplomatic negotiations can be carried on. It is also no slogan under which free collective bargaining can be carried out.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this is a most unfortunate day in the history of the House of Representatives. I have never been more certain of anything than that we will live to regret this day when we forced compulsory arbitration on American citizens and thereby made them second-class citizens. Even accepting much of the oratorical rhetoric which we have heard here today, there is no clear and present need for such catastrophic action.

I for one am getting a little tired of this legislation, by, crisis approach which finds us in the position of literally being forced to enact a measure which is wrong. Eighteen months ago the President in his state of the Union message promised to send to the Congress a comprehensive labor proposal to deal with

strikes. We have never received it. He has reneged on his promise and now this crisis, due to the misfeasance of the Congress and the malfeasance of the President, supposedly make it necessary to throw the collective bargaining process out the window, I do not agree with this. If the President does not deliver on his promise we still have the clear duty as the legislative branch to do what needs to be done. We have failed, too.

That this legislation is politically motivated can be seen in the cutoff date which is safely set at some 60 days after the 1968 election. In politics, I am afraid, the tendency seems to be to take yourself off of the hook and put someone else on. President Johnson is doing just this and if we vote for this legislation we are, in effect, doing the same thing.

I voted against the first attempt at this compulsory arbitration proposal and I will continue to vote against it. No American worker or businessman should have a Government gun at his head. It is possible to point to an emergency situation in the rail strike but a greater emergency should be sounded by the action the Congress is taking here today.

I have heard it said time and time again that this bad legislation must be enacted to support our boys in Vietnam. No one is more interested than I in supporting our soldiers but possibly we should treat as equally important the preservation of the type of system they are fighting for. I am also concerned about what type of America they will be coming home to. This legislation will help make our Nation something it has never been before and should never be. It should be defeated.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation designed to avert a lengthy railroad strike which could disastrously affect our fighting men in Vietnam.

There are times when we in this House can justify quiet deliberation and leisurely debate, but this is not one of those times. One day of a nationwide railroad strike is already 1 day too much when we are waging a war.

At this very minute there are railway cars standing idle on the sidings, loaded with tanks, missiles, and tons of ammunition. At this very minute there are 10 ships lying in U.S. ports waiting to be loaded with some of those supplies for our forces in Vietnam.

None of us wishes to deny labor its right to bargain freely, but neither can we afford to bargain with the security of this Nation. That is the issue we here and now face.

I am sure that we are all aware of what this strike, if continued, can do to American industry and our whole economy. But apart from that immensely important consideration, there is the simple fact that we are denying our men the support they require to defend themselves in combat.

This denial cannot be permitted to handicap those who are risking their lives for the cause of freedom and justice in the world. It is in the interest of all Americans that rail transportation be restored without delay and that some other course be found to resolve the

grievances of the railway employees. Mr. Speaker, we must immediately enact this legislation to prevent an irreparable catastrophe both here at home and abroad.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the national railroad strike is here upon us and in view of the war situation we must vote for this legislation to prevent the strike. There is no alternative.

I would like to describe to you the destructive impact that a rail strike could have on our national defense efforts. Our national rail transportation system is vital to support our current efforts in Southeast Asia and to meet our military commitments worldwide.

Over 40 percent of the freight shipped by the Department of Defense, exclusive of those petroleum products transported by pipeline, is moved on our Nation's railroads. During the first 9 months of fiscal year 1967, Defense rail shipments totaled 5.4 million tons. This amounts to 20,000 tons, or approximately 625 carloads, every day. Without rail transport our ability to keep stocks of ammunition and other essential support moving to our troops in Southeast Asia will be seriously impaired. During the next 2 weeks, over 3,000 railcars will be needed to transport ammunition, weapons, tactical vehicles, rations, and other combat supplies for Vietnam.

When General Westmoreland appeared before Congress he said:

Our President and the representatives of the people of the United States, the Congress, have seen to it that our troops in the field have been well supplied and equipped. When a field commander does not have to look over his shoulder to see whether he is being supported, he can concentrate on the battlefield with much greater assurance of success. I speak for my troops, when I say we are thankful for this unprecedented material support.

We must not permit a railroad strike to jeopardize the logistic support so necessary for our military forces in Southeast Asia. In the light of the current world situation and with new and dangerous unknowns created by the Near East crisis, I believe it is unthinkable that a strike should be permitted to occur in an industry which constitutes one of the basic elements supporting our military posture.

Secretary McNamara has stated that the stoppage of rail service in this country had an immediate impact on our combat operations in Southeast Asia.

I do not personally see how, at a time when our defense needs are greater than they have been at any time since World War II, we can accept anything less than the immediate return of full and uninterrupted operation of the Nation's railroads.

In conclusion, the consequences of a continued shutdown of our national rail transportation facilities would be such that it cannot be permitted to occur. This is true not only because of the serious threat such a shutdown poses to our national defense effort but also because of the great harm which it will do to our economic stability. I therefore strongly urge action by the Congress—and action now.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dire

warnings by our defense experts of the disastrous effects of a railroad strike have now come true. This serious situation demands immediate action by the Congress.

At this very moment, 10 cargo ships are at berth in the United States awaiting ammunition shipments for Vietnam. Fifteen hundred railroad cars of ammunition are needed to fill these ships. Are they to remain empty at their berths because Congress refuses to act?

Thirty-nine tanks and armored personnel carriers will be stranded on the lines of the Southern Railway today. Will our troops in Vietnam be forced to wait for this essential equipment because Congress refuses to act?

Defense plants all over the country need a steady supply of raw materials to continue full production of vital supplies and equipment. Are the production and assembly lines to be slowed and eventually stopped because Congress refuses to act?

What answers will the Congress give to our fighting men in Vietnam and to the American people?

I say the answers must be "No."

I urge the Congress to act today to restore the full and uninterrupted rail service that is the keystone of our defense effort.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, America is caught in the throes of one of the gravest labor situations in the post-World War II period—a railroad strike that is debilitating the entire country.

The Nation's railroads are not operating in the first countrywide rail shutdown since the 2-day strike in 1946. Every American stands to lose heavily in this strike.

The shutdown—the result of a breakdown in collective bargaining—will have especially distressing effects on the members of the Armed Forces who are making such great sacrifices in Vietnam.

Already, the strike is hindering the transport of arms and other strategic supplies to the nearly half a million gallant American troops fighting for freedom on foreign soil.

To turn our backs on these servicemen by allowing this railroad strike to last an hour longer would be unforgivable. Any further delay in the transport of these materials could be disastrous for them.

At home, the paralysis—should it last long—will lead to a health and food crisis, an economic slowdown we cannot tolerate, the loss of many jobs and other devastating effects.

The situation clearly calls for immediate and effective congressional action.

What we need to get the country rolling again is a means of complete collective bargaining, not to replace it. We need legislation that considers the overriding public interest.

For the sake of all Americans, especially those fighting in the dense jungles of Vietnam, I urge immediate passage of effective legislation to end this dispute.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion to concur in the Senate amendments of this bill. I was, in fact, prepared to support the original Senate bill when it was first before us a month ago. This is not an

easy vote to cast now, and it would not have been an easy vote to cast before. But the action the House took previously did not solve the problem, it merely postponed it. And now that we are in the midst of a nationwide rail strike it is perfectly clear we cannot tolerate such a shutdown while men are fighting and dying in Vietnam.

It has been said that this bill is compulsory arbitration. I do not quite agree with that designation. What this bill does is to postpone this strike for 2 years, with the provision for some temporary pay increases for railroad employees in the interim. Surely this is better than delaying the strike with no pay increases at all. And in the meantime there is the opportunity at any time during this 2-year period for the two parties to the dispute to come together and agree through normal collective bargaining.

But, in the meantime, our troops will get the ammunition and supplies they need, and the vital secret weapons; secret weapons of which I, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, have been kept informed, will also continue to be delivered to our troops. Under the circumstances, I could not, as a Member of this House, discharge my solemn responsibilities by voting in any other way.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are allegedly a sobered and chastened lot now that the country is feeling the first effects of the rail strike.

From this we are supposed to draw the inference, I suppose, that we acted irresponsibly in the first instance in rejecting compulsory arbitration.

I categorically reject that aspersion on our action.

If the battle to preserve collective bargaining as an indispensable element of industrial democracy is lost—if it is replaced by Executive order or fiat—history will at least record the fact that some fought to preserve it even in the face of the incalculable folly of some within the ranks of labor who have precipitated this crisis. When the House met last on this matter on June 14, the wire services reported a furious round of activity at the White House—complete with a special Cabinet meeting.

Apparently yesterday we saw a repeat performance—and this time it was congressional leaders who were brought in and told that the original administration bill providing for compulsory arbitration must be passed today.

And we are even now hearing a repetition of what we heard a month ago—that in the first full day of the rail strike, the war effort is being threatened. If that is the case this Congress ought to proceed right now to pass a war labor disputes act and set up a war labor board as we did in 1943. After all, the wires also tell us that Colt Manufacturing Co., sole producer of the M-16, is locked in a strike. If we need compulsory arbitration in the rail strike, we perhaps need to apply the same remedy to that strike. And while we are on the subject of the import of the rail strike on national defense and the war effort—did the Government do as industry does—did it prepare? Did it stockpile ammunition?

If war is a failure of diplomacy, then a nationwide rail strike which in turn calls forth the type of legislation the administration is urging us to pass today is the acknowledgment of failure by railroad, management, and labor. It also represents the failure of the present administration to use its power of persuasion to achieve a settlement between the parties to the current dispute.

You may recall that following the 43-day airline strike of 1966, Assistant Secretary of Labor Reynolds was interviewed with respect to his outlook for future legislation. On television on September 4, 1966, he made this statement:

I think one of the things that I've learned is that there is no sense of accomplishment in lifting the hand of a groggy winner in a thing like this when you know the groggy loser has been the public, and somehow or other, these strikes that have such an impact on the public comfort and the public interest will have to be shortened or will have to be avoided, and still preserve the institution of free collective bargaining. Now that's quite a trick, but I think we can do it.

Well, Mr. Secretary, more than 10 months have gone by—soon a year—and we're still waiting for this administration to find its voice. Maybe what we need is a new task force to find the task force that set out in search of a solution in 1966 and somehow has never been heard from since.

I am further reminded of the fact that 4 months ago—which has certainly been the period of gestation for some Great Society legislation—4 months ago the Ginsburg Panel, otherwise known as Emergency Board No. 169, in its report on March 13, 1967, recommended that the Railway Labor Act be amended to help expedite the settlement of disputes in the transportation industry. I have seen absolutely no administrative initiatives in that direction.

Almost a century ago Walter Bagehot in "Physics and Politics" observed that "the whole history of civilization is strewn with creeds and institutions which were invaluable at first, and deadly afterward." This is precisely what is happening to the institution of collective bargaining under the dead hand of this administration.

I want to make it abundantly clear before closing that if the reports are true that five out of six shopcrafts wanted to settle on basis of the Fahy Report and only Mr. Siemiller stood in the way of a settlement then he has done the house of labor the gravest disservice.

He deserved the condemnation he received from me on this floor a month ago. I am only sorry that the Secretary of Transportation found it necessary to issue an abject retraction and apology for a similar statement of condemnation. For there are unfortunately within the ranks of labor and management both those who have not progressed beyond the Jay Gould philosophy of the last century expressed in the words "The public be damned."

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend Newsday published a story by Judge Samuel I. Rosenman relating to the most important domestic issue of the moment. The timing of this story, coming as it does on the eve of a nationwide

crisis caused by a threatened railroad strike, was most appropriate. The article is well written, well thought out, and deserves the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and all citizens in the Nation who are striving so hard to find a solution to the nationwide strike affecting the national interest. I am therefore placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this day when the Congress is being called upon to take emergency action to protect the public:

A BETTER WAY TO HANDLE STRIKES

(By Samuel I. Rosenman)

Mr. O. Citizen (O for Outraged) picks up his newspaper on June 15, 1961, and reads that this is the 24th day of a national maritime strike. Hundreds of ships are idle, cargo is piling up, much of it is rotting, international contracts cannot be fulfilled, thousands of American firms are being severely strained. The secretary of labor had told the President only eight days after the beginning of the strike that it would imperil national health and safety if it continued. And it had, for 16 more days.

Mr. Citizen mutters: "Something has to be done about this immediately, and also to prevent it again in the future. There's got to be some law about it."

But in the months and years that follow, he still reads of threatened strikes, or of actual long strikes, in stevedoring, bituminous coal mines, atomic energy plants, basic steel mills, newspapers, the New York City subway and bus system, long-distance trucking, meat packing, communications, fabricating steel mills, aircraft manufacturing. And each time Mr. Citizen complains that something must be done about it.

Quite apart from danger or inconvenience to the public is the immense loss to the striking workers and their employers. In 1965, for example, in all industrial disputes 3,963 work stoppages occurred which involved 1,550,000 workers. Idleness amounted to 23,300,000 man-days. Of these strikes, 221 lasted 90 days or more. They averaged 25 days.

There was a time within memory when it was difficult, if not impossible, even to form a union strong enough to strike. Lack of union funds, the right of an employer to discourage or even to fire anyone who joined a union, lack of individual savings, competition among workers for one job, the activities of professional strikebreakers and strong-arm men, the alacrity of many courts to grant injunctions against strikes—these were shameful items in the American past in labor-management relations. There was no semblance of bargaining equality between an employer and an employee.

That era is behind us.

Starting with the once-revolutionary principle that a man was entitled by law to join a union of his choice, and to bargain collectively, equality of economic strength between management and labor was gradually established. Today unions sit around the bargaining table not as suppliants, but as equals.

It was my great privilege to play an active role—albeit rather anonymous—in some small part of this progress since 1933. I take great personal pride in this growth of the labor movement. I am sure that this article will bring down upon me the criticism, if not the imprecations, of all my friends in the labor movement. But what I urge here cannot be dismissed as coming from an old reactionary or labor baiter.

My thesis, boldly and broadly stated, is that—with labor equality insured by our many labor laws—the right to strike should be curtailed when it is in conflict with the public interest, and that some form of final compulsory decision must be provided.

I would limit it—at least initially—to certain well-defined industries: transportation by land, sea and air; manufacture or production of any material necessary to national health or security; communications; and essential public, municipal and state services such as police, fire, sanitation, subways and buses, hospitals, and public health and welfare agencies.

By compulsory decision, however, I do not mean compulsory arbitration by an ad hoc appointed board of arbitrators. I mean by a separate system of labor courts and a separate labor judiciary with the sole function of deciding labor disputes.

To the outraged citizen who demands a law to prevent further stoppages I reply: There is a law—in fact, several laws—but these laws do not prevent or stop strikes often enough. Besides, and equally important, the laws never prevent all the distress and economic disarray which even a threat of a strike in a vital industry brings about.

What are the present laws?

There is the Railway Labor Act of 1926, which covers disputes involving railroads in interstate commerce and airlines in interstate or foreign commerce. When disputes are not settled, the National Mediation Board (three members appointed by the President) tries to bring about a settlement or to suggest compulsory arbitration. If arbitration is rejected (as it almost always is) and there is substantial danger that commerce may be interrupted to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation, the board notifies the President. The President may then create a Railway Emergency Board to investigate and report within 30 days. During these 30 days, and the next 30, no strike or lockout or change of employment rules can take place. This is the so-called 60-day "cooling-off" period.

There is the Taft-Hartley Law of 1947, to deal with nontransit disputes that might result in a national emergency when an entire industry, or a substantial part of an industry, is involved. If the President sees a peril to the national health or safety, he may appoint a board of inquiry to investigate and report publicly on the issues—without recommendations. He then directs the attorney general to get a court injunction, which is usually granted. For the next 60 days, the parties are supposed to negotiate with the assistance of U.S. mediation services. During those 60 days the President may reconvene the board to make a further public report. In the next 15 days the National Labor Relations Board must hold an employees' election on the final management offer, and must report the results within five days. Thus a cooling-off period of 80 days is provided. If the workers do not accept, which is usual, the parties are then free to strike or lock out and the President must give Congress his recommendations.

From 1947 through 1966, Taft-Hartley was invoked 24 times—10 by President Truman (whose veto of the act was overruled by Congress), seven by President Eisenhower and six by President Kennedy. Injunctions had to be obtained from the courts in 20 of these disputes. Settlements were reached during the cooling-off period in 10 disputes, in seven the strikes began or were continued even after the cooling-off period. In the same 20-year period, 109 emergency boards were set up under the Railway Labor Act.

In addition to the major federal statutes, many states have laws dealing with mediation, fact-finding and settlement of intrastate industrial disputes.

I have had personal experience with these boards. In 1946 I was appointed to one by the mayor of New York City, who was faced with an imminent subway and bus strike. On July 15, 1949, President Truman appointed me to a three-man special board when a steel strike was to take place the next day. On June 26, 1961, President Kennedy ap-

pointed me to a Taft-Hartley board in a national maritime strike. In 1963 President Kennedy appointed me chairman of an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act.

Among my colleagues on those four boards were Clark Kerr, then president of the University of California; Carroll Daugherty, James J. Healy, David L. Cole and Nathan Feinsinger, all experienced labor arbitrators and conciliators of outstanding reputation.

So I have had ample opportunity to observe the process at work. I have been in many long sessions with the parties separately and jointly. I have seen the parties come closer together, but have also seen their tempers heating up instead of "cooling off."

I am convinced that there eventually comes a time, after all the collective bargaining, mediation, fact-finding and recommendations have failed, when some third entity must come in and settle those parts of a labor dispute on which the parties cannot or will not agree.

Until now the only way, other than by consent to arbitration, has been to send the matter to Congress. This happened in the 1963 rail dispute, and has already happened twice in 1967.

The 1963 situation, involving railroad firemen, shows how desperately the government tries to avoid compulsory arbitration until it is up against the gun. And what happened in 1963 is being repeated—and even compounded—by what is now going on in the railroad industry.

The principal question in dispute in 1963 was whether the railroads should have the right to discontinue by attrition, pension, or job retraining and relocation the services of firemen who used to stoke steam locomotives but who were no longer necessary on diesel freight trains. Here's a chronology from 1959, when it all began:

November 1959. Notice served by railroads of a change in rules re: firemen.

Oct. 17, 1961. Creation of a presidential commission representing management, labor and the public. (Outside the Railway Labor Act, it did not have powers to decide but merely to recommend.) It devoted 13 months of study, had 96 days of hearings, took 15,306 pages of testimony and examined 319 exhibits totaling 20,139 pages.

Feb. 2, 1962. The commission's recommendations were reluctantly accepted by the railroads but not by the unions.

April 3, 1963. Creation of a Railway Labor Act board, of which I was chairman.

May 13, 1963. Our report issued. No settlement was reached and a strike became imminent involving 94 per cent of railroad employees.

June 5, 1963. President Kennedy persuaded the parties to maintain the status quo through July 10. The secretary of labor and the National Mediation Board intervened from June 4 to July 10, 1963, and there were about 100 meetings. No settlement.

July 9, 1963. One day before the deadline, the President suggested final arbitration by his former secretary of labor and then associate justice of the Supreme Court, Arthur J. Goldberg. The carriers agreed, but the unions did not.

July 10, 1963. The President got both sides to agree to an extension to July 29, and to his appointment of a new committee of six members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee to review the facts and report. There is no statute providing for this third committee.

July 19, 1963. This committee reported. No settlement.

July 22, 1963. Seven days before the next deadline, the President finally sent a message to Congress asking legislation. Extensive congressional hearings took place while further mediation was attempted, and the deadline was postponed to Aug. 29.

Aug. 29, 1963. On the very eve of the

strike, Congress passed a joint resolution calling for compulsory arbitration of the firemen issue by a new seven-man board (the fourth board) and further negotiation of the other issues. The arbitration award was to be valid, however, for only two years.

The new board held hearings again and made its award, providing for eventual elimination of the firemen. The railroads accepted it; the unions rejected it. The award was unsuccessfully challenged by the unions up to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The award of this board was carried out, but the legislation provided that it lapse on May 7, 1966. The entire matter is before us again just as it was back in 1959, unsettled and a fruitful source for a national strike, even though the other issues were settled by the intervention of President Johnson.

During all the developments following the President's message of July 22, 1963, which clearly provided for compulsory arbitration, all the political figures in the White House and on Capitol Hill kept insisting—with solemn face and without a smile—that they were not really exercising compulsion, but were providing for a continuance of collective bargaining. Of course, this was pure political hokum which fooled nobody, and certainly not the unions.

Now take a look at 1967, and you will see the same kind of shilly-shallying again at play in another threatened strike by six different unions representing 137,000 nonoperating railroad shop workers. Indeed, it is a little more ridiculous:

1. An Emergency Railway Act board made recommendations for a settlement, which the unions rejected, and a strike was set for April 13.

2. The President asked for agreement extending the 80-day deadline, but the unions refused.

3. The President then asked Congress to extend the deadline for 20 days until May 3. It did—on April 12, a day before the deadline.

4. Congress, at the President's request on April 30, nearly the last moment, again extended the deadline to June 19.

5. On May 3, the old deadline, the President sent a message to Congress asking for legislation to (a) outlaw any rail strike until Jan. 1, 1969, (b) provide a new, five-man board to seek a negotiated settlement within 90 days, and (c) if none was reached, the board would make a final decision to take effect immediately and remain effective until Jan. 1, 1969.

Of course, anyone could see—as did all the disputants—that the entire plan was compulsory arbitration if further mediation by this third panel failed. (It would take effect, however, only until Jan. 1, 1969.) But both the White House and the Department of Labor called it "extended collective bargaining and mediation to finality."

Organized labor ridiculed this description of the proposed legislation, and proceeded to fight it bitterly in Congress. The railroads approved the legislation, but pointed out that it was only a temporary palliative—as the last arbitration on the railroad firemen issue had proven to be—and repeated their demand for a permanent compulsory arbitration law.

The bill is having a hard time in Congress, which of course has recognized the proposal for what it is—compulsory arbitration. It can feel the labor leaders looking over its shoulders, insisting on the right to strike and tie up the nation's economy, unless there is seizure by the government. Of course, seizure has nearly always proven a fine weapon for the unions, for they have a better chance of getting what they want from the government than from the railroads. Seizure really solves nothing permanently, and is a much more drastic departure from the traditions of a free economy than the President's proposal.

The Senate passed the bill substantially

in accord with the President's message. But not the House. There, after bitter debate, the bill was emasculated by striking out the final compulsory feature. In effect, it therefore is nothing more than an adjournment of the strike for 90 more days. As this is being written the bill is going to a House-Senate conference. The unions agreed to postpone the strike from the deadline of June 19, until such time as Congress agrees on a bill, and have proceeded to fight the compulsory feature as it had so successfully in the House.

This passing-the-buck between the White House and Capitol Hill is a repetition of the 1963 railroad crisis. Congress is justifiably irritated at having to shoulder the responsibility for individual labor disputes with all its political liabilities, a function which is executive rather than legislative.

Congress, consisting of 535 members, is by its very nature unqualified to find a fair settlement; it does not have the time or facilities, and it will of necessity be actuated by politics. It should not be called upon for these ad hoc emergency strikes, any more than in the many functions which it has delegated to the respective administrative agencies, such as granting television and radio licenses (FCC), fixing rates and regulations for interstate electricity and gas (FPC), and many others.

This is the fourth time in the past year that Congress has had to come to grips with a strike measure. Everyone knows that the only ultimate solution is some form of settlement by compulsion; yet all hope that by delay there may be some so-called voluntary settlement.

The President, in his annual message of 1966, promised to propose general legislation to prevent emergency strikes. This promise was made in the midst of the disastrous subway strike in New York City. The President, however, has failed as yet to carry out his promise. He appointed a task force to advise him on how to meet the problems generally and permanently, but he has not published the task force's recommendations—if it made any.

The President says that he has not yet found a satisfactory permanent proposal. Of course, if what he means is legislation "satisfactory" to management and labor, he is looking for an impossible Utopia. But it is equally important to find one "satisfactory" to the public and fair to both sides—and that is easy. Neither he nor the congressional leaders, however, want to make the first jump into the cold water of compulsion.

Now it seems that the President has given up and has asked Congress to find a "satisfactory" permanent solution—which he has not been able to do—for emergency strikes. It is difficult to see how or why Congress should undertake this politically dangerous chore when the President, after 17 months of striving to contrive a "satisfactory" law, passes the buck to Capitol Hill.

Even if no strike occurs on the railroads, it is obvious that the economy has been damaged by the uncertainty, the delay and the hazard of planning ahead. This is true of threatened strikes in all industries. Cooling-off periods are fine, but the public gets no share of the cooling. Opposition to compulsory arbitration has come with equal intensity from widely diverse ends of the political and economic spectrum. The subject has made as incredible a set of bedfellows as can be imagined: Wayne Morse and Barry Goldwater; the AFL-CIO and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Morse in 1953 said on the floor of the Senate that compulsory arbitration "attacks in my judgment some basic foundations of economic freedom in this Republic." In the same debate Goldwater said, "It can mean price control, wage control, quality control, and even place of employment control." The AFL-CIO has said that "compul-

sory arbitration means loss of freedom." And the NAM has said that it "violates the American concept of freedom, under which the government is the servant rather than the master of the people."

Of course, these statements are all emotional and grossly exaggerated. I am sure the same kinds of charges were made when the federal government was advancing—in violation of "freedom of contract"—to abolish child labor, limit hours of labor for women in industry, establish decent minimum wages and many other items of social legislation that are now accepted as normal areas of concern by the government.

Labor seems to overlook the fact that in two out of three major fields of industrial strife, it has voluntarily and without too much persuasion given up its "economic freedom" and its right to strike. There are three principal categories of labor disputes, all of which were formerly used as causes for strikes. These are (1) jurisdictional disputes as to which union should represent the workers in a plant or industry, (2) "grievances" arising out of the performance or nonperformance of existing labor contracts, and (3) making, renewing, or reopening of basic labor contracts.

By now, the first two categories have largely been abolished as causes for strikes. Nearly all labor contracts contain provisions that any dispute about the meaning or application of the contract, or grievances, should be determined by compulsory arbitration, either on an ad hoc basis or by referral to an agreed upon "impartial chairman" or "impartial umpire." This is quid pro quo for a no-strike clause in the contract. With respect to industries under the Railway Labor Act, grievances or problems of interpretation or applicability are referred by statute to the National Railroad Adjustment Board for decision.

The only category of disputes not covered by statute or agreement is the making of a new contract. The arguments against any form of compulsory arbitration in this category are well-known, and have been advanced in many places. Of course, most Americans would prefer settlement by collective bargaining. They would not even object too strenuously to strikes in some localized industry where there would be no substantial impact. When, however, the American people are faced by the national stagnation which must result from strikes like the 116-day steel strike in 1959 or the 36-day longshoremen's strike in 1963, or the railroad strike threatened in 1963 and now again in 1967, they will insist that the national interest prevail, and that such strikes be nipped in the bud by some form of compulsion.

The better way to handle a national emergency conflict—the way all economic and personal conflicts are settled in a democracy—is by judicial determination.

What I propose is a new judicial system of courts—labor courts—with jurisdiction solely over industrial strife, including strikes. This would be confined initially to industries affecting interstate commerce, threatening the health or safety of either the entire country or such portion of it as the statute may provide, and also to essential municipal services like subways and buses, etc., which have been stopped by a strike.

The essential feature of labor courts is that the judges would have the same title, dignity, respect and standing as all the other federal judges. This would require that they be appointed by the President for life, and confirmed by the Senate in the usual way; that their time be devoted exclusively to labor cases; that they have the same salaries, the same retirement privileges, all necessary clerks and assistants, and the same dignified courtrooms and chambers as other U.S. judges. They should be empowered to assure orderly hearings by contempt proceedings and, in all respects, have the same public

standing and expertise in their particular field of labor as any other federal judicial officers. They will become qualified specialists in particular industries, and know the history of labor relations in those industries.

Labor courts' decisions should have the effect of judgments, enforceable by substantial fines, and appealable to a Federal Labor Court of Appeals consisting of the same type of specialized labor judges with powers to affirm, modify or reverse.

Labor court decisions should be conclusive and binding on both sides. In that sense the result will be the same as by compulsory arbitration. Yet I hazard a guess that most of the present rejection and abhorrence of compulsory arbitration by management and labor will gradually diminish and finally disappear.

I am sure that there is seldom the same complete confidence in an ad hoc board of appointed arbitrators as there is in a U.S. judge. There is naturally a great reluctance by both sides to have their economic future, and possibly their survival, placed in the hands of three men haphazardly appointed for one specific case. This reluctance is sometimes even greater with management than with labor, although labor protests more loudly.

The men usually appointed under the statutes or otherwise are necessarily part-time people. They all have their main economic interest elsewhere. Many of them are lawyers with busy practices; many are college professors whose main concern is not the disputes before them. Many of them (including myself) know practically nothing about the industry involved in the dispute, or of the history of labor relations in that industry. They have to begin from scratch, and learn the necessary background. While they are willing to serve as a matter of public duty, they still have their normal vocations to which they will return—hopefully as soon as possible. Some serve without pay on a job which may consume many weeks of seven 12-hour days. Those who are paid receive a small fraction of their normal earnings. It is a particularly thankless job because neither side, except in rare instances, is satisfied with the recommendations or findings, and they both publicly abuse the board.

Many of these board members hold jobs as professional "impartial chairmen" or "arbitrators" in different industries. They have been appointed on consent for a year or two by both sides of a labor contract, to pass upon grievances or disputes arising from the contract. Many industrialists privately fear that some of these persons tend to be partial to labor because they look to labor for its consent to be an impartial chairman. Whether there is any truth in this charge or not, it is enough if a substantial part of management believes it to be true.

Yet the same industrialist who views compulsory arbitration with suspicion feels perfectly content in submitting controversies—often involving matters of greater importance to him than an increased wage scale—to a U.S. judge. And he is quite prepared to abide by the judgment, feeling that this is the way of life in a democracy.

Labor, on the other hand, is more deeply concerned over the fact that compulsory arbitration makes unions give up their right to strike. From this premise, the conclusion is reached by union leaders, usually without any real analysis or reasoning, that our system of collective bargaining must come to an end under labor courts or compulsory arbitration. They also assert that compulsion must result in price-fixing, and eventually a regimented economy.

Nothing in my proposal calls for any interference with the give-and-take of collective bargaining. Unions will continue to require the same equality of strength, even though they cannot strike. For before a labor controversy reaches the end of the judicial

process, both sides have to try to reach a settlement on as many of the issues as possible by collective bargaining. Only items on which agreement cannot be reached will have to be resolved by the court. Individual employees or even weak unions cannot do this kind of bargaining successfully. They must be strong enough to amass all the facts with which to sit opposite management at the bargaining table. They must be able to employ the best of economists, lawyers, statisticians and bargainers. And they must have even greater resources if they have to go to court on a long, protracted trial.

It is not true that collective bargaining must stop when the right to strike is taken away. That is not true in the Australian system of labor courts. That is not true of any other kind of civil dispute or litigation in our courts. For every case actually tried, there are scores which are settled before litigation, during litigation, and even in the course of trial. These civil settlements are all the results of vigorous bargaining. A party settles for less because he fears that the court may decide against him and thus he will lose all. The weaker his case, the smaller his settlement. So each side, in negotiating, marshals his facts and his law, argues justice and equity with the other, and then takes a look at the strength or weakness of his opponent's case.

Labor argues that if left alone to strike it can do better than with government intervention. That may be true, but even that is subject to debate in many cases. But, if true, what is just about that kind of result? A man in a civil suit settles, but not because he is afraid that his adversary will compel him to do so by force or violence, or by economic warfare, which is really what a strike is. Why should justice in a labor dispute depend upon who is stronger in a strike?

Each side in a strike wants something. A strike will not determine however, which side is more justified, or reasonable, or intrinsically entitled to win. The union members have to eat; the union feeds them as long as it can. The richer the union, the longer it can hold out. Management in a strike has to meet overhead, fixed payments, demands of customers, and an outraged public calling for its services. The stronger it is, the greater its reserves, the longer it can hold out. Propaganda pours out of both sides, expecting that the power of public opinion on one side or the other will help it prevail. In actual practice, neither side wins all it has demanded (and really never expected to); a compromise is reached after untold damage is done to each other, to the economy and to the public.

How does this really differ in essence from the medieval trial by battle in which the strongest was declared the winner of a dispute? I concede that public opinion may in some cases help toward a settlement. This is the basic argument for fact-finding. But how much does the public really know about the issues of a strike and where justice lies, despite columns or pages of fact-finding statistics? On boards where I was a member, I used to take home hundreds of documents, charts, briefs, analyses of wages and profits in various industries, historical background material and legal briefs. It took me many hours just to read this material. I came to certain conclusions after heated arguments with each side, and sometimes even after warm colloquies with my colleagues. What can the general public know about any of this as a basis for forming an opinion? How many newspapers print the fact-finding material?

And how realistic is the claim that public opinion brings about a just settlement? Was there ever a more unified public opinion than the cry of outrage at the union responsible for the 1966 subway strike in New York City? Did it have any effect on the union? Of course not. The entire strike was illegal un-

der the laws of New York State from beginning to end, yet the union won. It won only because its employer, the City of New York, just had to provide means for citizens to get to work.

A dispute between individuals can be settled in one of three ways: (1) by agreement, (2) by outside determination, or (3) by a fist fight behind the barn. A strike is an enlarged, organized fist fight, without violence or physical injury but with plenty of blows. Centuries ago, civilized man, in the pursuit of justice, gave up this kind of combat.

What has given workers strength has been union, the ability to speak with a collective voice. That strength labor courts will not impair, but will increase. That is obvious because the court can deal with only one litigant—a union. So it will be essential to the proper workings of the court that there be strong, united, well-led unions to speak and act for their members. That has been the experience in Australia, where unions are relatively just as strong as they are in this country.

Not only is collective bargaining not jeopardized; it will remain an absolute necessity if labor courts are to be adequate to fulfill their functions.

But, the unions argue—and so does some management—collective bargaining will become a farce; neither side will retreat from its best offer, because it knows that a third party will finally have to decide it anyway, and suspects that he will probably merely split the difference.

To this there are two answers:

1. This is not what happens in other kinds of civil litigation. It is true that neither side makes its best offer of settlement at first. But as negotiation proceeds, and as a judicial determination draws near with the possibility presented to each side that it might lose much more than a reasonable offer or demand would give it, they come down to rock-bottom settlement terms. There is no reason why a different course should follow in a labor negotiation. The experience in Australia with labor courts has been that bargaining often continues right down to trial.

2. The contention that the presiding judge will ask what the best offer on each side is and merely split the difference constitutes a libel on our judicial tradition. I was a trial judge myself for 10 years, and I have had trial experience as a lawyer for 35 years. I have not personally met a single judge guilty of that practice after a trial. Besides, there is no reason why a judge should ever know about the offers on either side. Settlement offers are inadmissible as evidence in a court. And procedural arrangements can be made, if necessary, for the trial of any case to take place before a judge who has not tried to settle the dispute in discussion with the litigants.

I submit that the time has now come to end the strikes and stop the damage, and to substitute the reason and considered judgment of the courtroom for a verdict based only on strength and resources. Giving up rights like the right to strike—even more ancient rights—for the general good and welfare of the community is nothing new in civilized countries. The right to send your children out to work to help the family bank account instead of to school; the freedom to make contracts with workers on any terms mutually agreeable; the right to put up a building on your land of any height or bulk you wish; the right to deal in securities at arm's length in the good old way before the 1929 crash; the right to use in speculation other people's money entrusted to your care; the right to overproduce crops and to use your farmland as you wish without all the bother of agricultural regulation—all of these rights and hundreds of others were given up because the public interest was served by their surrender.

I submit that the interest of the public in any labor strife which affects its health, security or safety justifies—nay, requires—the same surrender.

What about price-fixing, which the opponents of compulsion say must follow any imposition of settlement? Do not wage increases caused by strikes do just as much to fix prices? Of course they do. Do you often see wage scales go up unless they are followed by price rises? Of course not. Almost every settlement of a major dispute, and especially of an emergency dispute, has been announced by the appropriate government official with the expression of a pious hope that prices would remain static. But they seldom have.

Five years ago I visited Australia. There I met several labor union leaders and discussed with them the workings of the labor courts in their country. They were well-satisfied with their experiences, and with the results they have achieved. The arguments usually advanced in the U.S. against any form of compulsory arbitration were dismissed by them as contrary to their experience with labor courts.

In this country, we have had the present haphazard system a long time—too long. The American public will welcome any reasonable change which will put an end to the needless economic waste which comes from strikes. And in the long run, I am confident that both labor and management will join in the welcome.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, when the railway labor dispute of 1963 came to the floor of the House of Representatives with a recommendation that amounted to compulsory arbitration, I stated as follows:

The President's message to the Congress, and the Joint Resolution introduced pursuant to that message, amounts to nothing more than compulsory arbitration and "passing the buck" until after the 1964 election. The adoption of the Administration's resolution seems sure to weaken rather than strengthen the collective bargaining processes in transportation, and perhaps sets a precedent in all industries.

Unfortunately, this prediction has turned out to be true, and the course of labor relations in the railroad industry has been downward ever since. It has now arrived at a point where the administration says, and the Senate echoes, that no solution other than compulsory arbitration is possible. To me this is defeatism and admission that we are unwilling to face up to the realities of the entire emergency labor relations picture in the United States today. That picture, unfortunately, has developed to the point where, in a major industry, there are few disputes that can be settled without intervention by the Government on one side or the other. The difficulty with this is that the prospect of governmental interference being virtually assured, or even worse, the compulsory arbitration being certain as it is under House Joint Resolution 559, neither management nor labor will have incentive to lay their cards on the table to see where areas of agreement may be arrived at and what eventual settlement can be worked out between the parties.

In spite of the Vietnam war and the delay that has already occurred as a result of the brief strike that we have had, it is my feeling that the Congress can and should immediately find a better solution. As a temporary expedient, the

alternative offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], offered this opportunity and continues to offer it. For these reasons, I could not support House Joint Resolution 559, since it is my conviction that it will lead to a weakening of collective bargaining; and collective bargaining is an absolute essential of our private enterprise system. Sooner or later, the Congress is going to have to face up to this situation. Let us hope that even though House Joint Resolution 559 is about to become law, we will continue in this session of Congress to seek for better solutions to the emergency labor dispute situation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 244, nays 148, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—244

Abbitt	Duncan	Jones, N.C.
Abernethy	Dwyer	Kazen
Adair	Edmondson	Keith
Albert	Edwards, Ala.	Kelly
Andrews, Ala.	Edwards, La.	King, N.Y.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Erlenborn	Kleppe
Annunzio	Esch	Kluczynski
Arends	Eshleman	Kornegay
Ashley	Evans, Colo.	Kuykendall
Ashmore	Everett	Laird
Aspinall	Evins, Tenn.	Landrum
Ayres	Fallon	Langen
Baring	Fascell	Latta
Bates	Findley	Lennon
Belcher	Fisher	Lipcomb
Bell	Ford, Gerald R.	Lloyd
Bennett	Fountain	McCarthy
Berry	Frelinghuysen	McClary
Betts	Friedel	McCulloch
Bevill	Fuqua	McDonald,
Blester	Gallinanakis	Mich.
Boggs	Gardner	McMillan
Boland	Gathings	Machen
Bolton	Gettys	Mahon
Bray	Gilmo	Mailliard
Brooks	Gibbons	Marsh
Broomfield	Goodell	Mathias, Calif.
Brotzman	Goodling	Matsunaga
Brown, Ohio	Green, Oreg.	May
Broyhill, N.C.	Gross	Mayne
Broyhill, Va.	Grover	Michel
Buchanan	Gubser	Miller, Ohio
Burleson	Hagan	Mills
Bush	Haley	Minshall
Button	Hall	Mize
Byrnes, Wis.	Halleck	Monagan
Cabell	Hamilton	Montgomery
Cahill	Hammer-	Morris, N. Mex.
Casey	schmidt	Mosher
Celler	Hanna	Natcher
Chamberlain	Hardy	Nelsen
Clancy	Harrison	Nichols
Collier	Harsha	O'Neal, Ga.
Colmer	Harvey	Fatman
Conable	Hechler, W. Va.	Pelly
Corbett	Henderson	Pickle
Corman	Herlong	Pike
Cunningham	Hicks	Pirnie
Daddario	Hosmer	Poage
Davis, Ga.	Howard	Poff
Davis, Wis.	Hull	Pool
Dawson	Hunt	Price, Tex.
de la Garza	Hutchinson	Pryor
Dellenback	Ichord	Purcell
Devine	Irwin	Quile
Dickinson	Jarman	Quillen
Dorn	Joelson	Reid, Ill.
Dow	Johnson, Pa.	Reifel
Dowdy	Jonas	Reinecke
Downing	Jones, Ala.	Resnick
	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Ariz.

Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roush
Sandman
Satterfield
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schneebell
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.

Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt

NAYS—148

Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Barrett
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Carter
Clark
Clawson, Del.
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Culver
Curtis
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dulski
Eckhardt
Ellberg
Farbstein
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Gilbert

Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gude
Gurney
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hollifield
Holland
Horton
Jacobs
Johnson, Calif.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kirwan
Kyl
Kyros
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McDade
McFall
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Martin
Mathias, Md.
Meeds
Meskill
Mink
Moorhead
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.

Waggonner
Walker
Watkins
Watson
Watts
White
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wylder
Wyle
Wyman
Yates
Young

Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Rallsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Saylor
Scherle
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Staggers
Steiger, Wis.
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Wampler
Whalen
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wyatt
Zablocki
Zwach

Mr. Robison for, with Mr. Moore against.
Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Carey against.
Mr. Whitener for, with Mr. Roybal against.
Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Cowger against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Minish with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Fino.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Roubush.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Edwards of California.
Mr. Brinkley with Mr. Cramer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the measure just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED AND FOUND TRULY ENROLLED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO REINSTATE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order that I had reserved for 60 minutes for this date be reinstated following completion of the legislative business on this date.

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

There was no objection.

NEWARK AND RIOT CONTROL

Mr. RYAN. 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

NOT VOTING—40

Anderson,
Tenn.
Battin
Brinkley
Burton, Calif.
Carey
Cederberg
Clausen,
King, Calif.
Don H.
Cleveland
Cowger
Cramer
Denney
Edwards, Calif.

Fino
Garmatz
Gray
Halpern
Hays
Hébert
Hungate
King, Calif.
Kupferman
McClure
McEwen
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Moore

Morgan
O'Konski
Passman
Pucinski
Rarick
Robison
Rodino
Roubush
Roybal
Scheuer
Whalley
Whitener
Williams, Miss.
Zion

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Burton of California against.
Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Kupferman against.

to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares to consider the so-called anti-riot bill, the disturbances in Newark are ironically timely. I am sure all of us were deeply disturbed by the outbreak of violence there. As the Washington Post editorialized this morning, the ghetto riots of the past 3 years have been "not-revolutionary or homicidal, but purposeless and suicidal."

They are born of anger and despair, and characterized by little organization or ostensible political purpose. Nevertheless, the objects of attack are the symbols of white authority and property.

The tragic outburst in Newark makes even more irrelevant the efforts of this House to pass a riot-control bill based on the premise of outside agitators. I invite any colleague to show how the enactment of H.R. 421 would have prevented the latest disturbance.

Will we have the incredible shortsightedness to emasculate programs to eliminate urban slums and give hope to despairing citizens and then expect that the problem will be solved by Federal laws forbidding persons to cross State lines with intent to incite riots. In cities like Newark, despair can explode into riot without crossing a street.

We seem unwilling to accept the fact that downtrodden peoples are fully capable of taking action themselves, whether in Newark or Southeast Asia, independent of those who may enter to fan the flames.

Newark and Watts—and the list will inevitably grow longer—are the forgotten backwaters of urbanization. The press reported that, as each exploded, the rioting took on an almost "festive" atmosphere—a relief, perhaps, from the oppressive boredom of urban misery.

Will we continue to let the slums fester and seek solutions only in new police powers? Police are at best an interim, inadequate substitute for respect for self and respect for law. There can never be enough police to protect the white middle class from resentments which grow increasingly bitter and even suicidal. In cities like Newark social dynamite will continue to explode unless downtrodden people are given hope for a brighter future.

"THE APOLLO MESS: STAGED FOR A RERUN?"—CONGRESS MUST RE-OPEN THE HEARINGS

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker will the Apollo disaster be repeated?

Two weeks ago on July 3 there was another fire during a test of the lunar module in White Sands, N. Mex. There was no public outcry because it was an unmanned test for engine thrust, and no injuries were sustained by human beings.

The lunar module was in a vacuum chamber, and presumably a leak developed in the fuel line. What will it be the next time? Is this a matter of deficient workmanship? Or is it possible that NASA still does not know enough about the hazards of fire in oxygen-rich environments and whole and partial vacuum environments and other conditions which will be encountered on the moon's surface and en route? Does NASA yet know enough to undertake this venture with a reasonable degree of assurance about safety and success? Does NASA have enough coordination within its own program to satisfy us that it is fully aware of all the complex difficulties, challenges, and dangers and has taken every possible and reasonable precaution to avoid further disasters?

The publication Chemical Engineering of June 19, 1967, answers the question about repetition of disaster by saying:

Administrative confusion, more than technology, triggered the accident that took the lives of (the) Astronauts . . . there will be future oversight disasters, regardless of patch-up work on the Apollo capsule—unless NASA management learns to communicate with and between the many technical skills essential to space engineering.

This was the conclusion expressed in a challenging article by the senior editor, Robert Davidson, and other staff members following a detailed study of the available evidence surrounding the Apollo disaster. They aver that a lack of effective management within NASA is the major villain contributing to past difficulties and will—if not greatly improved—perpetuate the conditions which brought about the recent tragedy. The Phillips report, the Apollo Review Board report and other recent revelations support the conclusions expressed in this article.

It is commendable that an effort is being made by some members of the engineering profession to take heed of present warnings and learn serious lessons for the future. Certainly NASA should also be doing this, but NASA's continued reticence prevents us from knowing if this is the case. Current rumblings of discontent within the space program suggest that schedule pressure, corner cutting, and administrative chaos continue, and that internal and external politics as well continue to take their toll of good management. Congress should not close its eyes to this question and allow unsatisfactory conditions to continue by default. The Apollo hearings should be reconvened—not for the purpose of continuing further a technical discussion of possible technical causes for the Apollo fire—but to undertake a serious and far-ranging management review of the sort that would force NASA to take stock and develop sound management practices for the protection of the public's investment in the space program. This is not to mention the safety of our astronauts.

This year Congress has shown itself willing to take a small step toward exerting some preliminary control over NASA via the budget. Let us now, much more importantly, take the next step toward demanding that NASA manage-

ment prove itself equal to the task of providing the Nation with a first-quality space program that can bear and should bear public scrutiny.

I recommend that my colleagues read the perceptive article, "The Apollo Mess: Staged for a Rerun?" from the June 19 issue of Chemical Engineering, which I include at this point in the Record:

THE APOLLO MESS: STAGED FOR A RERUN?

A lack of effective technical feedback may be breeding new hazards for our space program.

As NASA mops up in the wake of the Apollo-204 tragedy, two urgent questions loom: How could it have happened? Will it happen again?

Administrative confusion, more than technology, triggered the accident that took the lives of Astronauts Virgil I. Grissom, Edward H. White, 2d, and Roger B. Chaffee. This was confirmed in the 2,375-page final report of the Apollo Review Board. And there will be future oversight disasters, regardless of patch-up work on the Apollo capsule—unless NASA management learns to communicate with and between the many technical skills essential to space engineering.

Admittedly, it is tough to coordinate our \$5-billion/yr. space empire, but not impossible by modern management techniques. Will NASA meet the challenge? Can it correct the system that permitted gross safety oversights? Perhaps more important, will NASA rely more on chemical engineers and benefit from their interdisciplinary approach to technology? Are there new roles opening for chemical engineers in materials selection, safety, design, fire protection and systems planning? (See box, p. 91.)

But most perplexing: Why did NASA disregard its own warnings?

NASA on the Carpet—The Apollo Review Board failed to identify the underlying cause that permitted the January 27 conflagration.

Representative Donald Rumsfeld of Illinois charged that the Apollo Review Board "failed to examine, or at least report on, the fundamental conditions which permitted the accident to occur. It is inconceivable to me that they could exist without their being the direct result of serious and fundamental defects within NASA." And Representative Kenneth Hechler of West Virginia called for "sweeping changes and tightening up of administration of the space agency and its contractors."

Industry experts contacted by Chemical Engineering blame many of NASA's woes on managerial high-handedness. Among the complaints leveled at NASA:

There is duplication and lack of over-all coordination in safety organization; two separate safety programs—manned and unmanned; duplication without coordination in safety at Langley, Houston, Edwards, Huntsville, Moffett and elsewhere; rivalry between safety and fire protection.

Contractors are allowed to ignore the lessons of previous contractors, being determined to do it by themselves, and better.

Work started from scratch. Twenty-five years of experience with oxygen atmospheres by the Navy and Air Force mostly overlooked; industry know-how with oxygen ignored; a deaf ear given to suggestions ("You just don't give advice to NASA"); major old-line oxygen companies given no significant role in spacecraft environmental design.

Pet vendors are nurtured; few among the non-pets are heard.

Favored vendors are allowed to raid key men from NASA for their technical and political (NASA organization) know-how.

Recommendations by researchers are often overruled to achieve mechanical and structural success.

The anxiety of many was stated by Representative Olin E. Teague of Texas, head of the House Subcommittee on NASA Oversight. He charged that the Apollo Review Board report was a "broad indictment of NASA and North American and the whole program."

Fog in the Crystal Ball—At February hearings by Rep. Teague's House Subcommittee, Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., deputy NASA administrator, testified, "Continued alertness to the possibility of fire had become dulled by previous ground experience and six years of successful manned missions."

NASA administrator Webb told the House, "In moving ahead to utilize the resources made available to us, we have to take technical risks in the development of equipment and in establishing our schedules. But we have not knowingly accepted a higher level of risks in order to meet our manned-flight schedules . . . we have taken no risks as to the lives or safety of the astronauts that we could find a way to avoid."

Astronaut Frank Borman, a member of the Apollo Review Board, said that his work on the investigation of the Apollo accident convinced him that "there were hazards present beyond the understanding of either NASA's engineers or astronauts."

And, testifying before the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee headed by Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico, Dr. George E. Mueller, head of manned space flight, said, "It was not through overlooking the problems that we arrived at the accident. It was rather that our specifications did not take account of the specific event."

In April, before the House Subcommittee for NASA Oversight, Mueller admitted that design and inspection procedures were inadequate. He said, "If more-thorough testing of flammable materials used in the cockpit had been conducted, the accident might not have happened." He also said, "If engineers had carried out full-scale fire tests in a mockup version of the spacecraft, they would have realized the hazards of such materials in pure oxygen."

Assuming Catastrophe—Oldtimers in industrial oxygen work follow Murphy's Law: If it can happen, it will. For a pure oxygen atmosphere, laboratory risk evaluations of ignitable materials are not enough. The total system must be considered—How much is there of the material; What are the system conditions; Are all sources of ignition eliminated? And the big questions: *What if it ignites anyway? What then?*

As for NASA, however, the Apollo Review Board said: "The underlying design approach in Apollo was to control the known risk of fire . . . by isolating and rendering safe all possible ignition sources . . . led to the use of several solid combustible materials within the spacecraft, including nylon and polyurethane foams." There were 70 lb. of flammable materials in the fatal Apollo command module, mostly nylon.

Space-chamber mishaps were not new. The first such fire occurred five years ago in an oxygen-rich space chamber at the School of Aerospace Medicine, Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex. Two crewmen in prototype space suits entered the chamber, which was at 5 psi. oxygen. A power tube overheated, and its plastic base ignited. Fumes alerted the crewmen, and both escaped without injury.

Soon after, two crewmen in pressurized suits with closed helmet visors were in the same chamber at the same conditions. A glow appeared behind the instrument panel. Within seconds, the rear of the panel was in flames. Both men passed out from the heat and smoke. One suffered from severe smoke inhalation when he opened his visor.

The third fire took place four years ago at the Aircrow Equipment Laboratory at Philadelphia's Naval Air Center. Four men in shirtsleeves were in a 10-ft.-wide space

chamber, pressurized at 5 psi. oxygen. An overheated light bulb burned out. When it was replaced, flame shot from the fixture. One crewman tried to snuff out the fire with a towel, but the cloth caught on fire and burned so vigorously that the man's clothes ignited. An asbestos fire-blanket was thrown over him, but it too burned. Flaming insulation from the light fixture dripped onto a bunk. When a crewman tried to beat out the bunk fire, his skin began to burn. Quick action from the outside saved the four men. And only when the oxygen was pumped out of the chamber did the fire stop.

Ignition for these three fires was caused by electrical failure. The January 27 Apollo incineration is thought to have started from an electrical arc through abraded Teflon insulation. The "most probable" cause of the ignition in the January 31 oxygen-chamber death of two Air Force men at Brooks Air Force Base was a Teflon-insulated work-lamp cord arcing against the aluminum floor.

How Secret the Risk?—There were numerous warnings. Early in the space program, fire prevention experts urged that NASA study how to control the spread of fire by proper design and structural arrangements within the cabin. They further recommended the use of full-scale fire-detection and protection tests. Both procedures have now been adopted by NASA.

The hazards of oxygen-saturated clothing were reported by the New York Naval Shipyard in *National Safety News*, September, 1957. Frequent injuries occurred during work aboard ships because of oxygen leaks and the ignition of oxygen-saturated clothing. Oxygen content of as little as 8 to 14% above normal created hazardous conditions of "major proportions."

Other published warnings of the dangers of oxygen-rich environments have been available for many years from the National Safety Council, the Compressed Gas Assn. and the National Fire Protection Assn.

More striking, however, are NASA's own warnings in its 1964 publication, *Space-Cabin Atmospheres, Part II—Fire and Blast Hazards*. Some pertinent excerpts from this publication are:

1. "... a statement of defining the hazardous nature of any gaseous environment must include a very rigid definition of the entire system."

2. "... increasing the percentage of oxygen at any total pressure will not only decrease the minimum spark energy (for ignition), but also extend the limits of flammability to a much wider range . . . from 21% to 100% oxygen, the minimum required spark energy decreases by three orders of magnitude."

3. The table, "Preliminary Screening Tests of Materials for Possible Use in 100 Percent Oxygen Atmosphere" reports that nylon fabric burned completely, as did polyurethane foam.

4. Of the five major potential fire sources listed, one was "electrical wiring."

5. "Examples of combustible materials that should be minimized or possibly eliminated from space cabins" include: nylon, polyethylene, Teflon. "No material which supports combustion in high-oxygen environments after the ignition source is removed should be used . . ."

6. Basic cabin design should reduce ignition sources and "Prevent sparking and arcing of electric or electronic equipment . . . by use of [among other things] abrasion-resistant electric wiring . . . All electric and electronic equipment and wires should be considered as ignition sources, regardless of how well they are protected."

Chewing Gum and Baling Wire—The list of engineering shortcomings in the Apollo-204, many of which disregarded NASA's own warnings, includes:

Extensive distribution of combustible materials in the cabin: contoured couches

with nylon covering and polyurethane foam; space suits with inflammable nylon and rubber; polyethylene bags for waste; nylon netting and fasteners to collect and stow gear in the cockpit.

Vulnerable wire transmitted spacecraft power; Teflon electrical insulation was easily damaged or penetrated by abrasion.

Vulnerable plumbing carried a combustible and corrosive coolant. Soft solder (400 F. melting point) for joints in oxygen and ethylene glycol coolant lines was easily damaged by bumping—coolant leakage had plagued the spacecraft in previous tests.

No vibration test had been conducted of complete flight-configured spacecraft.

Significant engineering changes are planned. Pressurized oxygen will not be used in prelaunch operations. Ethylene glycol coolant may be replaced by water. Combustible materials will be replaced where possible with non-flammable materials. Non-metallic structures will be arranged to maintain fire breaks within the cabin. Flammability tests will be conducted with full-scale mockups of the new configuration and a new quick-exit escape hatch will be built.

Musical Chairs—Around Houston, the story goes that on the day of the fatal accident, the oxygen was only 90% pure. The director of the experiment wanted to stop, but the astronauts objected. They told him to assume that it was nitrogen, which it normally would be, and to proceed with the test. Yet in the past, explosions had occurred when liquid oxygen boiled away to leave a concentration of hydrocarbon contaminants.

This did not cause the fatal fire, but does illustrate a most important recommendation made by the Apollo Review Board—the need for better definition of responsibilities.

As an example, for months the grapevine had it that NASA was disappointed with North American Aviation as the prime contractor for the Apollo capsule. But as recently as late 1966, NASA officials denied their disenchantment with the firm. Yet, Major General Samuel C. Phillips, NASA's Apollo program director, had a different story this April. He told the House Subcommittee on NASA Oversight that in 1965 he was so disturbed by North American's performance that he had considered taking away part of its \$2.8-billion share of NASA space program contracts. He didn't, he said, because the company improved.

But it was a recent error by North American that delayed the initial Apollo flight from last November. Methanol was used to pressure-test Apollo's titanium fuel tanks. Eighteen of the tanks passed, but the next two failed from stress corrosion (*Chem. Eng.*, Dec. 5, 1966, p. 69). The technical literature of 10 years earlier had reported that methanol caused stress corrosion in titanium.

Further shrouding the management of the Apollo program was a bewildering array of administrative omissions. Outstanding among those reported by the Apollo Review Board were:

Lack of definition of the respective responsibilities of the organization involved.

Adequate safety precautions neither established nor observed for the test.

Fifty-six major changes in test procedures the day before the fatal fire, with most of the workers likely not familiar with them.

One hundred and thirteen significant engineering orders not accomplished at the time the command module was delivered to NASA; 623 engineering orders released subsequent to delivery.

Established requirements not followed with regard to the pretest constraints; list not completed and signed by contractor and NASA personnel prior to the test—oral agreement only.

Noncertified equipment items installed in the command module.

The August 1966 test specification not updated for changes.

Lack of emergency fire or rescue teams at the launching area.

A number of equipment checklists unchecked.

Howling in the Wilderness—Safety is only as important as management decrees. Its essential element is top-management authority by a responsible safety director who can coordinate the many skills needed to oversee a safe system.

Management and safety experts contacted by Chemical Engineering feel that the Apollo failure was more a breakdown in coordination than in technology. This problem is not unique to NASA, and is often found in large commercial organizations, particularly those in which management is individualistic, rather than systems-engineering oriented.

Systems engineering is the only answer for complex situations where equipment, skills and techniques must be composited for a unified purpose. It identifies distinguishable elements, their cause and effect relationships, functions to be performed in each case, and required trade-offs among resources. It reduces the chances for oversight and appraisal gaps.

Among the federal services, the Air Force is the recognized leader in the use of systems engineering (AFSCM 375-5, the Air Force Systems Command Manual, *Systems Engineering Management Procedures*, March 10, 1966).^{*} Though NASA follows some of the principles of systems engineering management, one element is missing: effective auditing. When management operates from the top down, it cannot "hear" problems at the lowest levels. Astronaut Gus Grissom was frustrated at not being heard during a period of spacecraft problems in late 1966, according to *Electronic News*. When Grissom complained there was lack of harmony in the program, a close friend asked him why he didn't complain officially. Grissom replied, "I've been howling in the wilderness for years."

In the administrative pecking order, hardware falls at the bottom of the pyramid, and these contractors are seldom heard. The solution: Continuous auditing superimposed on a systems evaluation concept. The characteristics of auditing are:

1. Construction from the top down (administration).
2. Implementation from the bottom up (wee voices).
3. All information cross-pollinated (between skills).
4. Continuous (no lapse).

With auditing, professional employees must rate each system or situation they meet as *not critical* or *critical*. The next higher person can overrule a *critical* rating, but assumes the responsibility for failure. Not only does the system give a chance for all to be heard, but it assigns responsibility.

THE CHEMICAL ENGINEER IN THE SPACE PROGRAM

Exciting opportunities beckon as we approach long-duration space flights to Mars and beyond. The chemical engineer is vital to the space effort because of his knowledge of heat transfer, reactivity, corrosivity, containment and combustion, power generation, materials properties, toxicity, and systems reliability. A few of the myriad of out-of-this-world problems seeking creative solutions are:

Chemical propulsion—Fuel-oxidizer mixing for combustion efficiency and stability; pressurization systems; thrust-chamber cooling; design criteria for industry.

Fluids handling—Cryogenic storage; seals and bladders, long-term outer-space stability

for extended space trips; handling propellant spillages; preventing explosions and fires.

Special coatings—Third generation reentry ablatives; thermal control of temperatures by radiant energy absorption and emission; high-temperature cermets and ceramics; prevention of outgassing and plating-over of windows.

Life support—Foods for long space flights; environmental control of cockpit temperature, air, water, toxicity.

Miscellaneous—High-temperature adhesives for reentry ablatives; control for effects of man's exudations on electronic devices; shielding for nuclear engines; coolants that will not corrode or contaminate the metals containing them.

STATEMENT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 421, THE ANTIRIOT BILL

Mr. ECKHARDT. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 421, The antiriot bill, deviates widely from established Anglo-American processes of justice in the respects that I shall point out.

But first, let us consider what acts are made offenses:

The acts that are made offenses are all based upon traveling in interstate commerce or using the mail. Such interstate activity is the purported basis for making the overt acts which are proscribed a Federal crime. If one intends to do one of the things enumerated below when he travels or uses the mail, and then does one of them, he is guilty of a Federal offense. The acts proscribed are: First, an act of violence in furtherance of a riot; second, carrying on a riot; and third, inciting a riot.

It is true that organizing, promoting, or encouraging a riot are also made illegal. In addition, aiding and abetting another in inciting a riot, or in an act of violence in furtherance of a riot, are also illegal. But it appears that inciting a riot covers all of such acts, for "inciting" is sufficiently broadly defined to include all of such activities. It includes "urging" and "instigating" a riot.

The connotation that the word "encourage" spontaneously yields might be something less than "organizing" or "promoting," but the act provides that mere "advocacy of ideas" or "expression of belief" are not proscribed. Thus, the term "encourage" must mean more than is usually embraced in a normal usage, and it is difficult to see how all definitions which would be embraced under that term are not also included under the term "incite" if inciting means "urging" or "instigating."

Each of the three described offenses is based upon a different standard, and the three are increasingly indefinite as to the overt act involved. They will be discussed separately.

The first type of act made illegal is violence in furtherance of a riot.

Aside from the fact that this type of prohibition is usually within a State's police power, and should remain there, there is little argument but that an act

of violence in furtherance of a riot should be outlawed. If nothing happened, no heads were knocked nor property burned or interfered with, then it would be impossible to show that "an act of violence in furtherance of a riot" occurred. Standing alone, this provision would not permit persons to be prosecuted for mere expressions or thought which did not ripen into illegal acts, and therefore the first aspect of the antiriot law is objectionable only in that it places police power at the Federal level—not so with each of the other types of illegal activity.

The second type of act made illegal is carrying on a riot.

This second type of act which is made illegal may involve no violence at all, for the act provides that the inciting of a riot may be merely the creation of a situation in which a riot is likely to occur. The act provides in (b) of section 2102 that—

A riot is a public disturbance involving acts of violence by assemblages of three or more persons, which poses an immediate danger of damage or injury to property or persons.

It is thus apparent that "an immediate danger of damage or injury to property or persons" may be created by a mere "public disturbance" in the nature of marching in the street in certain parts of Mississippi. Nothing may ensue as a result of the marching, but it would be difficult to say candidly that the activity does not pose some immediate danger if, for instance, there is Klan activity in the vicinity. The immediate danger is not because of the violence of the demonstrators but because of the possible reaction of the populace. Yet the demonstrators are the "rioters" under the definition.

Now, it may result that no riot in fact ensues. The populace may not become inflamed to violence. The marchers may demonstrate peacefully and the populace may exercise reasonable restraint. Yet the "immediate danger" existed, and those who crossed State lines to mobilize the march may well be in violation of the provisions of the act—if the literal provisions are constitutional.

The third type of act made illegal is inciting a riot.

One may be guilty of inciting a riot if he only "urges others to riot" though no riot ever occurs. Indeed, there may never have been an assemblage of persons at all. The illegal act is the mere urging of persons to riot. The urging may be abortive when plans are abandoned upon cooler reflection.

Therefore, if this legislation were passed, we would be presented with the unique case of the Government purporting to make a man's movement across a State line illegal if accompanied by an intent and followed by urging of certain activity. In most cases a man guilty of a Federal offense carries with him across a State line a much more tangible object: an automobile, a bottle, a package of narcotics, or a woman. But here he has with him only an idea which he continues to further after he has crossed a State line.

The danger of abuse of such a statute

^{*}Available from Supt. of Documents, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price: \$2.75.

is apparent. The more concrete the offense may be and the more tangible the transfer from one State to another, the more difficult it is to fabricate a charge against an innocent man or to fall into error as to his guilt. If there were no motor vehicle disclosed by the evidence, if there were no proof of a narcotic in the possession of the accused, then it is clear that prosecution would fail. On the other hand, it is quite easy to assert, even to believe, that the accused crossed a State line harboring the intent to incite a riot under circumstances in which he had no such intent.

For instance, suppose Jones, in the District of Columbia, states to others that it is his firm conviction that Negroes in Virginia "should not take it laying down," that they should "fight for their rights," that "things won't be better until they are much worse," and language of this sort. He then goes to Virginia and urges persons to march in protest of deprivation of civil rights. No march actually occurs nor is there any riot or violence. The ideas that he harbored are subject to many interpretations. One hearing him may understand the language to urge violence, to incite persons to riot. When he arrives in Virginia he urges persons to march, which marching poses "an immediate danger of damage or injury to property or persons." Testimony to this effect establishes the elements of the offense.

What Jones intended may have been quite different from the construction which witnesses may put upon his language. There is nothing but language to construe, and to derive meaning from, in order to make out the offense. This is the essence of the dangers inherent in this type of legislation.

Jones carried nothing across the State line but an idea, and what that idea was must be established by witnesses who repeat or construe his words, perhaps inaccurately. It is much easier for a witness to testify accurately with respect to whether or not he saw a Buick car crossing the line from the District of Columbia to Virginia than to say what Jones conveyed in his words.

Most illegal acts have very tangible harmful results. The act of murder results in a dead person. The act of stealing results in the appropriation of property. There is some insurance against miscarriages of justice in that these criminal acts are accompanied by demonstrable results. If no body is found, or if no property is discovered missing, there is probably not sufficient evidence to support a conviction. But in the case of this proposed legislation the ultimate determination must be made upon very fallible testimony concerning expressions and intent, and the offense may be proved although nothing resulted, no violence or riot occurred, no heads were broken, no property looted or burned.

The basic fault of this legislation is that it reaches out, to sustain Federal jurisdiction, to an artificial incident: crossing a State line with an idea of, or intent to, instigate a riot. The real evil is not the crossing of the State line but the riot itself.

It is true that, to complete the offense,

the actor must after crossing a State line engage in an overt act. But a riot, as defined in the statute, is not what we ordinarily think it is. It is not necessarily a violent disturbance. It may be an entirely peaceful march within a community where such peaceful activity "poses an immediate danger of injury" to the marchers themselves—as for instance from the American Nazi Party. Thus, urging others to engage in a peaceful demonstration may complete the offense, though others are not urged to engage in violence.

If a criminal offense were framed in the normal manner of a State criminal statute, it would not be necessary to deal with one's state of mind while he is crossing a State line. Criminal laws usually deal with the act of committing or inciting violence directly. The initiator of the violence is subject to punishment. Under this bill, this is not necessarily so.

For instance, local Klansmen may create a riot in a crowd watching a civil rights march. They are immune from this legislation because their plans and actions are altogether local. But the peaceful instigator of the march who comes from another State may be guilty if a local jury finds that he should have known that the Klan would turn the gathering into a riot.

The implications for a labor dispute situation are obvious: The demonstration may be a picket line participated in by one from out of State, as in the Rio Grande Valley farm strike. The violence may be by strikebreakers or Rangers. But only the unionist from out of State is within reach of the provisions of this proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, disorder and violence are reprehensible wherever they occur. But general breaches of the peace and crimes should be suppressed under the criminal law of the State or community where they occur. Let us never threaten freedom by establishing Federal criminal law based on carrying an idea or intent across State lines. If we do this, every crime may be framed to fall within Federal jurisdiction if certain contrived elements exist. Such would be a long stride toward a national police state.

VITAL EDUCATIONAL MANPOWER TO FILL OUR CLASSROOMS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. 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 gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, at the heart of our ability to win what H. G. Wells calls the race between education and catastrophe, is the necessity of having enough highly qualified teachers to provide the vital educational manpower to fill our classrooms from kindergarten through graduate work. In President Johnson's message on education on January 12, 1967, the President said:

Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the

brain-power to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

We must demand that our schools increase not only the quantity but the quality of America's education. For we recognize that nuclear age problems cannot be solved with horse-and-buggy learning. The three R's of our school system must be supported by the three T's—teachers who are superior, techniques of instruction that are modern, and thinking about education which places it first in all our plans and hopes.

Another important step toward reaching these goals was taken on June 29 in Philadelphia when the President signed into law the Education Professions Development Act. In doing so, President Johnson paid tribute to members of the Teachers Corps who have won commendation from officials of several hundred schools for their work with disadvantaged children.

The Education Professions Development Act strengthens the Teachers Corps by increasing the authorized funds, by extending to college juniors and seniors the right to participate—reserved heretofore to holders of baccalaureate degrees only—and by placing the responsibility for the Teachers Corps in the hands of local educational agencies and the colleges and universities where these corpsmen may study. The Teachers Corps is only a small part of the total Education Professions Development Act, but it has the potential of becoming a significant part of it. The undergraduate fellowship program continues and there is a new program giving grants to school districts for the training of teachers where there has been a critical shortage. Another provision of this bill has for its purpose the training of other personnel in higher education than those individuals who are working for their Ph. D.'s. Taken together, the committee hopes that these various programs will materially help to meet the shortage of teachers that has been critical across the Nation.

Under no previous administration have there been the accomplishments in education legislation that we have seen under the Johnson administration. On June 29, the following very significant statement was made by President Johnson when he signed into law this Education Professions Development Act:

This morning we celebrate the success of a revolution.

This quiet revolution has gone on this past year in 275 schools throughout the United States. It is based on a simple idea: that the wisdom, the dedication and the plain goodness of young Americans could be harnessed to help America's underprivileged children.

This idea was so sound that it has withstood the fiercest buffeting and the strongest challenge.

There were times in the past year when the fate of the Teacher Corps looked gloomy indeed. The fact that the Teacher Corps will live is only partly due to the legislators of both parties who reasoned together to enact a meaningful bill. It is only partly due to the tireless energy of Richard Graham and the Teacher Corps staff in Washington.

The lion's share of the credit goes to the 1200 Teacher Corps members all across America who devoted this year to teaching

and to learning how to teach. They won their battle in the classrooms. The idea spread, it grew, and it conquered.

There are those who say that the Teacher Corps is a small program, so far reaching only 275 out of 100,000 schools in America. They are right. The Teacher Corps is a small program—just as the Peace Corps was a small program to begin with. But that small program has left the mark of America's idealism all over the world.

I am signing the bill this morning, because time is short. Before tomorrow night, when the supplemental appropriations expire, contracts must be let, payrolls met, and commitments made. I am asking Commissioner Howe and Director Graham to work round the clock. And I am calling on young and dedicated Americans to come forward and apply for this great adventure. By fall, we hope to double the size of the Corps.

This act I sign—the Education Professions Development Act of 1967—is a basic building block for our schools and for our nation. For no school—no matter how fine the building or how fancy its equipment—means as much as the men and women who work in it. Not just the teacher, but the principal, the librarian, the school nurse and the social worker are vital to our children's education. We need to attract our most talented college graduates and train them for the most challenging work they could possibly undertake—to light the spark of learning in a young child.

This act will help us to do that.

SAGGING LOTTERY AND MORAL UNEASE

Mr. MURPHY of New York. 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. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week the House overwhelmingly passed legislation to prohibit federally insured and federally chartered financial institutions from participating as a sales agent in a lottery.

The House debate was very lengthy and involved and should be abridged and synthesized to clear the air and highlight the facts involved. The following article from the Wall Street Journal of July 17, by James Gardner, does just that. It includes many comments by people who all had predicted the failure of a poorly devised plan to finance a complex States' education. The lottery needs a new look out of our hands.

I include Mr. Gardner's remarks, as follows:

SAGGING LOTTERY AND MORAL UNEASE (By James Gardner)

Can a rich, respectable state like New York play the betting game as well as a local numbers operator?

The answer seems to be, at least right now, not by a long shot.

Behind the failure of New York's lottery to live up to expectations last month (ticket sales for June were about 65% to 75% behind schedule, according to reports preceding the official results due out this week) lurk a number of temporary snafus that any new product or service is likely to encounter, and several more fundamental problems that are likely to prove sources of continuing difficulty.

First of all, lottery promotional efforts got off to a slow start. Ted Brown, the Fuller Smith & Ross account executive supervising lottery advertising, says that "the campaign only got into full swing 25 days ago."

An aide of Mayor John V. Lindsay blames the ticket lag on the fact that no one has won any money yet. "Just wait until the first prize is given," he says, "then you'll see sales accelerate."

Also cited in the June disappointment were the inconvenience of ticket purchasing arrangements, the price (\$1 per ticket) and, of course, the long odds (chances of winning a monthly prize of \$150 are calculated at about 1 in 4,000 and odds against winning the annual \$250,000 "super-prize"—assuming the present ticket sales trend persists—are somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 to 1).

None of these explanations is groundless, and it's quite likely that an increased advertising budget, plenty of time to clean up administrative red tape and a chain of well-publicized monthly winners would help lottery sales. But some problems will probably prove less tractable.

It's unlikely, for instance, that lottery news will get extensive coverage by radio and television stations. A Federal code prohibits dissemination across state lines of "any information concerning any lottery . . . or any list of the prizes drawn or awarded by means of such lottery." Though broadcast networks are interpreting the law with varying degrees of strictness (NBC says it will not report the names of lottery winners but CBS maintains that "if there's news, we'll use it"), all are likely to skimp on lottery coverage because of fear of an FCC crackdown.

A bill passed last week by the U.S. House of Representatives bars the sale of lottery tickets by Federally insured banks and could spell additional trouble for the New York lottery. Banks now serve as a major ticket outlets.

The possibility of Federal restriction has been a sore point with many lottery detractors. Says one New York City political leader, "It's a hell of a thing when the state is coming this close to contributing to a Federal offense." The reaction is similar to a good many more people confused by the moral ambiguity inherent in state sponsorship of a gambling operation.

The typical attitudes to such programs seem to be either a tendency to automatically whitewash any operation that raises money for a "good cause," in this case education, or to condemn gambling as tainted, immoral and well beyond the proper pale of government activity.

The tangle of attitudes shows up in some crucial spots.

"We have two purposes in our advertising campaign," says John Poister, creative director for Fuller Smith & Ross. "The main appeal of the lottery is to give people a chance to win some money under fairly respectable auspices. But we're also trying to sell another purpose which is somewhat at odds with the first, and that is to aid education."

In an amplification of Mr. Poister's statement, Mr. Brown, the account executive, says flatly: "The purpose of the lottery is to further education. There is absolutely no other purpose."

Government officials' efforts to remove all undesirable taints and connotations from the operation and promotion of the lottery have been intensive. As Frank Otwell, official public relations man for the lottery, tells it, "We can't have a campaign that's too full of hoopla. What's this lottery about anyway? It's not just a commercial gimmick."

Mr. Otwell gives one example of the tremendous pains taken to keep the campaign dignified:

"The advertising men had originally come up with a slogan that went 'The lottery

means better education—you can bet on it.' That was scrapped, partly because school officials felt that children shouldn't be exposed to a colloquialism like 'You can bet on it.'"

But despite such efforts, the taint persists. William Dean, executive secretary of the Citizens' Union of New York, gets "irritated to see those ads saying that the way to help education is to buy lottery tickets. It's utterly incongruous to support the school system with proceeds of gambling."

Adds the Rev. Dan Potter, director of the Protestant Council of New York City, "The lottery is morally wrong. That's all there is to it."

Perhaps an anonymous New Yorker overheard on the street a few days ago best caught the sense of vague chagrin the Empire State's betting game has engendered in many minds:

"You wouldn't hardly think that important men like those government fellas would go betting to get their money."

STRONG FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Mr. MURPHY of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, once again we have been given a cruel reminder of the necessity for strong firearms legislation. The riots which now rage in Newark, N.J., and have spread to Plainfield, are a clear example of the problem caused by the indiscriminate sale of firearms. At last count the death toll in Newark stood at 24, and more than 20 snipers were still exchanging gunfire with police and troops. Firearms legislation would not have prevented the riot, but it would certainly have prevented such a large death toll.

We hardly need a bloody riot to remind us of the need for strong firearms legislation. A casual look at any newspaper is sure to turn up at least one crime involving the illegal use of a firearm. The Uniform Crime Reports published by the FBI show that last year there were over 100,000 serious crimes involving the use of a firearm. In Newark, over 1,000 of those arrested, many of them for carrying firearms, had prior criminal records. And yet we will not pass legislation that would prohibit the sale of firearms to such people. We continue to arm those same people who now roam the streets of Newark looking for new targets—human targets.

Since first coming to Congress in 1963 I have continuously introduced legislation to limit the interstate movement of firearms to certain licensed dealers, and to restrict sale by those dealers in order to prevent felons, juveniles, and mental incompetents from obtaining firearms. I think the responsibility of the Congress to face up to the problem and enact legislation is long overdue.

The bill I have introduced, which is now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, would make it unlawful for any person except those licensed under the act to transport, ship, or receive any firearm in interstate or foreign commerce. There would be exceptions to this provision for certain law-

ful purposes. In addition, the bill provides for licensing regulations for firearms dealers, and establishes strict criteria regulating the sale of firearms.

This legislation is a reasonable answer to preventing felons, juveniles, and mental incompetents from obtaining firearms. It will not restrict anyone legally qualified to possess firearms from buying or using such firearms for sporting or other legal purposes.

The loud cries of anguish from the various sportsmen, gun clubs, and their societies, both State, and national, are irresponsible and reflect an unwillingness to face up to the problem of firearms in our urban communities.

These many rifle associations provide a valuable public service in their marksmanship and safety programs. It is through such programs, which culminate in the annual rifle matches at Camp Perry, that the United States was able to place first in rifle and pistol marksmanship events in the 1966 world shooting competition in Germany, beating the Russians for the first time in 13 years. Ninety percent of the members of our team were military, and two-thirds of the military were in the Army. The United States also won first place in the Pan American Games and in the Tokyo Olympics in 1964. It is too bad that the rifle associations obscure their best accomplishments with unreasonable opposition to legislation that would in no way obstruct their activities.

It is unfortunate that we wait for riots and mass murder before we regulate the sale of firearms, but let us not fail to learn the cruel lesson such violence teaches. We must pass this legislation without further delay.

PROPOSAL FOR RECIPROCAL GRADUATED DEESCALATION OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, last Monday, on behalf of myself and seven of my colleagues, I delivered a detailed proposal for a reciprocal graduated deescalation of the war in Vietnam, starting with a first step of the United States in halting bombing in North Vietnam north of the 21st parallel for a period of 60 days. I spoke at that time on behalf of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOSHER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

We have been gratified by the initial response which has been made to the proposal we made only 7 days ago. It has received a positive reception in the editorial pages of the Nation's newspapers—the Boston Globe, the Washington Post, the Baltimore Sun, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the St. Louis Post-Dis-

patch, and the Chicago Daily News, just to mention a few of the newspapers which have commented favorably in their editorial pages.

Our offices each has received a multitude of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls expressing what we regard as genuine interest in the idea from all segments of the American public. And perhaps most encouraging, the administration through its congressional leadership here in the House, demonstrated last week a willingness to debate this proposal and its Vietnam policies in public, a precedent which we conscientiously hope will be continued during today's floor action.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], and others today as we continue our dialog on our policies in Southeast Asia.

Let me concur that it is indeed heartening to see that there is at last some willingness to discuss these issues, although the objectivity of administration spokesmen may leave something to be desired.

Surely this is a time for Congress, as an independent branch of our Government, elected by the people, to exert increasing leadership in the conduct of our foreign policy. As one who comes from that State which was honored to have the late Mr. Vandenberg as its distinguished Senator, it is a special moment for me to stand on the floor as a part of this debate. When Senator Vandenberg developed the concept of a bipartisan foreign policy, he envisioned a personal and total involvement with the Congress in the developing of that foreign policy. Unfortunately, such has not been the case in current times. Indeed, this same Vandenberg bipartisan concept has been prostituted to allow the administration justification for increasing unilateral activity without the involvement and consent of Congress and without full reporting to its Members. It is in this framework, then, that I and seven other Members last week spoke out in an attempt to begin the dialog of other possible alternatives toward peace.

During our discussion last week, several questions were raised by the majority leader who, I assume, also speaks for the administration.

One question asked of us was: "What makes you think this plan will work when all diplomatic efforts in the past have only demonstrated Ho Chi Minh's total unwillingness to negotiate or to end the war?" I would like to talk directly to that point.

No one can be certain of Hanoi's response to our proposal, but as we said on July 10:

It seems to offer more promise than the stand-pat policy of the Administration or the alternatives suggested by either set of its major critics.

We are aware, of course, that the North Vietnamese Government has shown little inclination in the past to seek an end to the conflict or even a lessening of its intensity. It has not

shown a sincere interest in peace. Nonetheless, we believe that another effort to induce a promising response from Hanoi is desirable, particularly if that effort involves minimum military risk to the United States as we believe our proposal does.

Most important, we believe that it is possible that the negative attitude of Hanoi to U.S. diplomatic efforts to date may in large part have been dictated by the kind of diplomacy the United States has used. Thus, in this sense, the specific details of our proposal on July 10 were less important than the discussion of the diplomacy of limited war which accompanied them, and the dialog which has begun.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and the other Members who have joined him in reopening the discussion on Vietnam policy.

The subject is too vital and the price we are paying too high to permit us to drift along under present circumstances without a fundamental reevaluation of our present policies and objectives.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, our fundamental objective in Vietnam has been changed. I wish I could share the optimism that has been expressed with regard to such proposals as that advocated by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

But because of the changed nature of our basic objective, I see only two realistic choices facing us today: reaffirm our original objective and proceed from there; or pull out of Vietnam before another drop of American blood is needlessly spilled.

These are harsh words, Mr. Speaker, but they are spoken out of a deep conviction. I have said before and I repeat now that I am neither a "hawk" nor a "dove" on Vietnam but rather a pessimist.

My pessimism arise from the commitments that were made by our country in Manila last October, commitments that were reaffirmed in clear terms by the Secretary of State some 10 days ago in Chicago.

In my view, the commitments, if implemented, can only lead to the eventual takeover of South Vietnam by the Communists. In the next few moments, I would like to explain why.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has become largely an American war. American casualties have now mounted to such an extent that they are outrunning South Vietnamese casualties by roughly two to one.

In specific figures, the Pentagon admitted 2 weeks ago that Vietnamese combat deaths for the week ending June 24 were 119 while American deaths for the same period were 274.

Since the beginning of 1967, Vietnamese casualties—dead and wounded—have amounted to some 19,000 while American casualties have totaled more than 35,000.

This more than anything points up the folly of challenging the Communists man for man where they are supreme rather than placing a greater reliance on the effective use of air and sea power where we are supreme.

But it also points up something else.

These are grim totals.

They represent a high price—one that Americans have demonstrated time and again in the course of our history we are willing to pay—for a high goal.

Whenever Americans have deemed it necessary to go to war to preserve our freedom, or to defend that of our friends; we have been willing to make the sacrifices.

But Americans have also demanded that if we are to make such sacrifices, the end result must be worth the price.

WHAT IS THE END RESULT?

Which brings us to a crucial question, Mr. Speaker.

Precisely what is the end result we are striving to attain?

What is the shooting all about?

What is it in Southeast Asia that justifies a kill rate of 10,000 Americans annually and possibly 50,000 wounded?

A little over 2 years ago, President Johnson attempted to answer this question in a notable speech at Johns Hopkins University.

He defended our country's goal in Vietnam in that April 7, 1965, speech in this way:

Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way. We will do everything necessary to reach that objective and we will do only what is absolutely necessary.

That was the President's statement of our goal.

In that same speech, he outlined the methods we would follow to attain that goal. In a word, he formally committed this country to achieve that goal by way of negotiations—through what he called "unconditional discussions."

To be sure, he made clear that we would use our power to achieve that goal and he outlined what he called the "essentials of settlement."

Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country. These are the essentials of any final settlement.

I recite this history for a reason, because it lays the groundwork for what is to follow in my own assessment of the situation.

There has been a fundamental change in our country's position since the Johns Hopkins speech. It has gone largely unnoticed, but it has caused me and others, I believe, to rethink our own position and our own support of the administration's position in Vietnam.

Those who have followed closely congressional feeling about the war know that my party's position and my own has consistently been to support the President's firm actions in Vietnam though we have differed in the tactics

to be employed for achieving the goal he outlined.

To understand why this support—at least on my part, possibly on my party's—may be withdrawn, it is necessary to understand what formed the basis of our support in the past and how circumstances have changed.

On April 7, 1965—and repeatedly since, the President of the United States has made clear at least two fundamental positions: first, that our country's goal is to bring the conflict to an honorable end through negotiations; and second, that the honorable end must include assurance of a free and independent South Vietnam.

Ever since the President's first clear announcement that these were our goals in Vietnam in April of 1965, Republicans have made clear their support for achieving those goals. Our differences arose over the tactics used to pressure the Communists to sit down at the conference table.

On June 14, 1965, I made clear my belief that the best way to "persuade" the North Vietnamese to come to the conference table was not by escalating the war on the ground. I felt then, and still feel, that the United States should not allow itself to get bogged down in a massive land war on the continent of Asia. I believed also, and still do, that the best way to bring pressure was to challenge the Communists where we are supreme—namely with sea and air power—and not where they are supreme—in manpower.

On December 13, 1965, the highest policymaking body of the Republican Party, the Republican coordinating committee, issued a statement which generally echoed these same sentiments and called for a "Kennedy-type quarantine" around the port of Haiphong and better use of U.S. air and sea power against "significant" military targets.

This remained the Republican position all through 1966, and some would argue still remains our basic position.

But those who would so argue do so in the belief that the circumstances which governed the evolution of this policy are also unchanged.

I would argue they are not.

Going back to the President's Johns Hopkins University speech of April 7, 1965, it must be remembered that it contained two basic goals of our country: to end the war honorably through a negotiated settlement, and to assure the subsequent existence of a free and independent South Vietnam.

The one has not changed. The other has been thrown into serious question if it has not already in fact been abandoned.

We still mean to negotiate. But we appear to have abandoned the overriding goal of a "free and independent South Vietnam."

The President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Ambassador to South Vietnam, and many others would dispute this claim.

But the facts contained in the public record would seem to indicate otherwise. And they are plain for all to see.

To understand this fundamental shift

in the policy objectives of the United States, it is only necessary to recall two very significant occurrences: one in September 1966; the other in October 1966.

That they are significant cannot be questioned.

One involved a major policy statement by the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

The other involved a major undertaking on the part of the President of the United States.

In his speech to the United Nations on September 22, 1966, Ambassador Goldberg formally committed the United States to a course of action which, if agreed to by the Communist North Vietnamese, would result in an end to the war.

The President's travels to Manila in October 1966 resulted in a major reaffirmation of the Goldberg offer in the now famous Manila communique of that month.

The offer was simply this: If the North Vietnamese withdraw their regular forces from South Vietnam and if the violence in South Vietnam thus subsides, then the United States would "within 6 months" after these conditions have been met, pull its own forces out of South Vietnam.

In other words, in exchange for pulling between 45,000 and 60,000 regular units of the North Vietnamese army out of South Vietnam, the United States would withdraw its own force of more than 400,000 from South Vietnam. Some 200,000 Vietcong personnel would, of course, remain in South Vietnam.

Those who argue about whether our bombing policies or our naval and sea pressure or our activities in the south will accomplish the widely touted objective of bringing Ho Chi Minh to the conference table assume, it seems to me, that we can still sit down to "unconditional discussions," and that presumably, once at the table, the bargaining power of allied interests would insure the subsequent existence of a "free and independent South Vietnam."

With the Manila communique and the Goldberg speech still outstanding, however, the discussions can no longer be unconditional, if, indeed they ever could have been.

With those offers still outstanding, the United States is committed—and we do not treat our commitments as lightly as some of our adversaries—to the course of action outlined in those pronouncements.

Those who would seriously assess our prospects in Vietnam, therefore, cannot do so intelligently without taking into account the very serious ramifications of those outstanding offers.

To me the ramifications are clear.

Simply stated, the end result of acceptance of the Manila and Goldberg offer on the part of the Communists would eventually be realization of their—not our—goals in South Vietnam.

Their goal, of course, is a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

My own view is that implementation of the Goldberg and Manila offers would insure that eventual outcome.

Why?

Quite simply, because the South Viet-

name Government today is not much if any stronger than the South Vietnamese Government of 2 years ago when American "advisers" had to become active combatants and when the National Liberation Front of those days threatened to take over the country.

All are agreed that only U.S. intervention on a massive scale—in effect, a metamorphosis from a largely Vietnamese war waged by Asians to an American war waged by Americans—prevented a Communist takeover 2 years ago.

Though progress has been made by the Ky government and hope can be expressed in what the elections will bring about for South Vietnam, few I think would argue that the Government is sufficiently stable to repel what South Vietnam had to contend with in the person of the Vietcong prior to direct American involvement.

Yet it is precisely that assumption which governed our willingness to make the offers expressed by Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations and President Johnson through the Manila communique.

Much as I personally would like to think otherwise, I cannot believe that the South Vietnamese are ready today, or will be ready within the short space of a year or so, to act successfully against a rejuvenated Vietcong unhampered by American involvement in support of the South Vietnamese.

The point of all this is that Ho Chi Minh has been made an offer. It appears to many of us to be in his best interest to snap it up. If he does, the bombing and general harassment of his own country will stop. The casualties among his own regular army units will stop. The formidable array of American armed might which faces him now in South Vietnam will disappear. And the situation regarding eventual Communist takeover of South Vietnam will return to roughly the same situation that existed 2 or 3 years ago.

At the same time, once U.S. forces have pulled out of South Vietnam, the likelihood of their early return—no matter how critical the situation becomes—will in Ho's view be extremely remote. He has but to look at our willingness to ignore the repeated violations that have marked the record of the Geneva accord on Laos of 1962.

Clearly, the Manila communique represents a fundamental change in our Nation's short-term aims and long-term objectives in Southeast Asia. It should also be clear that my own support and that of my party has in the past been predicated on our country's commitments as spelled out in the President's Johns Hopkins speech of 2 years ago.

It is my own deep conviction that Manila has changed this, that the President's commitment in Manila, if carried out, would ultimately lead to a takeover of South Vietnam by the Communists.

If this remains the ultimate prospect of all our sacrifice in Vietnam, no American in good conscience would want to support anything more than an immediate unilateral withdrawal of American troops before another drop of American blood is needlessly spilled.

Speaking for myself, I can only say that continued support of our actions in Vietnam must await a clarification or disavowal of the terms contained in the Manila communique.

Anything short of that cannot justify the sacrifices that have already been made by Americans nor the further spilling of another drop of American blood nor the expenditure of another American dollar.

I wish it were otherwise. But the stark facts as I read them can only lead to the conclusions which are outlined above. If all of the sacrifice that has been sustained and that is being sustained in Vietnam is to be worth the effort, we must as a country return at the very least to the goals which the President spelled out in his Johns Hopkins speech 2 years ago.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that much as I would like to think otherwise, I cannot shake the conviction that all proposals designed to take us to the conference are most difficult to pursue until the Manila communique is clarified or disavowed.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, who serves as chairman of the minority conference, for his worthwhile and encouraging comments in behalf of our efforts.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in carrying on our discussions, we believe that our proposal which was made last week may have a chance to succeed, where others have failed. For these specific reasons:

First. It involves minimum military risk to the United States and to North Vietnam.

Second. It does not require Hanoi to take the first step, or that the first step be a simultaneous one by both Governments.

Third. It does not require major "conference table" negotiations in the spotlight of public attention.

Fourth. It affords an opportunity to North Vietnam to undertake its own diplomatic initiatives and an opportunity to "save face."

Fifth. It offers a means by which steps toward deescalation can be taken slowly and with complete verification, thereby building confidence on each side in the word and credibility of the other.

Sixth. It does not deal in ultimatums or threats.

In other words, we believe that implementation of our proposal would, for the first time, really test whether the Government in Hanoi is genuinely interested in honorable negotiations to end the conflict or even in any steps to lessen its intensity.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Vermont for his contribution to the effort which we are making.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, disapproving of and seeing great damage in precipitate and unilateral withdrawal, and also in precipitate and uncontrolled escalation, we are searching for some sound proposal which can lead to meaningful negotiations and a sound and lasting peace. I emphasize both. In other words, "meaningful" as applied to negotiations, and the words "sound and lasting" as applied to peace.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Vermont has just said, I think that before we pin too great hope upon any hypothetical negotiations which have not taken place, it is extremely important that we really test in some way that can yield results, whether or not the Government of Hanoi is genuinely interested in some sort of honorable negotiations. To date we have no sound basis for knowing whether anything could lead to a response on the part of the North Vietnamese, indicating that they are really interested in negotiations. All of the diplomatic efforts of the administration—at least all of which we are aware—have been made in such a way that it has been difficult, if not impossible, for Hanoi to respond responsibly to them. This is not to question the sincerity of the administration; it is merely to say that there is a distinction between the diplomacy of limited war and the diplomacy of total war, and that the distinction may not be adequately understood by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, much has been made of the fact that the United States has accepted 28 proposals for settlement of the war in Vietnam and that the Government of Hanoi has rejected all of them.

Much has been made of the fact that the United States has accepted 28 separate proposals for a settlement in Vietnam and that the government in Hanoi has rejected all of them. Unfortunately, none of the 28 points go to the style of U.S. diplomacy. The only one really relevant to this discussion is point 17, described by the State Department and its spokesmen as, simply: "Cessation of bombing and reciprocal deescalation." We are told that the United States has accepted the proposal and that North Vietnam has rejected it. The question to be confronted is: How has the proposal been made? Has it been made in such a way that Hanoi was likely to respond favorably? We do not think so.

Congressman ALBERT has described the style of U.S. policy:

On five separate occasions we ceased the bombing in North Vietnam without imposing any conditions on North Vietnam.

The first pause was for a 7-day period in 1965, from May 12th through the 17th. Hanoi's response was that the halting of the bombing was a trick.

In December 1965, there was a 36-day pause. Again, there was no change in Hanoi's belligerent attitude.

In December 1966, we paused twice for two days each. And in February of this year, we paused for another 5 days.

On five separate occasions we presented Hanoi with an opportunity for peace. And she

used that opportunity to resupply her troops in the south.

That is the end of the quotation from Mr. ALBERT.

It is our contention that a pause of 2 days or 5 days or 7 days is obviously too short to allow Hanoi to respond with a diplomatic initiative of her own that does appear to be some kind of surrender to U.S. policy. In a limited war, both sides must enter the peace process appearing as equals, or there will be no peace process. More important, a very short pause in the bombing does very little, if anything, to convince the other side of the sincerity of the United States.

It is imperative that we should convince the other side of the sincerity of the United States if we are to have any meaningful or productive negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for this chance to enter this dialog.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I thank the scholarly gentleman from Oregon.

I would like to add that the 36-day pause in December 1965-January 1966 certainly offered a better hope of securing a positive response. But here, too, the motives of the United States might well have been obscure to the North Vietnamese: Was it a trick? Was it a sign of weakness? Furthermore, it offered the North Vietnamese not just the opportunity to make their own peace initiative, but it also offered them an opportunity to gain military advantage by increasing supplies to the south. And, as we know, they chose the latter course. Finally, it should be recalled that the administration expected from Hanoi a giant response to its own giant initiative. In effect, Hanoi was asked to end support of the south in one dramatic step just as we had "ended" bombing the north, in one dramatic step. But did Hanoi have enough reason to believe U.S. sincerity to justify such a major change in policy? On July 10 we wrote:

A complete bombing pause would not prove the genuine sincerity of the United States while a complete bombing cessation long enough to prove the genuine sincerity of the United States would involve a great military risk to the United States.

In still other words, a complete bombing pause would not prove the genuine sincerity of the United States but a complete bombing cessation long enough to prove the genuine sincerity of the United States would not in any way assure the genuine sincerity of North Vietnam. It might, therefore, prove to be a greater impetus to instability than to stability.

Our proposal for graduated deescalation of the bombing in the north, by stopping it in stages starting north of the 21st parallel, involves no such major military risk. It does not assume North Vietnamese sincerity; it requires proof in the form of reciprocal deescalatory steps. The military risks involved come only when the bombing is halted in southern North Vietnam where the supply routes are concentrated—and by that time the North Vietnamese would have had to demonstrate their own genuine interest in deescalation by verifiable steps of their own. Thus, the plan protects American military forces by not envisaging a full cessation of bombing in North Vietnam until there is clear

evidence in the acts of Hanoi that a cessation would not merely increase North Vietnamese supplies to the south.

But our proposal has another very relevant and significant feature. It does not ask of either side a giant step toward peace—a step so large that neither Government could take it without great risk. It asks only small steps, taken one at a time, through which mutual confidence can grow. It does not say we will stop the bombing and you stop the support of the south. It says rather, let us take it slowly; we will stop part of the bombing and you respond with a similarly small identifiable step. The cumulative effect may be that giant progress is made—but it cannot be expected to come in one single dramatic act before any mutual confidence has been established. As we wrote on July 10:

The best chance for peace lies not in giant power or giant concessions. It lies in small steps, taken quietly—steps that make the position of each side credible to the other.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I would like to refer to a statement that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts made with respect to the proposal that has been suggested for deescalation of the war, and that is that this proposal does not assume sincerity on the part of the North Vietnamese.

I think this is a point that needs to be underscored—this proposal does not assume anything. It is a pragmatic objective test, and I think therein lies its great value.

When our colleague, the distinguished majority leader, was referring to this plan a week ago, he referred to another U.S. diplomatic effort which he apparently felt was an even more promising initiative than our proposal:

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] last week said:

It is common knowledge that we refrained from bombing an area of 300 square miles in and around Hanoi for the entire first quarter of this year—a period of cessation much longer than the Republicans are now calling for.

Mr. ALBERT apparently equates this action with the first step called for in our plan: the end to bombing north of the 21st parallel for a period of 60 days while waiting for a similar deescalatory step by the North Vietnamese.

I think, with all due respect to our colleague, the similarity that he sees and the comparison that he makes is only an illusion.

In the first place, there was no definition to the area not bombed—therefore, it was not perfectly clear to either the North Vietnamese or the South Vietnamese or to the world at large or to the citizens of this country that the United States was attempting to take a step toward progress.

Second, there was no specific time period involved; that is, the North Vietnamese did not know that the bombing would not be immediately resumed on any given day. There was, in short, no

precision to the U.S. initiative if indeed you can call it an initiative.

Third, there was no clear indication that a similarly small North Vietnamese initiative would be met by any further U.S. steps. It was an isolated act which was not intended as a part of a series or a plan or a blueprint, but was tied to a giant concession by the North Vietnamese.

Fourth, that giant concession expected of Hanoi amounted I think we have to say to an ultimatum.

President Johnson's letter to Ho Chi Minh of February 2, 1967, read as follows:

I am prepared to order a cessation of bombing against your country and stop a further augmentation of the United States forces in South Viet Nam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into the South Viet Nam by land or by sea has stopped.

The noted columnist, commentator, and reporter of the New York Times, Mr. James Reston, in commenting on that letter said:

This is not a proposal for a cease-fire during negotiations or even a request for "reciprocity" but a demand for prior proof that all infiltration from the North had stopped before we would agree to stop bombing . . .

Each is proposing terms for talking that would give its forces a military advantage they do not now enjoy . . .

I personally like the President's words which he used before the Tennessee Legislature on the 15th of March of this year in which I think he gave a more realistic and a more understanding definition of the term "reciprocity," for the President said there:

They have three times rejected a bombing pause as a means to open the way to ending the war, and going to the negotiating table . . .

We stand ready to advance toward a reduction of hostilities without prior agreement. The road to peace could go from deeds to discussions, or it could start with discussions and go to deeds.

We are ready to take either route. We are ready to move on both of them.

But reciprocity must be the fundamental principle of any reduction in hostilities. The United States cannot and will not reduce its activities unless and until there is some reduction on the other side. To follow any other rule would be to violate the trust that we undertake when we ask a man to risk his life for his country.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would draw particular attention to these words of the President of the United States delivered to the Legislature of the State of Tennessee when he said this:

We will negotiate a reduction of the bombing whenever the Government of North Vietnam is ready and there are almost innumerable avenues of communication by which the Government of North Vietnam can make their readiness known.

This plan that he had proposed is in essence just a specific reduction for one means of communicating these thoughts which the President has said are the essential sine qua non toward any progress toward deescalation.

A limited war cannot be ended by the diplomacy of total war. This letter set the framework within which Ho Chi Minh would react to the bombing pause

around Hanoi in early 1967. That framework was one in which Hanoi was asked to lose face by taking the first step toward deescalation of the conflict and by making that step a giant one.

It had not been preceded by growing mutual confidence between the two Governments. It had not been preceded by demonstration of U.S. sincerity. And it treated North Vietnam, not as a potential equal at the negotiating table, but as an enemy who was expected to surrender without qualification.

Mr. Speaker, during the past week Senator MANSFIELD emphasized the dangers ahead if we continue to escalate. I would like to quote very briefly from Senator MANSFIELD's statement. He said:

Before we take another significant step into Vietnam, it is to be hoped that we will have asked ourselves at what point we intend to increase taxes, apply the wage and price controls, tighten the draft exemption, call up the Reserves, and make the countless other adjustments in our national life which are implicit in further extensions of the American involvement.

It is to be hoped, that we will have asked ourselves, too, Mr. President, at what point . . . we reduce the present Vietnamese politico-military structure which is based in Saigon to a final irrelevancy . . .

It is to be hoped that before plunging deeper we will have asked ourselves at what point that which began as limited U.S. aid to the South Vietnamese military becomes wholly an American war against all Vietnam, becomes a war in Korea, becomes a war in the Formosan Straits, becomes a war with China. And while we are asking we had better ask ourselves, finally, at what point in this ever-widening compass of conflict—at what point along the road to World War III—the Sino-Soviet breach is finally healed? And, thereafter, at what point a new eruption occurs at Berlin or some other pressure point of potential universal conflict?

I end the quotation from Senator MANSFIELD's statement.

Mr. Speaker, these are questions that all America is asking. By our plan we are posing a possible answer.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for his significant contribution to the work of our group.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do want to associate myself, again, with the remarks made here today by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] and also with those others of my colleagues who have already risen to support our proposal for a carefully phased, step-by-step deescalation of the bombing in North Vietnam.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that some knowledgeable critics will consider our proposal as an arrangement altogether too simple. Oversimplification, we agree, can sometimes be dangerous. But I want to assure those critics that we do recognize the complexities and subtleties of the Vietnam situation, we do recognize that our suggestion is far from a complete solution to the Vietnam war. Our proposal does not deal fully with relations with the Vietcong, nor with the Soviet Union, nor with China. It does not pretend to define a negotiating posi-

tion for a comprehensive settlement in Vietnam nor Southeast Asia. It does not deal directly with the hostilities within South Vietnam itself.

But our proposal does offer a chance for two of the governments involved, Washington and Hanoi, to take a few cautious steps back from the conflict, and a few cautious steps forward toward peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that Hanoi has no interest in peace. We are not yet convinced of that. But we are convinced that the possibility of Hanoi's interest has not yet been tested by creative and sensitive U.S. diplomacy which would allow the North Vietnamese the opportunity to approach the peace table as equals, which would build up mutual confidence on both sides, which would allow both sides to "save face," and do so with a minimum military risk to both sides.

We believe that our proposal points in those positive directions, and whether it is too simple or not, we believe that any discussion of it or consideration of it by the public and by the administration will be in itself a healthy, forward step toward an eventual end of this horrible conflict.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we believe that peace is altogether too precious to be ignored now simply because we have already tried before and failed.

We believe in the old adage that we must "try, try again."

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his remarks and for his work in developing the proposals before the House at this time.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to indicate to him and to those of my colleagues who have preceded me my complete support for the statements they have made here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I had reserved an hour under special order today to follow the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, but in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that the House has been in session for such a long time, I am going to combine my time and use my time now under the special order of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to continue the foreign policy debate which began in the House a week ago, when I joined seven of my colleagues in suggesting a new course toward peace in Vietnam.

Spurring debate is my principal purpose here today. While I would again commend to the President and his advisers our stepped deescalation proposal of last week, the details of our proposal are not as important as a meaningful discussion of our tactics, our objectives, and the depth of our involvement in Southeast Asia. Even the Washington Post, which has long recognized and supported the need to combat Communist aggression in South Vietnam, said last Friday that—

At a time when confidence about the course and conduct of the war is faltering

* * * a genuinely concerned American public is being suffocated in optimistic generalities.

Is it any wonder that citizens support for the war is not unanimous, when the administration has done so little to make the goals of our engagement in Southeast Asia understandable? Is citizen misunderstanding of the war any mystery when even the most informed administration planners have been unable for 2 years to estimate the costs of achieving these goals to within \$10 billion?

The American people are accustomed to taking part in the major decisions of their Government, and to engaging in enlightened discussion. They are not accustomed to risking the health of their youth, their economy and their reputation in the world solely on the basis of assurances that "this will be a long, hard struggle," and on vague declarations that "progress is being made."

I call upon my colleagues in both Houses of the Congress to fill this void of information. Assuming that North Vietnam is seeking the fulfillment of Communist internationalist dogma by conquering and communizing South Vietnam, and that our considerable presence there has blunted their hope of success, what in turn, are our goals: to push them back behind the 17th parallel and keep them there with a large, long-term program of American occupation? To battle to a stalemate and then settle for a coalition government in Saigon which will include Communists? To stop the fighting long enough for a fair plebiscite to take place, thus allowing the South Vietnamese themselves to choose their future? These are questions all Americans are asking. The possible goals of our involvement which I have listed, plus numerous others can all be deduced from our present posture as being "the American purpose in Vietnam."

It is the responsibility of the Congress to sharpen the definition of our goals, where the administration has failed to do so. As the provider of funds and of manpower for our foreign commitments, the Congress must take on the responsibility of clarifying and questioning, if necessary, the need for the troops and dollars we appropriate.

Last week, after long weeks of study, my colleagues and I made public our plan for ending the hostilities in Southeast Asia, a plan which holds no military risk for our troops, but which, at the same time, gives the enemy a chance to respond without appearing to knuckle-under to an American ultimatum. This plan has spurred debate in the Congress, in the news pages and over the airwaves of America. Surely there are others in the House who have thoughts to express, questions to ask and suggestions to make regarding the course of the war.

At a moment when Vietnam is demanding more American men, more American dollars, and, sadly, more American blood, the question of policy direction in Vietnam demands more information and understanding among Americans.

As food for thought for what I hope will develop into a full-fledged debate, I offer, in addition to my suggestion for

staged deescalation of the bombing, the lead editorial of the Washington Post of last Friday:

WHAT'S GOING ON?

Once again, President Johnson has received from his Secretary of Defense an on-the-spot report on Vietnam at a time when confidence about the course and conduct of the war is faltering. And once again, a genuinely concerned American public is being suffocated in optimistic generalities—progress is "tremendous," improvement is "substantial," change is "dramatic" and current policy, strategy and tactics are all beyond reproach.

It is time to change this public relations ritual—the confident briefings in the White House Fish Room, the capsule appraisals at airport arrivals, the echoes from congressional committee rooms. It is time for the President to tell us where things stand.

When our military chiefs in Saigon and the Pentagon have been arguing for weeks, often out loud, for large and specific numbers of additional troops, and the public has been led to believe a decision is imminent, it is not enough to be told on Wednesday by Mr. McNamara that "some more" men will be needed but that "we haven't arrived at any final conclusion and we don't know when we will." Especially when the President tells us on Thursday that General Westmoreland will get what "he needs and requests and what we find acceptable."

When Premier Ky has just been deposed as a candidate for president after abusing the electoral procedures, and his replacement, General Thieu, is giving no assurances he doesn't intend to go right on doing many of the same things, it is a bit much to claim that the forthcoming elections reflect "tremendous progress, when one looks back" to the political shambles nine months ago. When one looks far enough back, one sees the government of President Diem, "freely" elected and firmly entrenched until its repudiation against political opponents began the process which brought it down.

When most American citizens can see nothing but an expanding United States force tied down in a military stand-off, it does not reassure them much to be told that the idea of a military "stalemate" strikes field commanders as "the most ridiculous statement they have ever heard." Not when United States casualties this past week were the third highest on record and sizable American units have been all but wiped out.

When a wire service dispatch is reporting a new burst of inflationary price increases and a new threat of economic trouble, it is hard for Americans to believe that a "dramatic change" in the efficiency of the Port of Saigon has brought a "very substantial improvement" in the economy.

This is the heart of the matter—not what Mr. McNamara may genuinely believe, but what the American public, at this point, can realistically be expected to believe. Mr. McNamara calls it a multi-faceted war and by that test some facets can be found that are doubtless going reasonably well. But it is also a war of attrition, in General Westmoreland's phrase, and it is quite unbelievable that in the past year "we have achieved all of our objectives while the enemy failed dismally," as the General contends. Attrition must be measured not only by Vietcong and North Vietnamese dead but by the ebb and flow of military-political-psychological struggle for the allegiance of the populace. And here is one "facet," Mr. McNamara will admit, where progress is "very slow."

That this is also the key "facet," which will very likely determine the duration and the outcome of the conflict, makes it all the harder to credit the cacophony of "progress" reports.

It is time for a candid, forthright, report on progress or lack-of-progress, that takes

frank account of difficulties and shortcomings, that compliments the intelligence of the American public by acknowledging failures and errors and that credits their maturity by explaining how hard and how long a struggle confronts the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their attendance at this hour, and I hope that they will help me to fulfill the rightful role of the Congress in hammering out questions of U.S. foreign policy.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in this important and crucial matter.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his work in this regard, and I commend him for his significant contribution.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and the Chamber is nearly empty. We had invited the distinguished majority leader, who played such a significant role in our debate a week ago, to take part, but I believe every one of us understands that after the rather hectic day we have had today his absence certainly is to be understood.

Mr. Speaker, there is not one subject which dominates the thinking and preoccupies the thinking of every American citizen as does the subject of Vietnam, our involvement, our direction, and the ultimate solution.

Those of us who are honored to serve in this body know that either explicitly or implicitly Vietnam dominates every debate on every bill that has come or will come before this 90th Congress.

The hour is late on this 17th day of July. The hour is later still in a beleaguered country half a world away.

The time has come for every Member of this House to understand that he has an immense stake in our activity in Vietnam and that the responsibility for U.S. action cannot easily be abdicated by referring to the constitutional provision which makes the executive branch that element of our national mechanism which has principal and primary responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, without the funds authorized and appropriated by this body, the military; indeed, the diplomatic effort, could not be made. So, no longer can we shirk our own very real and very personal responsibility as to the course of events in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, my mail has revealed in the last several days the deep interest and concern, and almost exclusive interest and concern, of the people of this land in what is going on in Vietnam. Only by the application of all of our talents and all of our energy and our very best judgment, and the most conscientious and imaginative thinking, can we discharge our very personal responsibilities in the direction of things to come in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue our efforts to sound the trumpets, to stimulate debate, to inspire discussion,

because we think that the American people want and indeed deserve the debate that has been so long denied.

We are going to continue our efforts to find an approach—hopefully a new and imaginative approach—which, perhaps, will lead us one step closer to the peace which every man of good will, no matter what his nationality, searches for. We hope that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will recognize the large task that we have laid out for ourselves; we hope they will recognize our humility in approaching such a massive undertaking and we hope that they will give to us and give to the Nation their most conscientious, their most careful, their most honest judgment as to the course of action which our Nation should follow.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with keen interest to the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and by several of his colleagues on the minority side.

I have the very highest regard and respect for all of them. I have never at any time questioned the worthiness of their intentions with reference to the matter that they have been discussing.

I do think, however, there have been two rather unfortunate inferences contained in the remarks that have been made here this afternoon.

The first one is the inference that the often stated readiness of the President on behalf of this Government to enter into negotiations at any time or at any place, that that statement is insincere in any way.

I think that one of the gentlemen on the other side who said that there was reason for the North Vietnamese to question the sincerity of our Government on that point contributed very little that is constructive to the forward movement in this area, and probably brightened the day considerably for Hanoi with that remark.

I believe the second inference that is unfortunate is the inference in the remarks just made by my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, when he says that we can no longer shirk our responsibility; the inference that the Congress has been shirking its responsibility in this area, I believe is unfortunate. I know all of us have different ways of carrying out our responsibilities as we recognize them, and I know the gentleman is carrying out his responsibilities as he sees them. I believe there are many, many Members in this body who feel that responsibility with reference to North Vietnam in different ways. Some have gone to Vietnam on more than one occasion, and at some hazard to themselves, in an effort to get a better understanding of what is going on over there. I know there has been an almost unanimous turnout of the Members of the House at every briefing or at every discussion that has been provided on this subject by not only the administration and its leaders, but also by organizations

interested in the same subject matter, when they have held meetings for discussion of this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I hope when the RECORD is finally completed on today's debate that these two inferences, the one as to the sincerity of the President of the United States, and this Government, in the often-repeated statement of readiness to talk at any time, at any place, and the other the inference that the Congress itself has not been acting responsibly, will either be eliminated or certainly, I hope, put more in line with the actual facts on the subject.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts very much for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. It is indeed regrettable that he made the inferences that he has just described, because nothing that was said by the earlier participants in this debate or by myself in my remarks a few moments ago has been intended to imply or give a basis for the inferences the gentleman has drawn.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this with reference to the suggestion of the inferences the gentleman from Oklahoma made from the remarks of my colleagues: I think I can clarify it by merely pointing out that seeking as we are all—and we all must who empathize with the other side in this—and the direction in which we are going—it seems possible that perhaps the other side had not understood the sincerity of the United States, and that was the burden of the gentleman's earlier remarks.

With reference to my own remark which gave rise to what I regard as an unfortunate inference by the gentleman from Oklahoma, let me merely point out that I do believe that this House and each individual Member is certainly mindful of the individual and collective responsibility which we as a body have, but I think further the responsibility for creative debate, and the responsibility for intellectual intercourse from which great ideas can be synthesized, perhaps has not been fully discharged, and I am not making any ad hominem reference to any Member. I am sure any Member of this body conscientiously feels—and properly so—that his own action with reference to the very serious situation which is on our hands in Southeast Asia has been proper, and I do not quarrel with that. However, I believe the body itself perhaps could make a major contribution to the discussion of events in Vietnam by energizing and by employing its collective wisdom.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to take one further minute to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his recognition of the hour at which these remarks have taken place, and for his understanding of the fact the majority leader, who has been engaged throughout the week in extensive negotiations and conferences with reference to the bill on the floor today, and to thank him for his understanding of the fact that the majority leader is not present at this time.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

A HISTORY OF KINGSPORT, TENN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANLEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to make available to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD a history of my hometown, Kingsport, Tenn., which was presented by Mr. W. F. Winders at the 20th annual meeting of the Kingsport Chamber of Commerce celebrating the 50th anniversary of the incorporation of modern Kingsport.

Mr. Winders, a native of South Carolina raised in Georgia, came to Kingsport in 1936 with the Tennessee Eastman Co., and he has been an outstanding civic, church, and business leader of the community serving as a member of the Kingsport School Board and as a member of the board of directors of the Holston Valley Community Hospital. He is also a former chairman of the Civic Development Council of the Kingsport Chamber of Commerce and a former member of its board.

Mr. Winders served as president of the Community Chest of Kingsport; chairman of the board of directors, Tennessee Council on Economic Education; and president of the Sequoyah Council, Boy Scouts of America. He has also served as president and secretary of the Kingsport Rotary Club and as president of the Sullivan County Tuberculosis Association.

The James House Williamson Award has been presented to Mr. Winders by the Tennessee Industrial Personnel Conference for outstanding contributions in the field of industrial personnel management.

He has twice appeared as speaker on the program of the Southern Industrial Relations Conference, has been chairman of the program committee, and has served 7 years as a member of the board of directors, of which he is now chairman Mr. Winders' career has truly been commendable in every respect.

His remarks to the chamber of commerce on the history of Kingsport have been printed in booklet form entitled "Up the Years From the Boat Yard," and have been widely acclaimed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in my remarks Mr. Winders' complete story.

UP THE YEARS FROM THE BOAT YARD

I am delighted that we can travel up the years together, and especially pleased that I can call you my friends; otherwise I would be most apprehensive about this trip. It would not be difficult to tell the fascinating story of Kingsport to an audience in Nashville or Atlanta or some more distant place. But to bring a history of a community to those who have participated in shaping that history would be a terrifying and maybe even hazardous undertaking if I didn't know that you are my friends and that any one of you might have been given this assignment. Therefore, I claim your understanding, interest, and support while we re-

view these pages of history together as we might fondly turn the leaves of a familiar family album—your family album—and recall times now past.

We are pleased to have our neighbors from the surrounding settlements of Sapling Grove, the Watauga Settlement, Nolichucky, Sycamore Shoals, and Estillville accompany us. (Perhaps you will recognize these as the names of Bristol, Johnson City, Greeneville, Elizabethton, and Gate City when our community was the "Boat Yard.")

"Up the Years from the Boat Yard" is a most exciting journey. To insure our safe and timely arrival in modern Kingsport, we shall have to resist many a beckoning side path that will attempt to lure us from a more direct course.

Napoleon defined history as "A fable agreed upon."

Perhaps our history will have something of the fable in it—but there may be some question as to whether our fables will be agreed upon.

Where should we begin? Should we go back just 50 years? Or should we start a hundred years ago, or perhaps a thousand, or even two thousand?

We have been told that some artifacts, some crude works of man discovered not too far from where we are tonight, might have been made by people who lived in the area 2,000 or more years ago.

Five hundred years ago, according to Gates P. Thruston in his book, "Antiquities of Tennessee", there lived in this part of the state a people whom archaeologists call the "Stone Grave Tribes" because of graves made of stone which have been found in a number of Tennessee localities, including East Tennessee.

So perhaps the Stone Grave people once fished in the Holston River and hunted forest game where our teenagers now cruise Broad Street.

To me, the beginnings of Kingsport start much later—surely not so late as 1917—but perhaps early enough to take in the times of Daniel Boone, John Sevier, and Andy Jackson.

And we would not want to overlook the colorful redmen who went by such names as Dragging Canoe and Chief Abraham (or Old Abram) nor the beautiful Indian friend of white settlers, Nancy Ward, whose friendship may have changed the course of American history and certainly had a positive effect on the history of Kingsport.

I had been doing a little looking back into history at the time of our February cold snap when thermometers registered zero, or below, and I thought of how it was in the area not 50 years ago, but 150 or 200 years back.

There were white people here then, and the winters couldn't have been very much different from the ones we now endure. I have a feeling that those early settlers were not worried about the functioning of a thermostat or a heat pump.

They had only one concern—to avoid freezing to death.

No doubt some things in life were much the same then as they are now. Babies probably chose 3 o'clock of a sub-zero morning as the time to be born . . . Grandpa most likely picked just such a time to bounce the ax off a stick of frozen firewood and cut a bone-deep gash in his ankle—or on such a night perhaps a polecat got into the chicken enclosure, which probably was attached to the back of the cabin . . . or maybe some half-frozen Indian chose a night of bitter cold and howling to see how things might be in a habitation warmer than his own.

Those were the kinds of warm, homey happenings which probably were discussed around evening firesides when the early settlers were building the foundations for the luxuriously easy life we lead today.

The date of the establishment of the first white settlers in and around the area that is now Kingsport may not be precisely clear, but it has been established that the first organized white expedition to enter the area was one led by Dr. Thomas Walker 215 years ago. That was in 1748, twenty-two years before the Boston Massacre of 1770 started the New Englanders really thinking about troubles with England.

Dr. Walker was so impressed on his first visit to the Holston Valley area that two years later he led a secondary party back here to settle near the confluence of the North and South Forks of the Holston River, establishing what is usually referred to as the first settlement.

Our river, incidentally, is said to have received its name from Stephen Holston, a pioneer canoe enthusiast who paddled his way down the stream in an early phase of its exploration.

For a time after the white folks came poking their noses and ploughs into the land of the Cherokees, there was little friction between the frontiersmen and the native Cherokees.

The peace did not endure, however, and by 1759, about the time frontiersmen such as Daniel Boone were ranging farther and farther into the wilderness, the Indians determined to discourage colonization in the only way they knew. They fought the settlers simply because the settlers were taking their land.

Many are the heroic tales of those hard days on the frontier—tales of heroism by both Indians and Whites. But, history, being "a fable agreed upon", we generally are led to believe that the white men were mostly good guys, and the Indians were terrible savages.

Fort Loudon, the first fort built by white men in Tennessee, was established about 30 miles below Knoxville on the Little Tennessee in 1756, and by 1760 was besieged by angry Indians.

The importance of the Fort Loudon siege to Kingsport history is the fact that a relief party was sent out in 1759 from Virginia, who considered Fort Loudon a part of her territory. Although these frontier soldiers didn't get to Fort Loudon in time to save that ill-fated garrison, they did get to the site of Kingsport. Here they established a strong outpost, which they named Fort Robinson, which later was to enable the settlers to hang on long enough to finally prevail against the Indians.

About 1760, when our settlement was 10 years old, Daniel Boone and a party of exploring frontiersmen began laying their historic trail across the mountains into the Kentucky region. That famous trail extended right through what is now Kingsport and stretched away through Moccasin Gap and westward into Kentucky. Known as "Boone's Trail" and the "Wilderness Road", it played an important part in the movement of pioneers to the West.

From 1760 until the end of the War of 1812 (a period of over 50 years), settlers in the Kingsport area had trouble with Indians. As if that weren't enough, they sought trouble with British soldiers who, during the Revolutionary War, were making themselves obnoxious just across the mountains in North and South Carolina.

The British, in fact, were about in position to put an end to rebellion, not only in the Carolinas, but farther north, too, where the prospects for victory were looking mighty dim for General Washington and his army.

But the situation in the Carolinas was becoming increasingly irksome to the hardy pioneers of what is now the Tennessee area. A couple of British officers, Colonels Ferguson and Tarleton, backed by British sympathizers were having things pretty much their own way in putting down the colonists in the Carolinas.

Moreover, the redcoated Britishers and their Tory allies were stirring up the Indians to war against the settlers and were threatening to cross the mountains themselves and do-in the "over mountain men", as the Tennesseans were called.

Officers of the Crown served notice that, unless the frontiersmen pledged their loyalty to King George, they would be put to the sword, their homes would be burned and their lands laid waste.

The threat to the lives and homes of the Tennessee settlers was the last straw. The "over mountain men"—those of Sullivan, Washington, and nearby counties—decided that the time had come for drastic action.

Colonels John Sevier and Evan Shelby sent out calls for men of the Tennessee area to assemble and go to the assistance of the colonists in the Carolinas. There was prompt response. Nearly 1,000 frontiersmen assembled at Sycamore Shoals (at Elizabethton) to form an "army" that was to turn the tide in the colonists' war for freedom. (So anxious were the men and boys to go that they had to draft those who were needed to remain and protect the home front.)

Colonel Sevier commanded the men from Nolichucky and Watauga; Colonel Shelby commanded the volunteers from the Holston settlement. They defeated the British soundly and the power of the Crown was forever broken in the South.

Thomas Jefferson pronounced King's Mountain "the battle that turned the tide of the Revolution".

There is a story behind the story of the battle of King's Mountain. It is a story about Nancy Ward, the Indian princess whose kindness to the white settlers has made a legend of her name and recorded her as one of the greatest of Tennessee's celebrated women.

It is known that her mother was Tame Doc, a sister of one of the important chiefs of the Cherokees, Chief Attakullakulla. Nancy Ward became a great power among the Cherokees and prevailed upon them to be less cruel in their treatment of captives and in their forays against white settlers.

On this occasion in the early days of the Revolutionary War, British agents inciting the Cherokees to attack the settlers found a receptive ear in Dragging Canoe, Old Abram, and other war chiefs who were angry about a recent treaty in which the Cherokees had given up tremendous tracts of their choice lands. A surprise attack was planned to be made simultaneously against the several settlements in the area, the object being to annihilate the settlers. The attack against the Long Island country was to be led by Dragging Canoe himself.

Nancy Ward warned the settlers in June 1776 of the times and places of the planned Indian attacks and the settlers made plans to surprise the Indians.

A major meeting of the white settlers with the Indian marauders in this area developed into the battle of Island Flats. The island, of course, was Long Island, and the "flats" were where Kingsport is today—some of the action may have taken place on the exact spot where we are gathered tonight. It was the bloodiest battle ever fought between colonists and Indians in this area, and the white men's victory ensured the continuation of the settlements.

And so it was that Nancy Ward's warning to the settlers in 1776, at the outset of the Revolution, left the "over mountain men" strong enough to make the difference at King's Mountain in 1780 and turn the tide of the war against England. The Chattanooga chapter of the D.A.R. is the Nancy Ward chapter, named in honor of this Indian princess.

Incidentally, the Watauga settlement was similarly warned by Nancy's messengers, and most of the settlers gathered in Fort Watauga. As the Indians attacked at daybreak, some of the women were outside

milking. One of these was young Catherine Sherrill, more familiarly known as Bonnie Kate. As she ran straight at the wall of the fort, a strong arm reached down and lifted her over the wall just ahead of an Indian arrow. The strong arm was that of John Sevier; the girl later became Mrs. John Sevier, the first First Lady of Tennessee.

Thus our early predecessors maintained themselves against the Indians and helped win the war of freedom. Their courage and pioneering spirit brought others into the area and brought our settlement up the years from the pioneers to the Boat Yard, where our journey was to have started 15 minutes ago.

Like so many of the events and happenings of the early days, there are different versions of how Kingsport received its name. The area was called by several names including Island Flats, Fort Robinson, Christiansville, King's Mill Station, and The Boat Yard. The Boat Yard was the most generally accepted term until the advent of the Kings. Most authorities agree that the town was NOT named for the King of England.

In 1774 Colonel James King, one of the settlement's early industrialists, established a mill—presumably a grist mill—at the mouth of Reedy Creek. He used the port of Boat Yard for shipping products of his own mill, as well as other items of trade. Some people maintain that it was from references to Colonel King's shipping port that the community became known as King's Port.

Another group maintains that the name came from a William King, who owned a salt works north of Abingdon, Virginia, and who sent salt to the Boat Yard to be shipped down the Holston River from a landing or port at the mouth of Reedy Creek, which also was known as "King's Port"—in this case Bill King's.

At any rate, it probably is safe for us to assume that we are living in what was once the "port of Kings"—James and William.

In Kingsport's early days, between 1779 and 1802, the people of the Boat Yard were unsettled as to what state they owed allegiance. They were successively a part of Virginia, North Carolina, the State of Franklin, and finally officially Tennessee.

Perhaps we should hurriedly recall to mind the State of Franklin. In 1784 North Carolina ceded that part of the state west of the mountains which is now the State of Tennessee to the United States, but cancelled the act before it was accepted by the Federal Congress. The people of the territory, angered at being disclaimed by North Carolina without being consulted, formed the State of Franklin in 1784, elected John Sevier as Governor, and petitioned the Federal Congress to accept Franklin as the 14th State. North Carolina, others bordering on the territory of the State of Franklin, and the Congress objected; and four years later, in 1788, Franklin ceased to exist as a state.

After North Carolina had succeeded in putting down the insurrection, John Sevier, who later served six terms as Tennessee governor, was arrested and taken to Morgantown, North Carolina, for trial on charges of leading the Franklin insurrection. In the course of Sevier's trial, a brand of Tennessee's "over mountain men" appeared in North Carolina once more—just as they had on the occasion of the Battle of King's Mountain.

The Tennessee invaders had with them Colonel Sevier's saddled but riderless horse. They made a great show of appearing before the Morgantown courthouse with Sevier's horse, which that gentleman recognized as he looked out of the courthouse window. Convinced that his trial defense was going badly, Sevier simply took advantage of a lull in the court's proceedings, dashed from the courtroom, mounted his horse, and in the company of his armed rescuers, galloped away from North Carolina justice.

Later the insurgents were given amnesty,

and John Sevier was elected to the State Senate of North Carolina. A year later North Carolina again ceded the area to the United States. It was accepted by Congress in 1790 and became part of the Southwest Territory, with William Blount as Governor. In 1796 the State of Tennessee was formed, becoming the 16th State of the Union, and John Sevier was elected Governor.

But we already had reached Boat Yard, hadn't we?

Boat Yard had its beginnings just before the dawn of the 19th century and showed signs of organization into a town by the year 1802. In that year Robert Christian laid it out into lots which he put up for sale—probably Kingsport's earliest subdivision.

Boat Yard was a thriving port for more than 50 years. It was an important shipping point for products from this area and from the area to the east and north. From Virginia and North Carolina goods came to Boat Yard in wagons to be sent on down the river in flatboats. Although there was a decline in this activity about the middle of the 19th century, some flatboat shipping continued from the boatyard in Kingsport until the middle 1880's.

The flatboat was a strange and wonderful mode of transportation. The ungainly craft were built at Boat Yard of stout native timber cut into rough-hewn planks. The boats generally were 50 to 70 feet long, 15 feet wide and were built at a cost of about \$1 per foot—\$50 to \$70 per boat. Some were as large as 20' x 100'. After unloading in Knoxville, they frequently sold for about \$5.

Bills of lading for flatboat cargoes contained such items as ginseng root, saltpeter, bearskins, hemp, snakeroot, salt, bacon, hog jowls, tallow, hams, feathers, beeswax, gunpowder, (there were four powder mills in Kingsport in 1806), tow linen, weaver's reeds, and many other items. Some cargoes were made up entirely of grain, sometimes as much as 1,400 bushels on one boat. The river distance to Knoxville was 224 miles.

It would be impossible for anyone discussing the days of Holston River flatboating to forget the most romantic voyage of them all, in the light of history.

That was the voyage of Col. John Donelson. The hazardous journey began in Kingsport where the Donelson family and many other pioneer families consisting mostly of women, since the men had taken an overland route, boarded their flatboats on the Holston River near the upper end of Long Island at Fort Patrick Henry. The voyage began December 22, 1779, in one of the coldest of winters. The flotilla, consisting of 30 flatboats, was to go down the Holston River to its juncture with the French Broad to form the Tennessee, down the Tennessee, shooting the rapids at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, and continuing on the Tennessee as it turns north and crosses the State a second time, then across the tip of Kentucky to the mouth of the Tennessee on the Ohio at Paducah, up the Ohio to the mouth of the Cumberland, and then up the Cumberland to French Salt Lick to establish the settlement that became Nashville. They arrived, what was left of them, at Nashville four months after the starting date, having survived many Indian attacks and numerous other hardships.

The historical importance of this 1,000-mile voyage is that one of the passengers on the boat was Rachel Donelson, Colonel Donelson's 13-year-old daughter who later on as the wife of Senator Andrew Jackson made more than "somewhat of an impression" on Washington's high society of that day.

On more than one occasion the Jacksons stopped in Kingsport on stage coach travels between Washington and the Jackson home at Nashville.

On such trips, the Jacksons and many another important personage of their day spent over-night rest stops at Netherland

Inn, which still stands in Old Kingsport and for which there is now a campaign under way for restoration and preservation. The preservation and restoration will include a dock and flatboat so that we may return to the Boat Yard.

Most historians agree that Kingsport or Boat Yard, as it was called both names for quite a while, went into a decline after the middle of the 19th century, when railroads were built into other sections of East Tennessee.

In the developments surrounding the coming of the earlier railroads, Kingsport appears to have been pretty thoroughly outmaneuvered by her neighboring communities.

There are different stories, but one is that our neighboring towns convinced Kingsport that, with the river traffic it had built up, a railroad would not be too important to Kingsport, whereas to other areas it would be just what was needed to bring prosperity to them and to Kingsport also.

The competing communities went so far as to assure Kingsport leaders that if this community would withdraw from competition for the railroad—despite the fact that the natural route would pass through Kingsport—the surrounding communities would unite with Kingsport in getting the river channel improved to bring steamboat navigation up and down the river. To clinch their argument, with the river running deep with the spring rains of 1850, they succeeded in having two steamers, the "Mary McKinney" and the "Cassandra", puff their way up river against the current to the Boat Yard docks.

It was a day of great celebration, but the jubilation was brief. The water level went down and the two boats were stranded for a time on sand bars.

It served the purpose of the outside promoters, however. The railroads were completed via Jonesboro, but the promoters' pledge was forgotten, and the river channel was never cleared. The idea is not dead, however, and there are still those who are convinced that someday river traffic will flourish again through this port.

Passed up by the railroads which were completed around 1856-57, Kingsport became what one author has called "sleepful". The sleepfulness lasted for about 50 years, according to the historian Oliver Taylor.

It was during this period of comparative hibernation that the tragedy of war came once more upon Kingsport. The outbreak of hostilities in the War Between the States in April, 1861, found the people of East Tennessee divided between loyalty to the South and to the Union.

Neighbors, friends, even members of the same families held differing opinions, resulting in great bitterness. There were several skirmishes at Kingsport but only one engagement of sufficient military significance to go down in history as a "battle".

This was the battle of Rotherwood, fought at the point where the North and South Forks join to form the Holston, and where years before Frederick A. Ross had built Rotherwood in the gracious Southern plantation style. (And that, in itself, is a most romantic story, but one of the beckoning side-roads we shall resist.)

The Battle of Rotherwood was a brief but sharp encounter in mid-December, 1864, when events were taking shape which would end the war the following spring. The outcome at Rotherwood was a victory for Union forces, but it was of little significance in relation to the war's outcome.

After the war, Kingsport's "sleepfulness" continued until activity was started by the founders of modern Kingsport—John B. Dennis, financier and planner; J. Fred Johnson, community builder and executive officer for Mr. Dennis; and George L. Carter, land purchasing entrepreneur whose early

acquisition of thousands of acres in this area had an important bearing on subsequent development. It would be impossible to adequately recognize the contribution of these men to modern Kingsport.

It was Carter, of whom we now hear comparatively little, who recognized that the Holston River Valley in the area of Kingsport was the ideal site for a manufacturing city to make use of the coal and mineral resources of the mountains.

Hours could be spent telling the story of the building of the railroad through the mountains both north and south of this area. It was a job started in 1836 and not completed until 79 years later. By 1909 the railroad extended through Kingsport as far northward as Dante, Virginia. In 1915 it was completed from Elkhorn City in Kentucky, where it linked with east-west railroads, to Spartanburg, South Carolina.

In 1905 Mr. Carter interested Mr. Dennis and his associates of Blair and Company in completing the railroad and starting development along its route. The Blair interests represented the fifth company to have a part in the railroad construction, and the only one that didn't go broke.

As the work of completing the railroad ground its tortured way over, around and through the mountains, Mr. Dennis, Mr. Carter, and their associates were dreaming of the future and wrestling with problems of finance.

In the Kingsport area they saw great possibilities. These were based on the solid, natural requirements for an industrial city—raw materials, transportation, adequate water supply, and, most of all, people—people whose roots in America extended back as far as 200 years.

Things were ready to begin moving for Kingsport when in 1915 Mr. Dennis and his associates decided that a city should be born—born according to a plan, not simply allowed to grow as pressures of economics, business, and speculation might dictate.

Well known to all of you, I'm sure, is the story of Dr. John Nolan, the professional planner and engineer of city design who was commissioned to lay out a plan for Kingsport.

Well known, too, is the fact that he set aside portions of the area for industry, a part for retail business, other sections for homes, and still other areas for schools, churches, parks, a hospital, and a city hall.

A sidelight on Kingsport's birth and an important milestone on our route "Up The Years From The Boat Yard" was pointed out to me recently by one of the industrial pioneers of our modern city.

He noted that modern Kingsport's first industries—those which took the places of such early ventures as the grist mills, powder mills, iron furnaces, tilthammer mills, linseed oil factories and even an ill-fated silk mill of an earlier era—still were generally of an elementary nature requiring a great deal of hand labor and a minimum of technology and sophistication.

He was thinking of brick-making, lumbering which concerned itself largely with producing rough-sawn timbers, an extract plant to take tanning chemicals from chestnut trees, a cement mill, a tannery, and a pulp plant where raw pulp, rather than finished paper, was produced.

Much of that catalogue of industry, is not too different from the kinds of manufacturing that existed in Old Testament days—brick-making, pulp (for papyrus perhaps), rough-sawn timber, leather making—all these were basic industries extending back almost to civilization's beginnings.

But what do we have 50 years later? Much of our industry has reached a technological level unsurpassed anywhere—books printed by highly sophisticated techniques using a full range of colors in top-quality picture production; chemicals, fibers, and plastics

in great profusion to meet a multitude of modern needs; highly polished glass turned out with ultra-modern facilities; fine white paper made on the very latest of machines; and cloth produced by the best in textile technology. These things and many similar ones characterize Kingsport's industry today.

Modern Kingsport has made its industrial transition from nearly-primitive to modern scientific technology in just 50 years. Many other areas spend hundreds of years to achieve comparable progress, and in much of the world it still has not been achieved.

The results of much of our town's industrial history are apparent to everyone. Suffice it to say that a cement plant began operations here in 1911, followed by a brickyard, dye plant, the extract plant mentioned earlier, a tannery, a hosiery mill, and then the pulp mill. In 1920 a Rochester concern took over a World War I wood alcohol plant which the Government had built but never operated. Like most of the others, this operation has grown. You are familiar with the other manufacturers that came in quick succession in the 20's—manufacturers of cotton textiles, glass, books, and others—and how they grew.

The anniversary we're celebrating tonight actually fell on March 2, for it was on that date in 1917 that Governor Tom C. Rye signed the legislative bill which made our community an incorporated municipality. That incorporation established the first City Manager-Council form of government in Tennessee—one of the first in the nation.

It has proved fortunate for Kingsport that our town's founders adopted that modern, efficient system of city government.

We have been doubly blessed in having men serve on our Board of Aldermen whose chief concern has been the over-all good of the whole city and whose primary interest has not been partisan politics.

I am convinced that these two important, basic elements of our municipal government have contributed much to the united progressive effort that has resulted in sound growth during our first 50 years as a city. I am equally certain that this philosophy is the way to continuous sound progress.

But let's go back to 1917—what was Kingsport like at that time?

Among those who were here, or who came to the new city in its first two or three years, there is unanimous agreement. Kingsport was like a frontier town—complete with mud when it was wet and dust when it was dry.

There was almost a total lack of pavement, few commercial buildings, a scattering of homes, and a claimed population of 3,000, which some of our older folks now estimate was a slight exaggeration.

A report of the Tennessee Fire Inspection Bureau issued March 21, 1917, had this to say about our city: "The streets in the congested value district are poorly graveled, but will be lighted; streets in the greater part of the dwelling area are impassable in the rainy season."

The report went on to say: "Owing to wide streets and only a few scattered brick mercantile buildings, a conflagration is hardly probable in the mercantile section and under ordinary conditions, not more than three buildings should be destroyed by one fire."

For fire protection, incidentally, there was a hand-pulled hose cart and a volunteer fire department.

But Kingsport was growing. An item in the *Kingsport News* of March 17, 1916, reported that 40 teams were at work on the streets of Kingsport Thursday.

And in the *Gate City Herald* of that time there appeared this item under personals:

"J. H. Peters and J. W. Quillen went over to Kingsport Sunday to spend a few hours watching the town grow."

In those days the town was almost entirely barren of trees, so a city beautification program was started. The men planted many

trees without success, and this job was turned over to Mrs. John B. Dennis who was especially skilled in making things grow. It is to her that we owe our tree-lined streets which add so much to our city's charm. Thanks, too, go to the ladies in the many flower clubs that followed.

Kingsport's first public health officer found that one of his first jobs—and one of the most difficult—was to eliminate the nuisance caused by an infestation of rats—it being generally agreed that the rodent population of the new city was greater than the human population.

One of the early moves in the sanitation campaign was to offer a bounty on rats, payable upon presentation at the health office of rats' tails.

Youngsters of that day apparently were as enterprising as they are today. It wasn't long before the kids discovered the place where the tails were disposed of after bounty had been paid on them . . . and some rat tails reportedly wore out through being used as a medium of exchange.

What was most needed to turn a muddy, dusty frontier town into a thriving, progressive city of homes, churches, business, and industry?

The greatest need was people—more particularly, a special type of man. Mr. Dennis found this man in the person of J. Fred Johnson who, at Mr. Dennis' behest, came to Kingsport from Johnson City in January of 1916.

Mr. Johnson became "Mister Kingsport". He was the representative of the Kingsport Improvement Company, the city's developer. He was the town's one-man Chamber of Commerce, its community salesman, its conscience, and its dynamo. He was the principal merchant and a one-man industrial development bureau. He was director, advisor, and unofficial executive officer. He was the moving force. And he made things move.

Often he made things move through the mud.

There are still among us a number of men who can recall going to a dance back in our early days as a city when they found it expedient—and pleasant, in a way—to take off their shoes, roll up their trousers, and literally carry their ladies from their wheeled conveyances to the scene of the party.

I knew Mr. Johnson, but there are many here who knew him better. Those who knew Mr. Johnson best have told me many things about him—how he wrote personal letters to everyone who built a home in his new community and took the opportunity to personally welcome them to town. They recall that many times when they went to see Mr. Johnson they found themselves waiting in an outer office while he arranged help for people who were literally down and out and who were in Mr. Johnson's office to seek aid. Mr. Johnson was almost constantly engaged in helping others.

They tell a story that Mr. Johnson used to use to illustrate what he began calling "The Kingsport Spirit".

The story was that in the early days there was a man in town, physically handicapped by the loss of a part of one of his limbs.

He appealed to Mr. Johnson and the town to have one of its anti-peddling ordinances waived in his case so that he might be allowed to operate a peanut vending machine, complete with steam whistle, at a downtown corner. In his plea, the soon-to-be peanut vendor spoke eloquently in behalf of himself, his fine wife and his beautiful little daughter, who needed his support.

Mr. Johnson frequently cited the town's loyal patronage of the peanut vendor as an example of Kingsport's fine spirit, and of its soft conscience. The town's patronage, did, indeed, enable the peanut vendor to support

himself and his family, and presumably to retire eventually.

What Mr. Johnson did not know was that the estimable peanut man sold hot roasted peanuts from the top shelf of his vendor, and moonshine liquor from a concealed shelf. A leading citizen told me the story, and said he knew because he bought from the concealed shelf on occasion. But he quickly added that if I named him he would deny it.

Mr. Johnson's memory is made brighter by the fact that he did not engage in any financial speculations which were open to him and by which he could easily have made himself a great fortune. He frequently said that he was interested in people, not in making a great deal of money for himself. He lived that philosophy.

But there was speculating in 'most anything and everything in Kingsport's early days. There are many interesting stories told about them, but that's another beckoning side-road we must pass by.

Some stories, however, we simply shouldn't omit:

The techniques used by Kingsport's founders to show off the city's attractions for the benefit of industrial prospects were somewhat different from those used today.

For instance, it was deemed important on one occasion to entertain the late George Eastman on one of his early trips to Kingsport. Mr. Eastman had achieved a reputation as an outdoorsman and a hunter as a result of trips to Africa and elsewhere, so special preparations were in order for his visit to Kingsport.

His hosts prepared what was known in earlier days as a "shooting wagon", and which at one time was used in quail hunting. The wagon, all freshly painted, had seats for a number of shooters, plus a compartment in back for the hunting dogs.

Mr. Eastman, armed with a double-barreled shotgun, was given a place among the other hunters, and the shooting wagon was hauled by horses into fine quail shooting country near the river, below Rotherwood.

On a signal from the hunt-master, the dogs were released and almost immediately flushed a covey of quail fairly close to the wagon. Mr. Eastman was on his feet at once, and fired two rapid shots. No one else in the party fired. Members of the hunting party were deployed and managed to pick up no less than 24 birds felled by Mr. Eastman's two shots!

Today, that kind of enterprise might be called building an image for a happy hunting ground.

Although it has not officially been made a part of this occasion, we might take just a few minutes to note another important Kingsport anniversary, that of the Kingsport Chamber of Commerce, founded May 22, 1947.

The Chamber of Commerce has been of great importance in the modern history of our city. As is the case with the work of other organizations which have contributed to our progress, we are too often inclined to take the Chamber for granted, without thinking of the countless hours of work and planning that go into its day-to-day and year-by-year functions.

Today you cannot come into Kingsport or travel about within the city without using highways and streets that have been built or improved with the assistance of the Chamber of Commerce Highway Council.

The Chamber also has played an important role, often unknown to the public at large, in maintaining within our city area the steady industrial growth we have enjoyed in the last 20 years. The Chamber through its various college committees has been one of the most effective groups working for our growing Kingsport University Center which now serves more than 700 students and which we hope will soon have its own new quarters.

The merchants' group has been another quietly functioning arm of the Chamber which has had an important role in the development of our commercial sections, and has exercised a great influence for progress in our recent history.

It would not be difficult to go on pointing out accomplishments of the Chamber, but its work can best be summarized, perhaps, by simply saying that it has been one of the main factors in keeping alive that elusive quality which was the watchword of our founders—"The Kingsport Spirit".

We have traveled long on our journey "Up the Years". I have chased too many rabbits up the slide-roads. Here we are in recent and modern Kingsport with insufficient time to do justice to the community's marvelous development in several major areas:

The very interesting story of progress from the Big Store to our modern commercial area,

The important and absorbing story of our industrial growth,

The stimulating story of the development of our outstanding educational system,

Our cultural development—up the years from the Band Stand to the Symphony Orchestra whose beautiful music entertained us this evening,

The inspiring story of the religious influence on our community and the growth of our churches.

Each of these is worthy of an hour's discussion. Perhaps during this golden anniversary year these subjects will be discussed in different forums.

And what of transportation?—a subject that is perhaps the key to our entire history. From the Boat Yard, when the river provided almost our only significant means of travel and freight shipment, we have progressed from riverboats, stage roads, and forest trails to ultra-modern railroads, to a system of paved roads now beginning to tie up with inter-state superhighways, to a tremendously important system of trucks, buses and automobiles, and to an airport that offers 31 flights a day and will soon offer jet service.

You will note that I have avoided discussing the personalities of the Kingsport builders except the early founders.

There is a reason.

The builders of today's Kingsport, and of the Kingsport of our recent yesterdays, are still with us. Look around you. These are the builders of today. You and your friends. People you know—people who live here. How can we discuss this history—and agree on it—when it has not yet gone into the crucible of time?

History has no end, but listeners do!

So, if I have left out your favorite subject, I hope you will understand that it was simply because it is so important we don't have time to do it justice. I hope also that you will find many of the answers to your questions in the fine Fiftieth Anniversary Book prepared by the City, and entitled "Kingsport, Keys to A Bright Future". Each of you found one of these at your place this evening. I commend it to you for a further travel experience. And I hope you saved a copy of last Sunday's anniversary edition of the Kingsport Times-News.

We in Kingsport have a great heritage. I have tried to review that heritage to some extent and to recall to you the pride which we can take in the accomplishments of our predecessors here in our home area.

We are still close to the articulate voice of the past—the sound of its wisdom is still audible if we will but listen.

What do you think Kingsport will be like in another 50 years?

I asked that question of many of our history-makers of the past. They have generally agreed on one thing although they have stated their views in different ways.

It boils down to this:

Kingsport, and the area of the United States of which Kingsport is a part, is one of America's best places to live and work. It is an area which has come far but has not yet found its fulfillment. It is an area well worth whatever effort it takes on our part to make it what we hope it will be. It is up to all of us to shape our future and the future of our children here. "Up the Years from the Boat Yard" has been a journey of great progress. With a bit of that indomitable spirit that is our heritage, let us make our journey one of continued progress as we go up the years from here!

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Winders' story is one of the growth of Kingsport, and this growth in the past 50 years has been remarkable. I am sure that the next 50 years will be even greater ones because of the efforts of dedicated men like Mr. Winders.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—1967

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, July 15, the National Captive Nations Week Committee sponsored a Captive Nations Conference at the Mayflower Hotel in which a thorough discussion was held of all facets of world complications stemming from the aggression of international communism.

One of the most pertinent presentations at the conference was the address delivered by Mr. Dumitru Danielopol, of Copley Newspapers, Inc., an international columnist of great renown, who has just returned from a 2-month fact-finding trip through Europe. As a lifetime student of Moscow's foreign policy his remarks merit special attention. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I place the address by Mr. Danielopol in the Record as a continuation of my remarks.

Throughout this week, Captive Nations Week, I will insert other material in the Record so that the entire picture of the present Communist designs for world conquest might be recognized and necessary counteraction commenced.

The address follows:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—1967

(Address by Dumitru Danielopol, Copley Newspapers, Inc., Mayflower Hotel, July 15, 1967)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Captive Nations Week is a time to remember the fate of some 26 countries that have fallen prey to communism in the last fifty years.

It seems to me, however, that this gathering is taking place in the wrong city . . . this is Washington . . . this is a city where many people have become too sophisticated, a city that doesn't welcome reminders that there are captive nations . . . The Washington Post is quite clear on this . . . it mocks Captive Nations Week as the "Annual captive nations charade that might better be called Captive Congressmen Week".

I don't believe either that our administration welcomes this untimely reminder . . . after all it is not in the spirit of Glassboro

where our President met one of the chief culprits of the enslavement of many people.

We are living in the age of peaceful co-existence and in the city where "peaceful engagement" was invented.

The President himself reminded us last October 7 that we who are concerned with the more than one billion people behind Iron or Bamboo Curtains . . . are dreamers . . . he told us that the world is changing . . . that the American policy must reflect the reality of today not yesterday.

In the reality of yesterday people like us had a meaning.

We were entitled to dream . . . to strive and to work toward the freedom of those who are in bondage . . . but in the realities of today we are told such ideas are obsolete. We are scolded that our aims are working at cross purposes with those expressed by our President.

The President's policy no longer reflects the aspirations of the enslaved peoples . . . he said so himself . . . he said that we must turn to one great unfinished task . . . of making Europe whole . . . but he also said "our purpose is not to overturn other governments" . . . in other words let sleeping dogs lie . . . leave the Communists where they are.

This is also the city, ladies and gentlemen, where we have important people in the State Department tell us that they are worried with the new trend in the captive countries . . . that nationalism is showing its ugly head again . . . that this is dangerous: that it could . . . in their own words "balkanize the area" and release old rivalries. They advocate a policy of status quo . . . a policy which accepts Soviet domination and makes the Kremlin guarantor of peace in that area.

This is the reality of today.

But since this is Captive Nations Week, and since I have been asked to speak to you on the subject . . . I'll tell you what I'll do.

As we are not supposed to speak of the reality of yesterday and there is little that I can say on the reality of today I'll speak to you of the reality of tomorrow . . . at least as it appears to me after an extended tour of Europe; nine weeks and fifteen countries: a tour which gave me a clearer insight of what could easily be in store for Europe and for the United States.

I am going to tell you not of the captive nations of yesterday . . . nor of the captive nations of today . . . but of the captive nations of tomorrow . . . for . . . there may be a new batch of captive nations sooner than we think if we continue down this path.

There is not one knowledgeable man in Europe that I visited, be he ambassador Francois Poncet, the French academician, or Julian Amery, the former British secretary of the air, or Constantine Kollias the Prime Minister of Greece or Herman Achminow, the chief researcher of the Institute for the study of the USSR in Munich, or Francesco Costantino, the secretary general of the Italian Chamber of Deputies who believe . . . what our administration wants us to believe . . . that the Russian appetite for expansion is over . . . that Russia is no longer dangerous.

The Soviets are just as hungry, they say. Maybe even more than they were twenty years ago . . . I agree . . . If you don't want to accept their word or mine listen to what some Soviet leaders have to say:

In 1963 Khrushchev told the world:

"We Communists want to win this struggle with the least losses, and there is no doubt whatsoever that we shall win. This is why we are striving for victory, for the triumph of communism, without unleashing a world thermonuclear war."

You may say that this idea is obsolete. Well, it was not so, in April this year.

At Karlovy Vary, Leonid Brezhnev, the Secretary General of the Communist party of the USSR reiterated this aim: "The historic

aim of our movement," he said, "is socialism and communism."

One factor which has stopped the Russians from reaching their goal . . . the unification of Europe under communism . . . from the Urals to the Atlantic is NATO. The Atlantic alliance which stopped the Russians dead.

So what do you think the Russians want most? They want to destroy NATO. And they are making headway and we are helping them.

Can you imagine what impact the October 7 speech had upon European thinking? A speech which calls for the unification of Europe half free and half slave . . . half capitalist and half Communist?—I will tell you—

It has taken the stuffing out of NATO.

After all NATO costs money . . . if the Americans feel that there is a chance of coming to an understanding with the Communists . . . a chance for genuine detente many people argue, it means that communism is no longer dangerous, and if it is no longer dangerous why spend good money on NATO when it is no longer necessary?

It makes sense doesn't it? Even West Germany is cutting its army.

NATO is in real peril.

De Gaulle gave the Atlantic Alliance the first blow. President Johnson gave it another hefty shove. Though he said in his "peaceful engagement" speech: "Our first concern is to keep NATO strong" . . . and he probably meant it, nonetheless he did help create an atmosphere of complacency, of laxness which can bring NATO down.

If you don't want to believe me listen to Brezhnev. He tells exactly what I mean:

"What does experience teach?", he asked at Karlovy Vary. "It teaches in particular that the 'cold war' and the confrontation of military blocs, the atmosphere of military threats, seriously hamper the activity of revolutionary democratic forces", which means the Communist forces.

Do you hear that?

While there was tension in Europe the Communists could not operate so easily. But now the situation has changed.

Now that the tension eased listen to Brezhnev . . . "The increase in the influence of West European Communist Parties is most directly correlated with the reduction of tension which has taken place in Europe."

This my friends is the consequence of "detente" and of "peaceful engagement".

Everytime you hear people talk about stopping the cold war, about easing the tensions just ask yourselves simply this:

Whom does it suit best? us or the Communists?

And then, remember what Brezhnev said. I can tell you from my personal experience in Europe this summer, where I visited one country which was on the brink of being one of our new captive nations, Greece. The military saved it in the nick of time.

We were lucky that time. We may not be so lucky the next.

The pressure the Russians are putting on Europe is constant and unabated. They want Europe badly. A fat, rich, prosperous Europe would suit them to a T. They need European riches to solve their own economic situation, which is bad.

Their propaganda works day and night. And they are making progress.

France can already be written off. Under De Gaulle, any real counterforce against communism has been silenced, though even De Gaulle got frightened when he practically lost the elections earlier this year. The Communists were the winners of that election. They increased their parliamentary seats by some forty new members.

In Italy, both Americans and Italians have told me that since our Democrat administration, under the late President John F. Kennedy asked the Italians to make the 'apertura a sinistra' the opening towards the left, the Communists have gained con-

siderable strength. Some people believe they hold such a grip on the unions and the co-operatives that Moscow could pick the moment when Italy would become a captive nation.

In the Scandinavian countries, where the Communists have worked very hard, the American name is dirt. The Americans have become the "bad guys." The Russians are "not so bad after all". Sweden entertained the so-called war crimes tribunal of Lord Russell, a vile mockery of justice, so biased that even De Gaulle couldn't stomach it and refused it a French platform.

Today some Swedish towns collect money for the Vietcong.

Despite all this, despite the fact that the Germans are withdrawing troops from NATO, that the British very likely will do the same, despite the fact that the Finnish Government is exhorting the Norwegians and the Danes to quit NATO . . . despite all these signs that we are in trouble, in deep trouble, over NATO, what is the attitude of our administration? What is our policy?

Zbigniew Brzezinski, the Columbia professor now a member of the President's planning staff . . . who by the way . . . is credited to be the father of the "peaceful engagement policy" . . . told us what to expect.

He said recently at a national foreign policy conference:

"Communism the principal and until recently the most militant revolutionary ideology of our day is dead. Communism is dead as an ideology in the sense that it is no longer capable of mobilizing unified global support . . ."

Because of this "lamented" departure of communism he advocated that:

"It is our task to develop a broader approach for Europe . . . to end gradually through reconciliation the cold war . . ."

Now what has the gentleman in mind?

Can one be oblivious of the Soviet aims to conquer the world for Communism?

Does he mean that Communism is no longer dangerous?

He says that it is no longer capable of mobilizing unified global support, in other words that there are several sources of Communist philosophical thought, of which one is Moscow and another Peking.

But the fact that these two do not agree on some points doesn't make it less true that they agree completely on one major issue. They both are not only convinced that they can win the world, but they are just as hard at work to achieve this aim as before.

They only disagree on the methods through which their aims of world domination should be achieved. The Chinese reds want total revolution, total war, total destruction. The Soviets want to do it without thermonuclear war.

If Communism is dead, as Brzezinski says, what are we fighting in Vietnam? What is happening in the Middle East? What are the Russians doing in Algeria? What is happening in Thailand? The Philippines? Malaysia? Burma? Bolivia? and how about Cuba?

Everywhere you turn Communists are creating trouble, and the Soviets are helping them.

The policy of peaceful engagement also implies economic aid to Eastern European Communist countries and to the Soviet Union. This the President promised despite the fact that these countries are effectively helping the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to stay in the war and to kill our G.I.s.

I know I am old fashioned. I know that I'm not "sophisticated" because I can't understand the theories and thoughts emanating today out of Washington.

But I'm not convinced that I am wrong.

I believe we need radical changes if we do not want to mourn many more nations on other captive nations' weeks.

Next year we have elections. And it is at the

polls that these things can be changed. Its our task to convince the American people of the danger that exists.

A Communist is a Communist. Remember that. And don't let anyone tell you that it can't happen here. It can.

Thank you.

GOLDEN JUBILEE OF SOUTH EUCLID, OHIO

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the city of South Euclid, Ohio, in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio, is celebrating the 50th anniversary of its incorporation as a village in 1917.

This fine residential community of 30,000 people had its beginning with the signing of the treaty with the Iroquois Nation in 1796. Gen. Moses Cleaveland was commissioned in that year by the Connecticut Land Co. to establish a capitol of the "Western Reserve" near the mouth of the Cuyahoga River at Lake Erie and divide the land east of the river into townships 5 miles square.

Early in the spring of 1796, General Cleaveland and 66 qualified surveyors and helpers journeyed westward to carry out his company's orders. At Conneaut Creek a camp was made and 41 men remained on that site while General Cleaveland and the others proceeded west to the bank of the Cuyahoga River where a "community site" was laid out for settlement. They were gone 18 days, and the men remaining at Conneaut Creek camp became dissatisfied and mutinied. They had enlisted for the duration, but now they demanded considerations not specified in their agreement. General Cleaveland did draw up a contract with them September 30 for their joint purchase of a township 25 miles square, at \$1 per acre. Each man was granted lake front property as well as a farm back in the rocky hills and plateaus. They were to clear land, erect houses, and sow two acres of wheat and grass, and settle a specified number of families during the next 3 years. In the early organization proceedings, the men involved named the township "Euclid" in honor of the Greek mathematician and patron saint of surveyors.

The new township became officially settled in 1797—1 year after the town of Cleveland was laid out and settled. The western boundary of the township began at approximately East 140th Street or Colt Road and the lake, proceeding directly south for 5 miles to what is now Cedar Road; eastward to the present Cuyahoga County line, and north from that point to the lake, a total in excess of 25 square miles. In later years part of this territory became the municipality of South Euclid.

The main early industry in the South Euclid area was farming. The forests were cut down and made into charcoal

and hauled down to Cleveland for use in hotels and factories. Following the Civil War the raising of grapes became a prime industry. A number of Bohemian families settled in the north end of South Euclid and in what is now Richmond Heights. Vineyards took the place of grain fields. Concords, Catawbas, Niagaras, Delawares, and Martha grapes were greatly favored. Two major factors contributed to the grape growing success: First, the slatestone-clay soil produced a hardy wood growth; and, second, the nearness of Lake Erie tempered the atmosphere and prevented frost damage. Grapes were packed in 6- and 9-pound grape baskets and shipped west as far as Denver and east to the seaboard cities, particularly New York. Wine competed with the grape, and enabled the grower to have a more stable year-round income. Euclid wines and Euclid grapes became nationally known because of the delicious and distinctive flavor drawn from the sticky clay soil.

In 1866 the first bluestone was discovered in Euclid Township and this industry flourished through the 1890's when five quarries were in operation. Many of the workmen in the quarries were the newly arrived immigrants of Swedish, Italian, French-Canadian, and Irish descent.

In 1881 the first post office was established in South Euclid. In 1899 the first village hall was constructed and was to continue in use until 1954 when the new municipal center was built.

A group of civic minded citizens started meeting in 1915 as the Citizens League of South Euclid to plan for the incorporation of South Euclid as a village.

On September 29, 1917, the trustees of Euclid Township met in the town hall in regular session, with Jacob Sulzer presiding, present were A. J. Clark, L. Fielitz, and J. Sulzer. They received the following petition:

PETITION TO THE TRUSTEES OF EUCLID TOWNSHIP FOR THE INCORPORATION OF SOUTH EUCLID

To the Trustees of Euclid Township, Cuyahoga County, Ohio:

The undersigned being 30 electors, a majority of whom are freeholders and all of whom reside in the following described territory situated within Euclid Township, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. To wit:

Being a part of original Euclid Township and is bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone monument in the center line of Cedar Road and marking the southwest corner of the original Euclid Township Lot No. 24 (referring to the area west of present day Warrensville Center Road and including Warrendale, Colony, Eastway, and East Antisdale and the shopping area to Washington Blvd.).

An accurate map of which territory is attached hereto (this included present day South Euclid with the addition of Quarry Drive, Keystone Drive, and Northampton Rd.), respectfully represent that the number of inhabitants residing within said territory is 1,500 and respectfully petition your honorable body that said territory may be organized into a Village in the manner provided by law, and that the name of said Village may be the "Village of South Euclid", and hereby designate T. W. Francis, their agent to act for them in all matters relating to the hearing upon this petition and in other matters relating to the incor-

poration of said territory into a Village, and further petition your honorable body that an election may be ordered to obtain the sense of the electors of said territory upon the question of its incorporation into a Village prayed for in this petition.

Signed:

Wm. H. Prasse, Ed Prasse, L. Kirchner, F. Kaestle, W. F. Eckert, George J. Eckert, John Dahler, Jesse Dorsh, James Crane, R. H. Maxwell, Henry Eckert, J. W. Clark, F. R. Shepard, J. H. Hussong, Henry Schwenker, E. H. Reker, Henry Prasse, Henry Huger, Wm. Miller, Chas. Elbrecht, J. G. Whigham, Albert E. McFarland, Chas. Havre, Wm. Libby, F. W. Thorp, Henry Finkemeier, John G. Urban, William Martin, J. H. Bilkey, T. W. Francis, Wm. T. Arnos, Justice of Peace.

Election to be held on October 13, 1917, 15 days from said petition, said election to be held at the South Euclid Town Hall on Green Road. Polls to be open 5:30 central standard time.

Resolution adopted Sept. 29, 1917.

Trustees, J. Sulzer, A. J. Clark, John L. Fielitz, Louis Harms, Clerk.

On October 13, 1917, it was duly recognized as the Village of South Euclid. On November 6, 1917, a regular election was held to choose the village officials with 290 people voting.

Mayor: Ed C. Foote.

Clerk: Paul Prasse.

Treasurer: Jesse Dorsh.

Marshal: J. H. Bilkey.

Council: D. P. Hannan, O. H. Whigham, Wm. Miller, Henry Faust, D. E. Fierbaugh, Fred W. Shepherd.

Assessor: J. W. Hussong.

School Board: Dr. G. I. Bauman, E. H. Leppelmeier, B. E. Luster, M. A. Gates, W. R. Carson.

During the past 50 years of its well organized, efficiently planned growth, this fine community of South Euclid has been served by the following distinguished mayors:

Edward C. Foote, 1918-22.

Charles Havre, 1922-28.

C. H. Quackenbush, 1928-30.

Oliver H. Whigham, 1930-32.

Douglas G. Oviatt, 1932-45.

Lloyd N. Reynolds, 1946-48.

George J. Urban, 1948 to present.

During each of the past 8 years it has been my privilege to witness the presentation of an award to the city of South Euclid in the National Cleanest Town contest. It is now my distinct pleasure to join with all the people of South Euclid in their golden jubilee celebration of the 50th anniversary of the incorporation of their municipality.

A PROMISE UNFULFILLED

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which is most timely and to the point, particularly in

the light of the stoppage in operation of the Nation's railroads.

This editorial in my hometown paper, the Grand Rapids Press, reminds the Congress and the American people where the blame for our failure to deal properly with national emergency strike situations really lies—at the door of the White House. I agree with the editorialist that the monkey still is right where it belongs—on the President's back. I urge all House Members to read the editorial, which follows:

A PROMISE IS UNFULFILLED

It is now obvious that there will be no action on long-needed legislation dealing with labor disputes in national emergencies. President Johnson sealed the doom for any action when he tossed the issue back to Congress after admitting he hadn't been able to keep the promise he made in his State of the Union message to draft and submit such legislation.

In 1966 President Johnson had recognized that the nation must have workable machinery "which will enable us to deal effectively with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

The danger hasn't disappeared or in any way lessened, yet he now has advised Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield that his administration has been unable to come up with recommendations on the subject.

"The President would be very pleased," volunteered Mansfield, "if the labor committees of both houses of Congress would take up the question."

Of course, there is no expectation at this late hour in the session that the committees will act. It invariably takes strong administration pressure or heat generated from the folks back home to get action on explosive issues, and certainly the matter of legislation to deal with strikes affecting the national interest falls into that category.

The lack of leadership manifest in the President's admission that neither he nor his corps of advisers has been able to fulfill a promise he made to the nation reflects no credit on Johnson or his brain trust.

Mansfield interpreted the President's admission of failure as "a clever tactical move that gets the monkey off his back and puts it on ours." Only a gullible and uninformed public, however, could be expected to regard the President's back flip as a clever move. It was the President who promised the American public action on a problem he, himself, described as critical. His attempt now to duck out from under the responsibility he assumed leaves the monkey right where it was—on his own back.

THE NEED FOR PRIORITIES

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been distressed by the administration's utter failure to establish priorities in dealing with the problems of the country. The administration has refused even to recognize any need for priorities. As a result, the President has continued to come to Congress with alleged remedies for all our problems which on examination have proven woefully in-

adequate for any problems of major proportion. Congress should have stepped into this obvious breach long ago and established priorities, and I am disappointed that it has not.

James Reston, associate editor of the New York Times, assessed the effect of this indeterminate policy yesterday in an article entitled, "The Disorder of the Age." Under unanimous consent I include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of our colleagues:

[From the New York Times, July 16, 1967]

WASHINGTON: THE DISORDER OF THE AGE
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 15.—The disorder of the age has never been more obvious than in the last few days—chaos in the streets of Newark; strikes or threats of strikes in the railroad, rubber, copper and auto industries; civil war in Nigeria, rebellion in Rhodesia, tribal war in the Congo and war itself in the Middle East and Southeast Asia.

It is interesting to observe what has been going on here in Washington in the face of this racial revolution in our own cities and in the hungry and miserable states of Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia.

MEANWHILE, IN WASHINGTON . . .

The Administration has been looking during the last few days for a 15 per cent cut in nonmilitary spending at home. The Congress has been slashing the foreign-aid appropriation for the underdeveloped countries overseas. The Republicans have been opposing a tax increase to meet the costs of the Vietnam war they want to wage more vigorously. And the President has been sending more troops to Vietnam and saying that he and General Westmoreland and Secretary of Defense McNamara agree on the number of troops needed there, which is untrue.

The disorder in our cities was not unexpected; generations of discrimination against the Negro assured it. Independence and modern communications have convinced the peoples of the new states of the world that hunger, disease, and ignorance are not inevitable, but intolerable. So there is rebellion and revolution. It is not the fault of one administration or generation alone, but this convulsion of the cities and the new states is undoubtedly the greatest menace to the peace and order of the world today, and it is not being given first priority by any of the modern industrial states it threatens.

There is a vast and defective sense of scale in the policies of the northern industrial countries. They recognize the problems of human fertility and nationalistic ambitions. They identify the problems but do not adopt policies that are equal to them.

JOHNSON'S DILEMMA

It is easy to sympathize with President Johnson's situation. He is confronted with the terrible dilemma of deciding whether the war in Vietnam is a greater menace to the Republic than the revolution in the cities and the new states of the world, but he has dealt with this dilemma by denying that it exists.

His argument is that he has not "cut" his budget for the American cities in order to finance the war in Vietnam, which is true. The problem is that "his" budget for the cities never had a chance of achieving his objectives for the cities. He over-talked and under-financed. He declared a "war" on poverty and financed a skirmish. He compromised between the war in Vietnam and the war in the cities to the detriment of both. He didn't really determine his priorities; he fuzzed them. And the result is that he has not generated enough power either to win his war on poverty or his war in Vietnam.

THE TRAGEDY

The tragedy in this is that President Johnson, probably more than any man in Washington, really wants to give first priority to the cities and the underdeveloped countries. This was his main argument to the Soviet Premier in their recent meeting at Glassboro—that the problems of the peoples of the Middle East, Vietnam, the Soviet Union and the United States could be resolved only by cooperation between Washington and Moscow, and never by competition. But Kossygin did not agree.

He insisted that there could be peace and cooperation only if the United States withdrew from Vietnam and the Israelis withdrew to the prewar boundaries in the Middle East. So the dilemma continues and the question of priorities remains.

THE LARGER ISSUES

This is what really divides Washington. The main issue here is not really between the hawks and the doves on Vietnam—in fact they are both unhappy with the Administration's present policy. The main issue is between those who think Vietnam is the vital issue that must and can be resolved, and those who think it cannot be resolved and is merely keeping us from concentrating our energies and resources on the more important problems in our own cities—which probably can be resolved.

Beyond this, there is an equally important question. Nobody here is sure that he has the answer to the disorder of the age, or even to the problem of right priorities, but most agree that the question of priorities should be faced and that it is not being faced. The Administration is pretending that it is facing up to everything: Vietnam, the cities, the underdeveloped countries; but it is merely compromising ineffectually with them all, and this is what is creating the present mood of doubt and frustration in the capital.

THE CHANGING STRATEGIC MILITARY BALANCE: U.S.A. VERSUS U.S.S.R.—PART II

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, July 13 I directed the attention of the Members of this body to the recently released Armed Services report, "The Changing Strategic Military Balance, U.S.A. vs. U.S.S.R." Today I would like to direct attention to an editorial from the July 12, St. Louis Globe-Democrat which adds further emphasis to the question of whether the United States will regress to a position allowing nuclear blackmail at the hands of the Soviet leaders.

The importance of the issue is expressed in the letter written by Committee Chairman L. Mendel Rivers, transmitting the report to the committee. The first line states:

The problem of whether the United States has sufficient nuclear weapons to meet the Soviet threats underlies our entire defense posture.

The meat of this controversy which has placed the administration—Secretary McNamara in particular—at odds with

those who favor an assured defense posture—including 18 of the Nation's top national defense experts—is given in the Globe-Democrat editorial. I include it in the RECORD:

PERIL IN NUCLEAR GAP

The American Security Council study released Tuesday confirmed what this newspaper and other critics of the Administration defense program have long been saying—namely, that Secretary McNamara's policies of cutting back or deferring vital defense projects is permitting the Soviet Union to succeed in its drive toward strategic military superiority.

If anything, the facts gathered by 18 of the nation's top national defense experts indicate the situation is much worse than most imagined.

It was found the Russians already have surpassed the United States in total nuclear delivery capability. This year the USSR capability is estimated at between 16,000 to 37,000 megatons as against the estimated United States range of between 18,000 and 29,000 megatons. (A megaton is an explosive force equal to 1,000,000 tons of TNT.)

By 1971 this massive gap will have grown to the point where the Soviets will have a deliverable megatonnage potential of 50,000 tons as opposed to about 15,000 by the United States if present defense policies are continued in this country.

Further tipping the strategic weapons advantage heavily in favor of the Russians is their success in developing and installing anti-ballistic missile defenses.

Secretary of Defense McNamara has tried to minimize the Russian ABM program, acknowledging only "a deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system around Moscow."

The study, however, quotes military analyst Hanson W. Baldwin's finding that the Russians have ABM launching sites and related radar systems extending in a wide arc across the northwestern part of the Soviet Union. Additional ABM installations have been discovered east of the Ural Mountains.

Some experts believe the Russians are deploying TALLINN-type anti-missile systems capable of producing "X-ray effects" from ultra-high energy nuclear explosions that can destroy or neutralize attacking nuclear warheads over a wide area.

The Council study finds that "the United States has exchanged its goal of strategic superiority for a strategy of deterrence."

The USSR, by way of contrast, "is driving hard toward a goal of overwhelming superiority in the decisive field of nuclear weaponry."

The report warns that by placing sole reliance on ICBMs, Polaris and Poseidon missiles, and the remaining bomber force, the United States is putting itself in the dangerous position of having only two alternatives if it one day is faced with a Soviet ultimatum to surrender—which could happen if the USSR gains an overpowering capability in delivery of strategic weapons.

The United States would be limited either to firing its offensive nuclear weapons or giving up its sovereignty to the Russians.

But, the military experts add, "An anti-ballistic missile would at least strengthen the hand of the President if he is confronted with such a fateful decision, and it might stay the hand of an enemy at a critical moment in history."

Clearly the United States will be in enormous peril from Russian nuclear blackmail in less than five years if the McNamara defense policies are not reversed.

Our country not only can, but must, maintain a lead in strategic weapons systems until such time as all the nations in the world can agree on an end to the arms race.

This day is not on the horizon as the Communist world still considers the atom and all modern weapons of mass destruction instru-

ments for gaining global supremacy for Communism.

President Johnson should lose no time scrapping the disastrous McNamara policies that are virtually assuring the Soviet Union of an unchallengeable superiority in strategic weapons.

CHICAGO TRIBUNE PRAISED FOR BARING FULL TERMS OF PANAMA TREATY

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune has provided the public a real service by publishing in its issue of July 15 the full text of the Panama Treaty which is under consideration for ratification by the United States. Obviously the publication of the text of the treaty was being withheld to prevent ample time for full consideration of its contents.

The Sunday issue of the Tribune carried a sampling of the reaction which has been generated over this issue. To acquaint the public more fully with the opposition which has met the treaty issue from the beginning I include two articles appearing in the Sunday issue of the Tribune of July 16 in the RECORD at this point:

TRIBUNE PRAISED FOR BARING FULL TERMS OF TREATY

WASHINGTON, July 15.—Resentment over President Johnson's secrecy on the proposed Panama Canal treaty erupted on Capitol Hill today as copies of the full text published by the Chicago Tribune arrived here.

Meanwhile, an intensive lobbying effort on behalf of the administration was discovered to be under way in an effort to line up support for Senate ratification before Senate debate begins.

The White House had no comment on developments but it was reported that the administration has asked former Republican President Eisenhower to be present when Johnson and President Marco Robles of Panama sign the canal treaty and a companion defense treaty on canal security in an effort to give the ceremonies a flavor of bi-partisanship and continuity going back to the Panama riots of 1959 when Eisenhower was in the White House.

The Tribune published a major portion of the defense treaty a week ago.

Opposition to the treaty has been stymied by the secrecy about it, a situation that lawmakers pointed out has been remedied by the Tribune publication. Among the senators visited in the lobbying move were Sen. Dirksen (Ill.), the Republican minority leader, and Sen. Bourke Hickenlooper (R., Ia.), ranking minority member of the senate foreign relations committee.

ROBERT ANDERSON CHIEF LOBBYIST

The head lobbyist was Robert Anderson, the special ambassador in charge of negotiations with Panama. He sought to quell the fears expressed by many senators and House members that the canal treaties involve a hazardous surrender of sovereignty.

Dirksen was reported to have told Anderson:

"Go back and tell Lyndon [the President]

that he's in trouble on this one if he proceeds to sign the treaty without fully acquainting the Senate first with all of its details. Remind him that he needs a two-thirds vote of the Senate [67 senators] for ratification and there is already much resentment about the secrecy concerning its terms."

Dirksen saluted The Tribune feat. He said it is both an extraordinary achievement in journalistic enterprise and a genuine contribution to the interest since it will permit time for careful study of the treaties before the Senate is confronted with a fait accompli. "Too often in the past," he remarked, "the Senate has been sent a treaty, told that it has been signed, and warned that failure to ratify would incense the parties concerned. Thanks to the Tribune, we will have full information this time."

Dirksen told Anderson that he would give him an opportunity to meet with the Senate Republican policy committee next week. By that time, Dirksen noted, senators will be armed with Tribune texts for cross-examination.

TOLD SIGNING SET FOR JULY 24

Dirksen said he had been told that the treaty signing will take place July 24. Reports from Panama vary from July 23 to next month at the White House. Rep. Armistead Selden Jr. (D., Ala.), chairman of the House foreign affairs subcommittee on inter-American affairs, has scheduled hearings for July 24 to 26 on more than 100 resolutions introduced in the house in opposition to the new treaties.

Selden said Rep. Thomas E. Morgan (D., Pa.), chairman of the House foreign affairs committee, told him the three days were the only ones available. Morgan is regarded in Washington as a strong pro state department man. If the signing takes place on July 23 or 24, it will be over before Selden's hearings begin.

Selden said he wants to hold public hearings. He said he would like all state department testimony in public. He said if the state department insists he will close the hearings for its witnesses. Selden said he sees no reason for this, however, since the Tribune has published the treaty.

The House will have to jurisdiction over ratification of the treaty, which can be recommended or rejected by the Senate only. Most of the resolutions introduced in the House have urged the Senate not to ratify it.

Sen. Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.), a member of the Senate armed services committee, said he will put the treaty text published by the Tribune in the Congressional Record Monday.

Sen. Norris Cotton (R., N.H.), who demanded in a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday that "the strange veil of secrecy be lifted from the treaty negotiations," said the Tribune has performed a great public service.

As the ranking minority member of the Senate commerce committee, Cotton is familiar with the efforts of a special Presidential commission to find a route for a new sea level canal. He was perturbed by the fact that no feasible route has yet been discovered after a two-year study and that construction of a second canal, in any event, is at least 10 years away.

"I wrote Secretary [Dean] Rusk of my deep concern over reports that United States negotiators have agreed to a treaty which surrenders United States sovereignty over the Panama canal," Cotton said, "I told him that the strange veil of secrecy surrounding the details of the treaties has raised doubts and caused confusion in many minds. . . Now thanks to the Tribune's enterprise, those details will be available to answer many questions. We will be able to determine if we run the risk of some future Nasser-type government in Panama barring our shipping and that of our allies and friends. Surrender of sovereignty over the present canal sets a

pattern for surrender of sovereignty over any new canal built in the area with United States dollars."

OTHER LEGISLATORS EXPRESS RESENTMENT

Other legislators also expressed indignation and resentment over Johnson's secrecy. Rep. Edward Derwinski [R., Ill.], a member of the House foreign affairs committee, called it shocking that concessions of a major nature were made on the canal without consultation or discussion with the Congress and the committees involved.

"The timing and nature of this couldn't be worse," said Derwinski. "Administration leaders shouldn't have made the concessions and retreat they have made on the Panama canal. The Tribune has done a good job. With evidence of Castro infiltration in Colombia and Venezuela, the weakness of the Panamanian government and its national guard [army], and the lesson learned from the paralysis of the Suez canal by Egypt, this is the time for strong leadership."

Rep. Charlotte Reid [R., Ill.] said that instead of negotiating concessions costly to United States security before a decision is reached on a new sea level canal, the United States should be reaffirming our existing treaty rights over the canal.

"In my judgment, the administration should be doing more to impress upon our neighbors in this hemisphere the benefits they derive from efficient operation of the canal and the security this affords, Mrs. Reid said.

Rep. John Rhodes [Ariz.] chairman of the Republican policy committee in the House and a member of the defense subcommittee of the House appropriations committee, attacked the administration's handling of the canal treaty as "a rather sinister secrecy." He said publication by The Tribune will give everyone a chance to study it and determine whether there is something in the treaty that the administration wanted to break gently to the American people. He said The Tribune has performed a real public service.

SOUGHT TEXT OF PACT FOR WEEKS

Rep. Durward G. Hall [R., Mo.], who introduced a House resolution against the treaty that had the signatures of 132 House members, said he and others had been trying for two weeks to learn the terms of the treaty.

"I think this is a great public service to the American people and to the Congress," he said. "Perhaps this is the one thing that will crystallize opinion. Obviously, the number of people who co-sponsored mine and similar resolutions demonstrates the interest of the people and their representatives."

Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan [D., Mo.] chairman of the House merchant marine subcommittee on the canal, expressed mystification over administration secrecy on the treaty and explained that she is delighted with the Tribune publication because "I think the American people should know what is in this, if they can understand it."

"The big thing, the awful thing is the contents of the treaty which transfers sovereignty over the canal," she said. "The more you study it [the treaty], the more its terms become open to interpretation."

Mrs. Sullivan said that there should be "some digestion" of the contents of the treaty before Congress is asked to give its approval. She pointed out that the administration had not even given members of the foreign affairs committees copies, and said "opposition to the treaty seems to be growing."

READERS HAIL FULL STORY ON PANAMA PACT—MILITARY MEN, CIVILIANS REACT TO TERMS

Publication by THE TRIBUNE of the Panama canal treaty text yesterday drew enthusiastic response from business, government, and military leaders.

"The Tribune deserves a most remarkable

pat on the back for it," said Brig. Gen. Lawrence H. Whiting [ret.], vice chairman of the American Furniture Mart.

"MOST COMPLETE STORY"

Referring to the publication of the complete treaty text, Gen. Whiting said:

"I think this is the most complete story on a matter of national interest that has been published by any newspaper in the west or to my knowledge anywhere in the United States. I think the people of the country should be deeply appreciative of the care and attention the Tribune has given to this problem because it is of the gravest political and national issues."

Gen. Whiting said his views were shared by Gen. Robert E. Wood, a director and retired chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co., who was in Presbyterian-St. Luke's hospital yesterday.

WORKED ON CANAL

Gen. Wood was one of Gen. George Washington Goethals' assistants in the construction of the canal, starting work on it in 1905. Gen. Wood has predicted the United States will be "finished in Latin America" if it permits arbitration of its treaty rights in the Panama Canal Zone.

"The canal is vital to our defense," he said in 1964. "If we concede any of our rights there, we are finished."

Major Gen. Francis P. Kane, commander of the Illinois 33d national guard division, said the publication of the treaty text "will awaken the people of this nation to the threat which faces their future security. No citizen who reads the text of the treaty can shrug it off by saying it really doesn't matter what happens to the canal. The Tribune deserves congratulations for its alertness in bringing this story to print."

KEY TO SECURITY

Cook County Board President Richard B. Ogilvie, a former army tank commander, said:

"In view of what happened with the Suez canal, we should not give up any controls in Panama. To do it would be stupid. It would be a miscalculation. The security of the western world is tied up in that canal."

Four persons selected at random in Michigan avenue and in the Sheraton Chicago hotel said Congress should study the proposed treaty carefully before giving their "advice and consent."

Sylvester Clifford, a speech pathologist from the University of South Dakota here for a seminar, said it would be a great mistake for Congress not to give careful attention to the treaty.

"The administration and Congress have a very difficult job ahead of them. They are to be sympathized with. The canal should stay open. It is vital to us. Even if we must develop another route—whether it pleases the Panamanians or not—it should stay open and the United States should have methods of protecting its interests in the canal."

Roger Duffey, an employee of the county public aid department, said an important move such as the canal treaty should be carefully evaluated by Congress.

"If there is such a thing as joint sovereignty, then I am for that," said Duffey. "I'm for protecting the rights of the Panamanians as well as those of this country."

Atty. Frederick E. Merritt, commander of the American Legion, said:

"We ought to move slowly and study the proposed new treaty with caution before any changes are made. By the way, the original treaty was negotiated by another native of Salem, William Jennings Bryan, while he was secretary of state."

Carl Stockholm, owner of a chain of cleaning stores and past national president of the Navy league, said the riots in Panama in 1964 were used as an excuse for proclaiming the need for the new treaty.

LABOR COURTS COULD SOLVE RAILWAY AND OTHER MAJOR STRIKES

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClellan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McClellan. Mr. Speaker, the walk-out of six shopcraft unions affiliated with the International Association of Machinists against the Nation's railways emphasizes again the need for comprehensive legislation to protect the public against labor disputes affecting the national interest. Labor disputes affecting the railroads and other forms of nationwide transportation require a general legislative remedy to which the public can turn for protection and relief. While this administration has given bland assurances of a new labor bill, it has dawdled and stalled for fear of stepping on the toes of some big labor bosses.

Meanwhile, Samuel I. Rosenman, a former New York Supreme Court Justice and a one-time adviser to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has advocated the establishment of labor courts. According to Judge Rosenman, who could certainly not be described as an antilabor figure, the public interest demands that a forum be established where differences between management and labor can be litigated to a conclusion. This would be in contrast to the type of ad hoc boards which have been appointed in the past when strikes and threats of strikes affecting the national interest have been involved. Mr. Speaker, a portion of Judge Rosenman's presentation—which appeared in the Sunday, July 16, Sunday Star—is as follows:

My thesis, baldly and broadly stated, is that—with labor equality insured by our many labor laws—the right to strike should be curtailed when it is in conflict with the public interest, and that some form of final compulsory decision must be provided.

I would limit it—at least initially—to certain well-defined industries: Transportation by land, sea and air; manufacture or production of any material necessary to national health or security; communications; and essential public, municipal and state services such as police, fire, sanitation, subways and buses, hospitals, and public health and welfare agencies.

By compulsory decision, however, I do not mean compulsory arbitration by an ad hoc appointed board of arbitrators.

What I propose is a new judicial system of courts—labor courts—with jurisdiction solely over industrial strife, including strikes.

The essential feature of labor courts is that the judges would have the same title, dignity, respect and standing as all the other federal judges. This would require that they be appointed by the President for life, and confirmed by the Senate in the usual way; that their time be devoted exclusively to labor cases; that they have the same salaries, the same retirement privileges, all necessary clerks and assistants, and the same dignified courtrooms and chambers as other U.S. judges. They should be empowered to assure orderly hearings by contempt proceedings and, in all respects, have the same pub-

lic standing and expertise in their particular field of labor as any other federal judicial officers. They will become qualified specialists in particular industries, and know the history of labor relations in those industries.

Labor courts' decisions should have the effect of judgments, enforceable by substantial fines, and appealable to a Federal Labor Court of Appeals consisting of the same type of specialized labor judges, with powers to affirm, modify or reverse.

Labor court decisions should be conclusive and binding on both sides. In that sense the result will be the same as by compulsory arbitration. Yet I hazard a guess that most of the present rejection and abhorrence of compulsory arbitration by management and labor will gradually diminish and finally disappear.

Nothing in my proposal calls for any interference with the give-and-take of collective bargaining. Unions will continue to require the same equality of strength, even though they cannot strike. For before a labor controversy reaches the end of the judicial process, both sides have to try to reach a settlement on as many of the issues as possible by collective bargaining. Only items on which agreement cannot be reached will have to be resolved by the court. Individual employees or even weak unions cannot do this kind of bargaining successfully. They must be strong enough to amass all the facts with which to sit opposite management at the bargaining table. They must be able to employ the best of economists, lawyers, statisticians and bargainers. And they must have even greater resources if they have to go to court on a long, protracted trial.

It is not true that collective bargaining must stop when the right to strike is taken away. That is not true in the Australian system of labor courts. That is not true of any other kind of civil dispute or litigation in our courts. For every case actually tried, there are scores which are settled before litigation, during litigation, and even in the course of trial. These civil settlements are all the results of vigorous bargaining. A party settles for less because he fears that the court may decide against him and thus he will lose all. The weaker his case, the smaller his settlement. So each side, in negotiating, marshals his facts and his law, argues justice and equity with the other, and then takes a look at the strength or weakness of his opponent's case.

In this country, we have had the present haphazard system a long time—too long. The American public will welcome any reasonable change which will put an end to the needless economic waste which comes from strikes. And in the long run, I am confident that both labor and management will join in the welcome.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed by Judge Rosenman's statement, and I am hoping that the administration will take note of his recommendations. If the administration does not wish to come forward with legislation to establish labor courts, then what, indeed, is its recommendation for handling those few insoluble labor-management disputes which affect the broad public interest? If the administration has a better solution, it should present its alternative proposal at once to an impatient Congress, and to an even more impatient American public.

OCCUPATIONAL DEFERMENTS AND SELECTIVE SERVICE: CONTINUING THE DRAFT DIALOG

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has just passed a draft extension act, extending the military draft virtually unchanged for another 4 years. However, the problems and inequities which sparked the strong public demand for reforms still remain, and I feel it is incumbent upon this House to continue to consider these issues and not to let this matter lie dormant over the next 4 years. Especially necessary at this time of military buildup and international crisis is a study of the effects of the draft system on the overall allocation of manpower between the military and civilian sectors.

I have argued for, and my resolution, H.R. 422, would establish, a joint House-Senate committee, composed of members of the two Armed Services Committees and members of the two Education and Labor Committees—which must be included if a correlation between manpower problems in the military and civilian fields is to be brought about—to study this area. The recent action of the Congress in making the National Security Council the advisory body to the Selective Service System on the problems of determining critical skills and occupations can in no way be seen as a final resolution of the question of allocation of manpower. In addition, the Congress has so far ignored the pressing problem of coordinating the use of the Ready Reserve with our present manpower allocation. The manpower needs, skill levels and operational readiness of the Reserves must be coordinated with civilian and military manpower usage if we are to have the Ready Reserves as our prime source of manpower for rapid expansion or "crisis" periods. The Congress has a duty to study this area, and I feel we would be remiss in our public responsibilities if we let the executive branch manage this task "behind closed doors" without establishing guidelines based upon studies that can only be meaningful if made in context of public hearings, cross-examination and public debate.

On July 28, 1966, and again on January 30, 1967, I took the floor to discuss and present to the House information I had received on our present system of deferring "critical occupations" and "essential activities." This material can be found in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 13, pages 17545-17550, 89th Congress, second session, and on pages 1822-1829 of the RECORD of this year. It includes my correspondence with Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and then-Secretary of Commerce, John T. Connor, concerning the Interagency Advisory Committee on Essential Activities and Critical Occupations, which, until this new law which we just passed, was the group which advised the Selective Service System on occupational deferments. It was somewhat surprising to me to see in our debate on the merits of a "National Manpower Resource Board"

or putting this function in the National Security Council no mention of the fact that we already had an organization that was assigned to perform this task. I would certainly hope that the Departments of Labor and Commerce realize that their interagency committee has now been superseded by the National Security Council, because I would hate to think that our oversight will result in duplication of effort and the continuing of unnecessary bureaucracy. It is interesting to note that the Interagency Committee suspended its operations since the beginning of the year waiting for Congress to act. Now the Commission is uncertain as to its future role, according to a committee source. However that may be, I think it important for this House to examine the work of the Interagency Committee to see how well the job of allocating manpower has been carried out.

The hearings conducted last March and April by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, entitled "Manpower Implications of Selective Service," are, I think, most useful and informative. In addition to providing valuable testimony on the question of manpower allocation and important data on the present system of occupational deferments—II-A deferments—the hearings demonstrated the concern of the labor committees for this question and the value which we could receive from a joint study committee which would bring together Members knowledgeable in all aspects of this many-faceted problem. Certain portions of the testimony received by the Senate subcommittee are especially revealing, and I would like to include excerpts from the questioning of Secretary Wirtz in my present discussion.

At the present time, we have some 250,000 young men deferred from military service because their occupations are critical to the defense effort and to the civilian economy. It should be noted that this type of deferment is usually permanent and these men are usually never called for military duty. Now on this matter, Secretary Wirtz testified as follows:

Secretary WIRTZ. . . . The present situation—resulting in the 250,000 II-A classifications—is the product of a complex administrative process which developed largely during a period of minimum demands for military service.

This process includes (1) the listing of essential activities by the Secretary of Commerce, (2) the listing of critical occupations by the Secretary of Labor, (3) advice in various forms regarding this matter by the national headquarters of the Selective Service System to local draft boards, and (4) virtually discretionary and broadly inconsistent decisions by local draft boards.

Half of the registrants recently reclassified by the local boards as II-A (occupational deferments) are neither in essential activities (as certified by the Secretary of Commerce) nor in critical occupations (as certified by the Secretary of Labor). (Emphasis added).

This is a surprising statement and Senator EDWARD KENNEDY questioned the Secretary as follows:

Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Secretary, that is an amazing statistic. Can

you give us some explanation why something hasn't been done about it?

Secretary WIRTZ. I think I understand why it has happened, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is not without justification. When we put ourselves in the situation of the local community, it is to realize that in a local community, there will be, perhaps, an essential military production plant there, which faces what have become in the last 2 years quite strong manpower needs. Under such circumstances it is pressed upon the members of the local draft board, with propriety, and it is part of the democratic process, that that plant needs help. Now when there comes up before that draft board the case of a young man who is working at that plant, I think that his deferment by the local board is understandable, in terms of those pressures.

Thus, we find that the decisions as to which occupations are critical are being made by local boards in response to the pressures of local industries. There is no way for any responsible national body to correlate the national defense needs for manpower in both the civilian and military sectors, as long as these crucial decisions are being made exclusively by local boards. Obviously, from the fact that one-half of those presently being deferred for occupational reasons are not in jobs which are considered critical by the national advisory agency, we can see that either the list of critical jobs is not related to the realities of our manpower needs, or the local boards are deferring men to protect purely local industries.

It is then important to go on and discover just how the List of Currently Critical Occupations, which I discussed in my remarks of January 30—page 1825—is related to the manpower needs of the defense structure and civilian economy. Discussing this list, Secretary Wirtz said:

Secretary WIRTZ. And just to complete this, I think it should be added that the list was developed during a period when it didn't make very much difference.

Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It hasn't been reviewed?

Secretary WIRTZ. It has not been reviewed. But I should say, Mr. Chairman, that there are descriptions of each of these occupational deferments. I don't mean to suggest that I think the decision was taken too lightly. It was taken, rather, during a period when, as I say, it didn't much matter. This is during the 1950's. There are reasons for it. . . .

Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Rather than running all through the list completely, I want that included although we also have included on it some foremen, glassblowers, structural linguists, and a number of others. In any event, would you say that the list should be completely reviewed?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, sir.

Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And reevaluated.

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, sir, it has been sort of false bravery.

As Secretary Wirtz points out, the list is not very well related to present manpower demands. In addition, the job descriptions in the list, as I mentioned in my remarks of January 30, are based on the now-obsolete 1949 edition of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Secretary Wirtz, in his letter to me of September 12, 1966, reprinted in the RECORD of January 30—page 1827—stated that the Labor Department was in the process of updating the job descriptions, but, as yet,

these changes have not been published. Certainly, one of the first jobs of any new advisory group in the area of occupational deferments, such as the National Security Council, must be to review our present list of critical occupations and update these job descriptions. I have been told by an official in the Department of Labor that the new critical occupations job descriptions are ready, but that they have not been put in published form and distributed through the Selective Service System because the Department was waiting to see what the Congress would do. Of course, all we did was move the advisory functions over from the Departments of Labor and Commerce to the National Security Council; and as a spokesman for the Labor Department indicated, the National Security Council is "not now prepared in any way to do the kind of staff job that's needed" in this area. It is perhaps, unfortunate that we decided to transfer the functions of this Interagency Committee to the National Security Council without any discussion of hearings on the capabilities of the NSC to handle this function. I will be following developments in this area rather closely, and will inform the House through the RECORD of any information I receive relative to the future work of the NSC on occupational deferments.

Secretary Wirtz, at the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower hearings also commented on the operation of the present system of local board discretionary power over occupational deferments. His testimony follows:

Secretary WIRTZ. The President has, I think, quite wisely said there ought to be a further look at the distribution of responsibility between the central system and the local boards. I feel no reluctance in saying this to you: I know that the present system, as far as the identification of occupational deferments, is not right, because it produces a sequence in which, on June 24, 1966, we have an interagency committee determination that there is no necessity for deferments in the machine tool industry. That committee advised the parties, who had submitted an application, to that effect. Then on February 28, 1967, there was advice by the National Headquarters of the Selective Service System, to the local boards, that the machine tool industry is one in which according to advice from the industry and so on and so forth, there are shortages, and a statement that they have backlogs that have increased every month since May 1965.

Unfortunately, that same statement came out just a day after the newspapers reported the machine tool orders reached a 2-year low. And then, when you go on and complete that procedure, by leaving it to the complete discretion of local draft boards, on that kind of record, I know that doesn't make sense.

What was revealed by this testimony is that under the present system, if an industry does not get its request for inclusion on the Department of Labor list accepted by the Interagency Committee—and Secretary Wirtz testified that every such request in the past few years has been denied—it can then go to the national headquarters of Selective Service and get a national recommendation to defer its employees anyway. If that does not work, as Secretary Wirtz indicates, the industry can go directly to the local boards in the communities in

which its workers live and get its people deferred on an individual basis.

Surely, this is not what we mean by allocating our limited supply of skilled manpower between the civilian economy and the military services. What good are national advisory agencies and national criteria when local boards choose to ignore them—as they have in fully one-half of the requests for occupational deferments? Secretary Wirtz stated that the system "doesn't make much sense"; it is, however, worse than that, because we have no way of determining just which critical personnel are being deferred and whether a supply of skilled manpower for essential civilian activities is being maintained. This means that we may face a shortage of critical skills in certain areas and have no way of doing anything about it. Secretary Wirtz makes it unequivocally clear that such shortages exist today; he stated to the Senate subcommittee:

Secretary WIRTZ. I want to make it quite clear, and I suppose, to respond to Senator Javits' point among others, that there are skill shortages today in some key occupations, there isn't any question about that.

With this kind of testimony before us, it is vital that the Congress undertake a more thorough study of our system of occupational deferments. The Secretary of Labor feels the system is wrong, and present experience with II-A deferments indicates that there are inconsistencies and inequities in the operation of the system, as well as real gaps in our ability to manage the allocation of skilled manpower. We should not leave the problem entirely in the hands of the executive branch—this is an area where an open, congressional study is most necessary, so that industry representatives, economists, labor union representatives, and others interested in this problem can come and testify and be cross-examined. The National Security Council is perhaps the least capable body for carrying out this task because it is responsible for high-level policy, and often top-secret decisionmaking, and is not equipped to make detailed staff studies of this issue. This testimony also points out the need for a broadly based study which includes members of those congressional committees most concerned with manpower problems. I certainly think that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee which conducted these hearings should be commended for their efforts and for the information they have provided the House and Senate. I hope they will continue their studies, and I hope that the Congress will support my bill, House Resolution 422, so that their efforts can be joined with the work of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

I have written to Secretary Wirtz to get further information with regard to the matters I have discussed and to keep abreast of developments in this area. I enclose, for the benefit of other interested Members, a copy of my letter. Also, I have written to the National Security Council to ascertain their plans for implementing their new responsibilities. I will, of course, place any response I receive in the RECORD. I am, in addition,

continuing my studies in this field and expect to have further information for the House shortly. The letters follow:

JULY 10, 1967.

Mr. BROMLEY SMITH,
Executive Secretary, National Security Council,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: As you no doubt know, the new Selective Service Amendments, S. 1432, passed by the Congress and sent to the President, transfers the responsibility for advising the Selective Service System on critical skills and essential occupations from the Departments of Labor and Commerce to the National Security Council.

This is an area in which I have been very concerned, as I feel we have not been adequately coordinating the manpower needs of the Armed Forces and the civilian economy in our deferment policies. Secretary Wirtz has told the Congress, during a March 21, 1967 hearing of the Subcommittee on Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that one-half of those now being deferred (II-A) for occupational reasons are not in "essential activities" or "critical occupations" as defined by the Departments of Labor and Commerce. At the same time, Secretary Wirtz testified that the civilian economy was facing skill shortages in some key occupations.

I would appreciate receiving any information you might have as to the plans of the National Security Council for implementing its new responsibility in the area of occupational deferments. I realize that this is a new task which has been given to you and that it may take some time to set up a structure to carry out this responsibility, but I hope you will inform me of whatever procedures and methods are adopted as soon as they are established. I have learned that the agency entrusted with this task in the Departments of Labor and Commerce has suspended its operation since January while awaiting Congressional action. Thus it becomes even more imperative to re-establish some guidelines and procedures for studying and making recommendations on this matter.

I would also appreciate your comments on the feasibility of placing this new responsibility in the National Security Council. Is this responsibility consistent with your present functions and methods of operation? Do you have staff who are familiar with the problems of manpower allocation in both the military and essential civilian segments of the population? Do you now carry out any analogous responsibilities, i.e., directly advising and establishing guidelines for another Federal Agency or Department? I am afraid that the transfer of responsibility to the National Security Council was carried out without any Congressional study or debate and, seemingly, without consulting with the Council itself. Therefore, I feel that your comments on this matter would be valuable for the Congress.

I am enclosing, in case you have not yet seen a copy, a copy of the Conference Report on the draft law, which includes the language of the bill passed by the Congress.

Thank you very much for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

JULY 10, 1967.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In your testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of March 21, 1967, you stated that "there are skill shortages today in some key occupations, there isn't any question about that." This

was in the context of discussing and evaluating our system of occupational deferments from military service.

I have been very interested in this matter, and I would appreciate any facts, statistics or other information you might have on skills now being deferred and any shortages which may now exist.

As you also are aware, the new draft law passed by the Congress transfers the responsibility for advising Selective Service on occupational deferments from your Department (jointly with Commerce) to the National Security Council. I would appreciate your comments on this transfer, especially on the ability of the National Security Council to handle this responsibility. What plans do you have to coordinate your responsibilities and expertise with the Council? Also, I would appreciate any information you receive on the plans of the NSC to develop their new duties with regard to advising Selective Service. I realize that this may take some time to get an organization developed for this function, but I hope you will inform me of the procedures and methods of operation in regard to this matter as they are established.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

THE PROPOSED TAXATION OF ADVERTISING REVENUE OF TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the effective administration of our tax system makes it necessary for the Internal Revenue Code to be supplemented by detailed regulations which serve as a vehicle for carrying out the legislative intent of the Congress. In general, the record of the Internal Revenue Service in preparing and promulgating regulations within the purview of the revenue laws enacted by Congress is commendable. However, our tax system, because of its vast complexity, produces some very sophisticated administrative problems and, as a result, the Internal Revenue Service, in its attempt to exact revenue, has sometimes exceeded its delegated authority.

When an executive branch of Government invades the exclusive power of Congress in an effort to legislate by regulation, redress may be had in the courts through a long, tedious, and expensive procedure which may result in irreparable damage even if the litigant is successful; or Congress, of its own initiative, may speak through the legislative process to thwart the attempted invasion of its prerogatives.

My remarks today are directed toward the Treasury regulations amendments proposed by the Internal Revenue Service which would have the effect of taxing the income of publications of tax-exempt organizations, even though such publications may be substantially related to the tax-exempt purposes of such organizations.

I do not propose here to discuss extensively the substantive merits of my bills. My primary purpose in introducing these bills in the last Congress, and in reintroducing them now, is primarily to put a stop to the Treasury Department placing its judgment ahead of the Congress to establish new lines of demarcation through the technique of issuing new Treasury regulations, and to permit the Congress after full public hearings of people on all sides of the issues, including the Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service officials, to render through law as opposed to executive rulings, any new judgments that seem desirable.

The Internal Revenue Service claims as authority for the issuance of such regulations section 7805 of the Internal Revenue Code which delegates to the Treasury Department the authority to "prescribe all needful rules and regulations for the enforcement (of the Internal Revenue Code)." Statutory limits inherent in this delegation of authority hinge on the word "needful."

Obviously, congressional intent and legislative history are relevant to the determination of whether a Treasury regulation is "needful" for the effectuation of the particular Internal Revenue Code provision. The statute under which the Internal Revenue Service intends to propose the regulations is the Revenue Act of 1950. This law was enacted for the purpose of curbing a growing abuse on the part of certain tax-exempt foundations and universities that were acquiring regular commercial businesses not substantially related to their tax-exempt purposes aside from the need for income. At the legislative hearings and in the congressional committee reports preceding passage of the Revenue Act of 1950, the focal point of attention was the acquisition by New York University of a macaroni factory.

In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder said:

Our tax laws have long recognized the principle that organizations operated for worthy public purposes should be encouraged by tax exemption.

About the provisions of the bill, which would subject to tax the income of a substantially unrelated trade or business, he said:

These provisions preserve the tax-free status of the legitimate activities of educational and charitable organizations and, at the same time, correct the abuses which properly have received so much general condemnation. Business operations of charitable and educational institutions clearly unrelated to their exempt functions generally would be subjected to the regular corporation income tax. This would apply to organizations now engaging in such unrelated business activities as the manufacture of food products, leather goods, vegetable oils, and the distribution of petroleum products. The bill would not tax their income from related activities.

It is clear from Secretary Snyder's presentation and from the congressional committee reports that the statute was intended to subject to taxation only the income of a trade or business that is substantially unrelated to the primary pur-

poses of a tax-exempt organization. In applying the statute, the operation of a publication such as a trade or professional journal may be regarded as a "business" but its income is properly subject to tax only if the publication is a business "substantially unrelated" to an organization's tax-exempt purposes.

Nevertheless, despite the legislative history and the clear meaning of the law, the Internal Revenue Service now proposes by regulation to tax the advertising revenue of publications of tax-exempt organizations, irrespective of whether the publication is substantially related or unrelated to its exempt purposes. In light of congressional intent, it is clear that the proposed regulations are not "needful" for the effectuation of the Internal Revenue Code sections under which they are proposed, sections 511 to 514. I can only conclude, therefore, that the Internal Revenue Service has exceeded the authority delegated to it by section 7805 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Even aside from questions of legitimate authority, as a practical matter the legislative hearing forum is better designed than the administrative hearing forum to give a full and impartial airing of all sides. The legislative hearing is better because we can force the Internal Revenue Service to come forward with a concrete need case. As it stands now, the Internal Revenue Service has issued nothing but a general conclusory statement indicating that there is, in their judgment, a need for the proposed regulations.

My correspondence with the Internal Revenue Service reveals that they have released only two papers relating to the proposed regulations. One is nothing more than a draft of the new regulations, the other, Technical Information Release 899, makes only passing reference to any need. It states:

The IRS noted that its experience in administering the unrelated business income tax had disclosed the need for a more complete and detailed explanation of the statute than that afforded by existing regulations. In response to this need, IRS several years ago undertook a comprehensive study of the tax laws and their bearing upon commonly encountered fact patterns. The proposed regulations result from that study.

Such a statement says nothing substantive about any real need for the regulations. Instead of the Internal Revenue Service merely stating that it is the considered judgment of the Internal Revenue Service that there is a need for the proposed regulations, I would prefer to peruse a detailed report of the study itself. The Internal Revenue Service does not plan to release any such report before their proposed hearings on July 18. In fact, I do not know if the Internal Revenue Service plans to assume any burden of proof even in the Treasury hearings themselves. It is not inconceivable that, if Congress does not intervene, there will never be a full airing of the facts and reasoning employed in the "comprehensive study" conducted by the Internal Revenue Service.

On the other hand, if the matter comes before the Congress in bill form, the Internal Revenue Service will be forced to

come forward with a convincing need case if they wish to get their proposed changes enacted.

The first bill which I am introducing today will assure to labor, agricultural, trade, professional, educational, charitable, religious, and similar organizations the tax-free status of their legitimate activities which Secretary Snyder promised and Congress intended in the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1950.

The sole purpose of the second bill that I am introducing is to accommodate the situation where a publication is incorporated separate from the parent organization as is the case with the Journal of Nursing—the publication of the American Nursing Association.

The need for this legislation runs the gamut of our worthwhile organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, churches, labor unions, professional and business organizations, and the National Education Association, among other educational groups.

BETTS REPORTS EXECUTIVE INEFFICIENCY AND MISMANAGEMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks the House has been made acutely aware of the enormous budget deficit which confronts the Nation in this fiscal year. While the concern of Congress has been manifested as to the need to reduce expenditures, there has been no concerted effort to eliminate the extensive waste, inefficiency, and mismanagement rampant in Federal programs.

In response to this problem and in an attempt to kindle an increasing awareness of the inefficiency and mismanagement prevalent in Government spending, I have prepared the following table which cites particular departments, agencies, or programs, categorizes the nature of the problem, and notes the frequency of occurrence. I present it not as an exhaustive analysis, but as a preliminary study which I believe attests to the existence of inefficient administrative procedures and substantiates the need for comprehensive examination and serious congressional attention.

I have already introduced a bill, H.R. 9164, which is designed to alleviate much of the inefficiency in the executive branch by calling attention to the unsatisfactory performance of particular individuals and the lack of compliance with administrative procedures. My bill, first, requires the Government Accounting Office to publish the names of employees personally responsible for failing to comply with the law or proper administrative procedures.

Second, the bill requires all newly established Federal agencies to consult with the Comptroller General concerning the proper accounting principles and procedures prior to the dispersing

of any moneys. Third, it requires the suspension of funds to all agencies whose accounting systems remain unapproved 2 years after the passage of the bill, including agencies yet to be established. Finally, the legislation requires that each agency reprimanded by the GAO file with the Bureau of the Budget a statement of the corrective action taken to prevent recurring waste.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of administrative inefficiency are apparent, and I urge my colleagues who share this overriding interest in developing an ef-

fective Government and saving taxpayers' dollars, to actively pursue constructive action. This problem demands our immediate attention. The table that follows identifies several specific agencies, the status of their accounting system, the type of maladministration reported, and the number of years such waste has persisted.

Many authorization and appropriation measures are yet to come before us. I hope the facts pointed out in this table will be noted as the House considers each department and agency involved.

Table of inefficiency and mismanagement compiled from GAO annual reports ¹

Department or agency	Status of accounting system ²	Inefficiency and mismanagement	Fiscal year			
			1966	1965	1964	1963
Department of Agriculture: Stabilization and Conservation Service and Commodity Credit Corporation.	Unapproved	Slack contract policies and practices. Unsatisfactory utilization of storage facilities.	X			
Soil Conservation Service.	do	Unnecessary procurement.	X	X	X	X
Department of Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads.	do	Deficiencies in design, acquisition, and contract practices. Inadequate financial reporting procedures.	X	X	X	X
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of the Secretary.	do	Inefficient records and property management.	X			
Public Health Service.	do	Inadequate inventory controls. Unnecessary procurement.	X		X	X
Department of Housing and Urban Development: Public Housing Administration.	do	Excessive cost.	X			
Urban renewal.	do	Unexact budgeting procedures.	X			
Department of Interior: Bureau of Indian Affairs.	Approved Jan. 27, 1953.	Questionable use of appropriations.	X			X
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Unapproved	Unauthorized use of appropriations.	X			
Department of Labor: Bureau of Employment Security.	do	Uneconomical use of funds.	X	X	X	X
Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training.	do	Unconstrained duplication.	X			
Post Office Department.	do	Excessive cost.	X	X		
Federal Aviation Agency.	Partial	Inefficient manpower utilization. Unprofitable employment of automated data processing equipment.	X	X	X	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Unapproved	Excessive cost. Unsatisfactory utilization of supplies.	X	X	X	
U.S. Information Agency.	do	Unprofitable acquisition or employment of automated data processing equipment.	X	X	X	X
Interagency Food for Peace.	do	Questionable use of appropriations.	X			
Department of Defense.	do	Questionable utilization of supplies. Excessive cost. Inadequate inventory controls.	X	X	X	X
		Inefficient procurement practices.	X	X	X	X
		Unsatisfactory maintenance.	X	X	X	X
		Inefficient manpower utilization.	X	X	X	X
		Slack contract policies.	X	X	X	X
		Unconstrained duplication.	X	X	X	X

¹ Table compiled from Comptroller General of the United States Annual Report 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 by Congressman Jackson E. Betts.

² Status of accounting systems taken from U.S. General Accounting Office Cumulative Summary, Mar. 31, 1967.

OUR HERITAGE: ARE WE REPUDIATING IT?—SERMON BY DR. V. W. SEARS

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, members of the congregation of the First Baptist Church in Annandale, Va., remarked to me that their pastor, Dr. V. W. Sears, had delivered an excellent sermon at their annual patriotic service on July 2, 1967.

While I was not fortunate enough to hear Dr. Sears on that occasion, I have been given a copy of his sermon, and

I believe the thoughts he has presented are worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Sears' sermon in full at this point in the RECORD.

OUR HERITAGE: ARE WE REPUDIATING IT? "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."—Prov. 14:34

I. A REPUDIATED HERITAGE

In the plan and purpose of God for the nations of the earth, it has never been God's purpose to destroy any nation just to get it out of the way. It is not God's way to inflict undeserved punishment on a nation. This is made clear in the experience of Jonah and Nineveh.

Many a nation has ascended the heights of glory, fame and world power only to go into destruction and oblivion not because of God's capricious vengeance but because of their wilful choice to disobey God.—Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Palestine, the Hittite kingdom, Greece, Rome, The Saracens, the kingdom of

Ghenghis Kahn, Germany. These nations chose not to fulfill their God-appointed destiny when their opportunity came to their place on the human scene. So, they were discarded.

Having received a heritage which included and involved a great opportunity to make a contribution to the world they chose to throw it away.

The Jews are the classic example of this. Look at what a heritage they had: (Romans 9:1-5)

Their name—Israel, prince of God.

The Sonship—"Israel is my firstborn."

The glory—God manifested his presence to them as to no other people.

The covenants—beginning with Abraham and renewed with his descendants.

The divine legislation—the law that God revealed through them for all people. A law that became the bed rock of our Bible.

The worship of God—represented in the Temple. They were chosen to be taught first how to worship the one true God.

The promises—which laid the foundation of all man's faith and hope.

The patriarchs—an ancestry of men who had demonstrated an indomitable faith in God, who through faith and obedience had claimed the promises of God performing unbelievable deeds of all kinds.

The Christ—theirs, too, was the Savior, as far as human descent goes. God chose them through whom He would give the Savior to the world.

And what did they do? They threw it all away. Today, they are still trying to get it back.

II. OUR MATERIAL HERITAGE

What about our heritage?

It is not possible to divide up our national life into neat little packages: this is material, this is social, this is intellectual, etc. These things all go together and all affect each other.

But, for illustration, think about our material possessions. We have an abundance and a standard of living unequalled in history.

But, 180 years ago—

Things were different.

We were a "have not" nation. We were far behind Europe in industrial development—no roads, no cities, no schools, no ships, no railroads, in fact not much of anything except bare hands and raw materials—and a dream!

Today

With 7% of the world's people and 6% of the land we have accumulated 50% of the world's produced wealth.

You think some other country is better, more ideal, treating its people better?

Where would you go?

To England? Your pay check would be cut 50%!

To France? It would be cut to 1/3 its present size!

To Russia? You would make only 22% as much!

To Italy? 18%!

Anywhere else. It would be the same, or worse.

Why?

Because the four great laws of abundance have been allowed to operate for all the people in our country as nowhere else in the world not only today but in history.

These laws are:

(1) *The Law of productivity.*

Men can have what men produce. They can't have what they don't produce.

Money is not wealth. It is the standard by which we measure each person's productivity.

A man who can lay twice as many bricks, hoe twice as many rows of corn, perform twice as good an operation can be paid twice as much without it being more costly.

(2) *The Law of Enterprise.*

We produce faster because we have in-

vented, accumulated, and organized machinery better than any other nation.

We did this because of free enterprise. With so many people free to work constantly in any and every project, some one of them is always improving on what has been done, no matter who did it and how permanent it was thought to be, and is willing to risk whatever is necessary to put his improvement into effect.

(3) *The Law of Incentive.*

Man is constantly seeking ways to satisfy his needs and desires with the least effort possible.

When a man feels he can improve something and is free to try, he has an incentive to do just that. And, he does it.

A free enterpriser is a young man going to night school to train himself to do a better job, (most won't go to night school.)

A lawyer moving to another locality to enlarge his practice. (Most won't risk moving. They want to stay where they are, where things are familiar and where they feel safe and secure.)

An inventor like Alexander Graham Bell and his telephone,

Ellas Howe and his sewing machine,

Or Wilbur and Orville Wright and their flying machine. (Most people won't try anything new.)

(4) *The Law of Competition.*

Active competition keeps things in balance. It works by supply and demand. Economics planned and operated by government decree have always failed.

Up to now we still have free competition in our country with the government acting as a sort of referee.

The operation of these laws have made our country what it is insofar as providing material possessions and wealth.

We have had, and still have, problems—unemployment, poverty, inequities of many kinds. But we have less of these than any other country. And the operation of these laws is what is still attracting other people to our shores by the millions.

As William Benton, Vice Chairman, Board of Trustees, Committee for Economic Revolt put it:

"We in America have always had a dream. We have never lost it. We have it now. With the enterprise, initiative, and good will of men urged on to the common good, we can make the dream come alive—not in a millennium but in America of the approaching tomorrow."

III. THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT

These laws we have been talking about were not thought up, worked out, codified, and then put into operation. They rather grew out of experience. They are the result, I believe, of the influence of the Christian Gospel. This influence at long last was able to be given full play in a new and independent nation made up of people of many other nations.

Somehow in the good pleasure of God the course of Christianity was turned Westward from Palestine through Asia Minor, Greece, Europe, England and finally to America.

The Gospel came to our shores in some people we call Puritans.

We are apt to remember these Puritans only as stern moralists, wearing rough homespun clothes, women in bonnets and long dresses, men in broad brimmed hats and buckled shoes, all going to church with a Bible in one hand and a gun in the other.

But we need to take a closer look at these folks. They have had a tremendous influence on our country—in religion yes, but in politics and in economics as well. They exerted a powerful influence on the embryonic American mind. Their influence on the social and political philosophy of the developing nation was far out of proportion to their numbers.

Who were these folks?

Protestants who struggled for moral reform

in the churches. Who tried to find the "pristine purity" of religion.

They were characterized by strictness of living, by simplicity of worship, and by unrelenting opposition to immorality.

They were a people with an idea and an ideal.

An ideal of a godly man in a righteous community.

An ideal of a free church in a free and Christian state.

A strong moral ideal which they tried to put into effect in their own day.

For example:

Henry David Thoreau was put in jail for refusing to pay poll tax in Massachusetts because the state would not declare itself against slavery. Ralph Waldo Emerson came to see him, and said, "What are you doing in there?" Thoreau answered, "What are you doing out there?"

The Puritans were characterized by a strong moral earnestness. Morals were deadly serious with them—more so than art or business or athletics or anything else including individual rights.

They had much of the Hebrew moral seriousness and so made more use of the Old Testament than the New Testament.

They had a rigoristic interpretation of ethics and tried to express it in legislation. (This was their key weakness.)

There is much rigor in Christianity. There is no legislation. Moral rigor and legislation have a relationship but they are not identical.

Then, they emphasized the economic virtues: *Work and thriftiness.*

And with all this these Puritans had a regard for truth unsurpassed in our history. These people had a great influence on the developing democracy of our country.

They injected the quality of Christian religion into our national life, a quality that has done more than any other one thing to determine our nation's character and made it possible for our nation to be unique among all the nations of the earth.

IV. THE PRESENT SITUATION

And now, we find ourselves here today with a heritage unequalled in the annals of time.

We are faced with problems no nation has ever faced before.

We have an unparalleled opportunity, as history goes, to do things for the world.

However, we can see our legacy being eroded before our very eyes.

Some strange things are going on:

It's getting stylish in all too many circles to extol the virtues of other countries, other societies, and other ideologies at the expense of our own.

The patriotic citizen who loves his country, who is thrilled by the sight of the flag, who enthusiastically sings the national anthem, is often ridiculed.

Crime is increasing at an alarming rate, encouraged in no small measure by the courts and those in authority, so that every excuse is made for the criminal at the expense of the law abiding citizen. The policeman has to stand by and watch his country's flag desecrated and has to step in and protect the flag of a foreign nation from the same treatment—even when our sons are being killed by that country.

Criminal after criminal is released on the sheerest technicality to repeat offenses including robbery, rape, murder; with men professing to be dedicated to law and justice blaming everything and everybody under the sun for the unlawful act except the person deliberately responsible, and that in the name of doing good, helping the poor, acquiring certain rights, it is perfectly all right to destroy property of others, to break laws, to riot, to wreak vengeance on innocent people, to do wrong and make all sorts of claims because of real or imagined wrongs of past generations.

Teenage law breakers are so overly protected and sheltered from any responsibility for their deeds that they have developed an almost total disregard for the rights and property of others, and they are rapidly growing up into adult law breakers.

We are living in a time when almost everyone, high and low, is loudly proclaiming that everyone has a right to everything he desires, as Dr. Walter Courtenay says, "everyone thinks he has a right to a good living, a nice job, a fat pay check, a convenient house, a pretty wife, a fast car, a smooth boat, a cabin somewhere on some lake, and an extended vacation," and if someone else doesn't provide all these things for him whether he works or not, he has the added right to go out and take them from the first person he meets.

Actually none of these things are matters of right. They are privileges to be earned.

A few years ago when I heard it said over and over again, "We want our rights and we're going to have them any way we can get them. *We don't care whether anybody likes us or not!*" I made a prophecy that somebody was going to wake up with a lot of rights and was going to find out he had won a hollow victory.

There is something in us that hungers for the respect and good will of our fellow men. But when I *force* my fellowman in anyway to give me a place, to *make* him *defer* to me, to *force* him to *bow* to me, even to *make* him share with me, and then look in his eyes and see how he really feels about me and thinks about me, (that though I could make him do these things—he still has a low regard for me as a person.) I find I still don't have very much.

And then, when I heard a high government official say to a nation-wide television audience, "We have got to have *everybody* respecting *everybody*. We're going to *make everybody* love *everybody*."

Then, I knew a movement had failed.

For we are living in a time when almost nobody is saying anything about personal responsibility. We blame everything and everybody but ourselves.

We are living in a time of self-styled and self-proclaimed non-conformists. People are striking out and rebelling against any kind of constituted authority.

I quote Dr. Courtenay again.

"Non-conformity is on the increase . . . men seek to liberate themselves from con-

ventions . . . They claim they are striving to be original, to be honest with themselves, to turn their backs on hypocrisy and the artificiality of the older generation. But all that has happened is that they have slipped from one level of life, where they have refused to conform, to another level of life where they are perfectly happy to conform. *To belong demands conforming.* The only thing you can choose is *the level* on which you want it to occur. Today we have the *long-haired* ones, the *strangely garbed*, *gaited*, and *vocabularyized*, the rebels against conformity who, when all is said, are our worst conformers . . . I have always known such people. They have always defied conventions, used bad language, and lived errant lives. We used to call them bums, hobos, and drifters. Now we invite them to address university audiences."

We are living in a time when the basic principles that made us are being shunted aside. We live beyond our means and neglect to pay our honest debts both individually and nationally.

A man cannot apply himself fully and make of himself what he can. He cannot reap the reward of working with his own hands. He is controlled and limited by law, by unions, by government.

There is an effort to tell him where he can live, what and how much he can do, and how much he can make.

We are hearing much about a guaranteed minimum wage whether it is earned or not. Next will be a maximum wage over which you cannot rise. (We already have some of this.)

Incentive, enterprise, diligence, thriftiness, honest work for honest pay and honest pay for honest work have gone out of style.

America, our land, has grown great and can become greater. Has done more for the world at large than any other nation in all of history and can do more.

How has it been done? This is the way.

Faith in God was a vital force in the rise of American civilization.

This religious faith remains a powerful factor in American culture, but we have drifted far in the direction of a secular interpretation of life and duty.

It is time for us to hear again the ringing message of the Bible with its moral demands. It is time for Christian teachers and preachers to call our nation back to the living God who is Creator, Redeemer, and Judge.

We need to recover the Pilgrims' passion

for freedom and the Puritans' regard for truth.

When we and our nation turn to the Lord we will then, and only then, try "to search out all the evils in the world . . . and to drive out iniquity from the earth." (Chas. G. Finney.)

Then we shall receive forgiveness and healing from God.

Our nation will come into its full heritage and exercise moral leadership in the life of the world.

Our God never fails. When we meet his conditions, He will be with us as light to guide us, as power to sustain us, and as a companion on the way.

May the God who gave us our nation help us to love, honor, and respect her, to rise up in His name and make her what she ought to be—

A blessed nation whose God is the Lord.

ADDITIONAL COMPARISON BETWEEN THE THIRD NATIONAL HOME OWNERSHIP FOUNDATION ACT AND THE 221(H) PROGRAM

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a comparison I placed in the RECORD last Monday between the National Home Ownership Foundation Act and the 221(h) program did not include the last page, or last six points of comparison. Precisely why this last page was left out I do not know, but I am submitting for the RECORD today the full 21-point comparison between the two programs. My introductory remarks of July 10 will not be reflected here. They can be found on pages 8217-8218 of the July 10 RECORD.

The comparison follows:

COMPARISON BETWEEN 221(h) AND NATIONAL HOME OWNERSHIP FOUNDATION

	221 (h)	NHOF
1. Philosophy of Government.	Government as regulator of lending activity and construction; private sector as participant only.	Government as guarantor of private institution; private sector as major initiator and developer.
2. Organization and control.	FHA program, under HUD. Nonprofit organization at neighborhood level.	No FHA, HUD control, private nonprofit national corporation chartered by Congress. Neighborhood nonprofit corporations, co-ops, limited dividend corporations.
3. Interest rate on mortgage.	Three percent, same as 221(d)(3) below market rate.	Market interest rate.
4. Interest rate to purchaser of equity ownership.	Three percent.	Could range from market interest rate to substantially lower figure as determined by formula in law, and allocated by Foundation (at present as low as 2¼ percent).
5. Resale of mortgage in secondary mortgage market.	No resale. Below-market-rate interest required purchase by FNMA in its special assistance operations.	Conventional secondary mortgage market; resale possible without dependence on FNMA.
6. Source of mortgage funds.	Dependent on FNMA willingness to purchase any mortgage made under program. Otherwise private lending institutions will not lend with below market rate.	Sale of \$2 billion in guaranteed bonds at market rates. Private capital.
7. Cost to taxpayers.	Money or FNMA to buy 3 percent mortgages must be borrowed by Treasury at higher market rates. Difference is subsidy. If FNMA then pools mortgages and sells participation certificates in pool, the difference between the 3 percent mortgage return	Where necessary, difference between interest rate paid to mortgage holder by home buyer and rate due holder from mortgage is met by Treasury. \$10 million first year; \$30 million second year; to \$60 million maximum authorization annually, third year.

COMPARISON BETWEEN 221(h) AND NATIONAL HOME OWNERSHIP FOUNDATION—Continued

	221 (h)	NHOF
	to FNMA and market rate on the PC must be made up by Treasury subsidy.	
8. Recoverability of subsidy.	None.	Interest subsidy paid back by home buyer when his income reaches moderate income levels, or when he sells equity at taxable profit.
9. Supporting services to local nonprofit groups and to the prospective home buyer.	None provided in law. Requirements added in regulations.	Supporting technical, planning, job training, budget counseling, etc. services required in law.
10. Neighborhood involvement.	Local nonprofit corporation may be neighborhood oriented, but nothing required in law.	First chance for homes and employment opportunities must be for neighborhood residents. Local nonprofit corporation, cooperative, etc., must have neighborhood involvement.
11. "Sweat equity" and downpayment.	Provides for volunteer work by potential homeowner with value of labor reflected in lower mortgage figure for unit. This does not take place of minimum FHA downpayment of \$200. Units can be rented with credit toward downpayment on rent with option to purchase plan.	Allows for "sweat equity" labor to cut down on cost of owning home to borrower in form of larger downpayment. Downpayment or equivalent to be set by Foundation.
12. Income levels served.	Limited to those who can be served by rent supplement program, which in turn is defined as public level incomes.	Mortgage money available to anyone unable to afford and obtain conventional financing who shows capability of becoming a homeowner. Would cover both public housing income levels and level immediately above that level where shortage of housing and mortgage funds also exists.
13. Type of housing assisted.	Limited to single family detached, semi-detached, or row housing.	Includes single family detached, semi-detached, row housing; also multifamily co-operatives and condominiums in recognition of core city type of housing supply.
14. Rehabilitation and new construction.	Limited to rehabilitation.	Applies to both rehabilitated and new construction housing.
15. Tie in with local government.	No direct tie-in with local government required in law.	Requires consultation with Federal, State and local public agencies; requires the Foundation to use existing public agency programs as much as possible; coadjutant (shared risk) loans with public agencies; "local nonprofit housing association" defined to include public agency; direct tie-in with urban renewal projects and acquisition of urban renewal land.
16. Return to investors.	No return on below-market-interest rate mortgage, which is immediately turned over to FNMA. Possible indirect return if loans commingled with others and participation certificates are sold by FNMA to investors. The difference between the below-market interest rate return on the mortgage to FNMA, and what FNMA must pay to sell PCs must be made up by a Treasury subsidy.	Market yield return to investors in \$2 billion worth of Foundation bonds. Return to those who buy market interest rate mortgages from Foundation. Return to those who invest through co-adjuvant loan agreements. Return to those who lend in area because of supporting services and neighborhood organization developed under Foundation program.
17. Scope of program.	Total authorization is \$20 million for FNMA to buy mortgages. Using an average cost of \$10,000 per unit, this would produce a total of 2,000 units. (If budget item was increased to equal the \$60 million NHOF authorization, it would produce 6,000 units, or 33 times less.)	Total mortgage funds would be \$2 billion. Using \$10,000 average cost per unit and an average interest subsidy of 3 percent, the mortgage funds supplied and the \$60 million in recoverable interest subsidy would produce a minimum of 200,000 units.
18. Stimulus to private lending in project neighborhoods for rehabilitation and home buying.	Compare scope of program as outlined in No. 17 above.	
19. Profitability to private enterprise (Home building, construction and remodeling firms, building materials, suppliers, architects, etc.).	Compare scope of program as outlined in No. 17 above.	
20. Mortgage payment insurance where loss of income is due to no fault of borrower (i.e. death, illness, layoff, etc.).	None provided for in law. Presidential study under consideration for developing Federal insurance program.	Foundation required, within a year, to develop program in conjunction with private insurance companies, or report suitable alternative to Congress. Industry study now underway.
21. Job opportunities of a permanent nature in the rehabilitation and construction trades.	Compare scope of program as outlined in No. 17 above.	

TAX EQUITY PLUS MERGER EQUALS IMPROVED COMMUTER RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty of improving commuter rail trans-

portation service in our major metropolitan areas continues to be one of our most troublesome public problems. This is especially true of the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, an important part of which I am privileged to represent. Should existing rail service be weakened or abandoned, an intolerable transportation emergency would result.

While there is no single solution to the railroad problem in general, or commuter rail transportation in particular, one of the most hopeful developments is the current effort to arrange the merger of the several independent eastern railroads into three major systems which could provide the stability and the potential for improvement which is so badly needed.

One of the principal roadblocks to merger, however, is the unwillingness of the larger railroads to accept as merger partners a number of smaller, debt-ridden carriers such as the Erie-Lackawanna and the Central of New Jersey, both of which are essential to the maintenance of commuter rail service in the New York-New Jersey area. This reluctance stems in large part from the fact that our tax laws now discriminate against the smaller carriers in the sense that they do not provide for a carryover of net operating losses to a new parent corporation when the carrier is significantly smaller than the system with which it merges. Under present law, therefore, the carriers and the people they serve who are most in need of assistance are left unaided and threatened with extinction.

To remedy this situation and remove the present discrimination, Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], and eight other members of the New Jersey congressional delegation in introducing legislation which would provide for the extension of the present system of net operating loss carryovers to even the smallest loss railroad corporations in the event of a merger with a larger railroad corporation.

In doing so, I must state that I shall condition my continuing support of the legislation on the willingness of the merged systems to maintain and improve the commuter rail service now provided by their smaller potential partners. Only in this way, I believe, will the costs of the legislation be justifiable. I am encouraged, however, by the fact that the Norfolk and Western System indicated 2 years ago that it would invest \$53 million in capital improvements on the Erie-Lackawanna, the Central of New Jersey, and the two other small carriers if a merger under the proposed tax revisions took place.

The objectives of our bill, Mr. Speaker, have been endorsed by the carriers themselves, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the New Jersey Department of Transportation. I am hopeful that the Committee on Ways and Means will give early and favorable consideration to this extremely important legislation.

FLORIDA POLLUTION CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, There is increasing concern across the length and breadth of the Nation over the quality of the environment. Pollution of our waters and the air have in many cases reached the point where citizens have demanded action. So strong and persistent are these demands that I would characterize this as an era of environmental reform, a reform which will be as sweeping as some of the periods of social reform which have occurred in the past.

The tremendous costs associated with restoring environmental quality have tended to concentrate improvement efforts at the Federal level. I submit, however, that the entire task cannot be carried out solely as a Federal venture. In demonstration of the constructive role that can be carried out by the States I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a news item in the Wall Street Journal of July 14, 1967. The article briefly describes recent action by the Florida Legislature to control air and water pollution which was described by Federal Health, Education, and Welfare Department officials as "model legislation."

The article follows:

FLORIDA LEGISLATURE ADOPTS TOUGH ANTIPOLLUTION LAWS

TALLAHASSEE, Fla.—The Florida legislature has adopted stringent air and water pollution measures described by Federal Health, Education and Welfare Department officials as "model legislation."

The legislation establishes an antipollution agency, which will be headed by the governor, two members he shall appoint, the secretary of state, attorney general and commissioner of agriculture.

The legislation provides for the agency's right of immediate access to plants engaged in operations that might pollute the air or water and gives the agency the power of injunctions in the case of emergencies. The agency also will issue construction permits. The agency will have the power to fine a company or revoke its permit to operate if, after administrative hearings, the concern is found guilty of violating the statutes.

THE CURRENT RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of American servicemen are putting their lives in danger serving on the Vietnam fronts in support of the administration's foreign policy. They are dependent upon the continuous supply of the tools of war coming from all sections of this country.

Their very lives and the success of our efforts in Vietnam have been jeopardized

by the present railway strike. Nationally, our economy has been seriously imperiled by this action.

This strike was called by the irresponsible action of one man—Mr. Roy Siemiller, president of the Machinists Union which took the lead in repudiating its pledge to attend upon our deliberations—and thus precipitated the current work stoppage. Chairman HARLEY STAGGERS, of the House-Senate conferees had but asked them to wait until 3 p.m., on this Monday so that his committee may take conclusive action on the problem.

I do not accuse the membership of the unions involved or most of their officers of this lack of responsibility to the welfare of our Nation.

I believe that the action is directly attributable to the political machinations of Mr. Siemiller. It will be remembered that Mr. Siemiller demonstrated his inability to provide his membership with effective leadership during the airline strike which occurred during the last Congress. Certainly all must agree that his actions unnecessarily prolonged that work stoppage. Once more in the present situation, he demonstrates his incapability.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot afford such irresponsibility with its possible disastrous effects. The well-being of our fighting forces and our national economy is at stake. I am firm in my belief and hope that the responsible people involved in this problem will consider this problem as one affecting our whole Nation and permit the continuing of our transportation until we can, in due and calm deliberations, find an equitable solution.

FRANCE—A MAJOR POWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable in certain quarters to deprecate the efforts of France to play a major role in international politics. Many critics of President De Gaulle deny any possibility of a significant role for the French nation because it lacks the necessary elements of a major power.

However, contemporary events clearly show that France has a major impact on the world stage. France is now the only non-Communist nuclear power on the European Continent; in 1963 it vetoed Britain's bid for entry into the Common Market; in 1964 diplomatic relations were established with Peking; President De Gaulle's personal tours of Latin America, Southeast Asia, and the Soviet Union have had significant impact. Without going into the merits of any specific policy of the French Government, I believe the record clearly shows that France is a major power not only in Europe, but in the rest of the world also.

In order to outline and detail those elements which make France one of the major powers I will discuss today its outer space program, foreign aid efforts, and military capability. In the preparation of this material I want to acknowledge the able assistance of Roselyn R. Wahner, analyst in Western European affairs for the Legislative Reference Service.

ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER

Although France played a diminished role in international relations after World War II, under President Charles de Gaulle, it has become a more influential factor in world politics. Though overshadowed in strength and size by the United States and the Soviet Union, France has regained a leading position in Western Europe. Moreover, despite the loss of its colonial empire, France continues to possess great influence in former French Africa through its economic and educational aid.¹

Under De Gaulle, France has given evidence that many varying factors can constitute major power status, factors ranging from geography and number of people to leadership and diplomatic skill, degree of technological advancement, and cultural heritage. Thus, such circumstances as a comparatively small population, small area, and scarceness of natural resources may be compensated for by the quality of leadership, scientific achievements, and military capability.

France, for example, is a nation of only 50 million people, compared with 59 million West Germans, 54½ million British, 195 million Americans, and over 720 million Chinese. It encompasses an area of only 212,659 square miles, significantly less than that of the United States, the Soviet Union, and China. Yet France today may be classified as a major power. She has developed a strategic nuclear force, without significant American assistance; was the third country to launch a space satellite on its own; and ranks among the foremost aid dispensers in the world.

Under the leadership of Charles de Gaulle, whose prime aim is to place France in the first ranks of the world's nations, France has divested itself of colonial liabilities; has adopted an independent status within the West which has won France some influence in the third world; has steadily championed Europe—on Gaullist terms—founded on the conviction that Europe can only be built by defining its interest distinct from—but not necessarily opposed to—U.S. interests; has promoted French-German reconciliation; and has engaged in diplomatic initiatives which have impressed other nations with the realization that France cannot be ignored. Moreover, De Gaulle has pursued his ideas of realism in international relations; for example, the recognition of the People's Republic of China on January 27, 1964, and the advocacy of neutralization of Southeast Asia in 1964.

Like his predecessors, De Gaulle is determined to make the most of France's favorable strategic position in Europe and of her "cultural radiance" in the world. He has consistently pursued his vision of France as one of the world's great powers. As he declared on the opening page of volume I of "Memoires de Guerre":

The positive side of my mind convinces me that France is not really herself except in the front ranks, that only vast undertakings are capable of offsetting the disintegrating

elements of her people. In short, France cannot be France without greatness.²

And, again, in Bordeaux in April 1961, he gave his conception of his country's role:

France must fulfill her mission as a world power. We are everywhere in the world. There is no corner of the earth, where, at a given time, men do not look to us and ask what France says. It is a great responsibility to be France, the humanizing power *par excellence*.³

I. THE FRENCH FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

France's foreign aid program is a virtual necessity for France if the goals assigned to his nation by President de Gaulle are to be fulfilled. High on the list of the French President's list of aims is substitution of French influence for the direct control which France once exercised as a colonial power. Although the empire is now gone, President de Gaulle continues to believe that France's civilizing missions should continue, including the choice by millions of citizens of the developing nations of French culture and language as their own. As one of De Gaulle's ministers, M. Foyer, declared of French foreign assistance policy:

*Flow of financial resources from developed OECD member countries and Australia to less developed countries, 1960-65*⁴

	United States	France	United Kingdom	Germany	Japan	Other developed OECD
Net official flow (million U.S. dollars).....	19,596	5,609	2,893	2,586	1,357	3,764
Private flows (million U.S. dollars).....	6,301	2,158	1,738	774	574	2,546
Total (million U.S. dollars).....	25,897	7,767	4,631	3,360	1,931	6,310
Percent share in total financial flows.....	52	16	9	7	4	12
Financial flows as percent of national income.....	0.9	2.2	1.1	0.8	0.6	0.7

From 1956 to 1964 the annual volume of French aid to developing countries generally averaged well over \$800 million. Her level of aid has been consistently about double that of either the United Kingdom or West Germany—both of which increased their aid programs significantly in the 1960's. From 1956 to

1965, French total—net—official aid reached \$8,391.9 million, compared with Britain's \$3,764.5 million and Germany's \$3,743.3 million. The chart below shows the amount of aid extended to the underdeveloped nation's from 1956 to 1965 by the members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development:

*The flow of official financial resources to less developed countries and multilateral agencies, 1956-65*⁵

In millions of U.S. dollars]

Country	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Australia*	39	47	47	57	66	72.9	84.5	96.4	106.8	120.7
Austria	—	—	2	7	—	2.2	13.8	2.1	14.6	33.9
Belgium	20	20	23	79	101	92.1	79.8	89.9	81.7	119.2
Canada	30	48	91	60	75	61.5	54.4	98.0	127.7	120.0
Denmark	3	2	5	13	6	8.1	7.4	9.7	10.6	13.3
France	647	819	884	835	848	943.3	977.0	850.7	831.2	756.7
Germany	161	297	278	325	343	615.3	449.8	424.2	442.9	427.1
Italy	43	164	73	84	110	85.3	110.1	110.2	54.1	93.4
Japan**	96	92	285	150	98	108.5	88.0	140.4	115.7	243.8
Netherlands	48	23	40	49	47	69.3	90.8	37.8	48.4	60.0
Norway	8	9	—	5	10	9.0	6.9	20.6	17.1	12.0
Portugal	3	2	1	17	37	43.8	40.8	51.1	61.9	21.4
Sweden	3	12	4	18	7	8.4	18.5	22.9	32.8	38.9
United Kingdom	205	234	276	377	407	456.8	421.0	414.5	493.4	479.8
United States	2,006	2,091	2,410	2,322	2,834	3,530.0	3,671.0	3,755.0	3,462.6	3,730.4
Total, DAC countries	3,312	3,859	4,419	4,398	4,989	6,106.5	6,113.8	6,123.5	5,881.5	6,270.6

*Figures shown for the years 1956-64 are gross flows on a fiscal year basis.

**Figures for Japan for the years 1956-59 are still on an unrevised basis and are not comparable to the figures of the following years.

² Charles de Gaulle, *L'appel*, volume 1 of *Memoires de guerre* (Paris, Plon, 1954), p. 1.

³ Cited in Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, "Changes in French Foreign Policy since 1945," in Center for International Affairs of Harvard University, *In Search of France* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 352.

⁴ Cited in Alexander Werth, *De Gaulle: A*

Political Biography (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965), p. 342.

⁵ Including Export Credits publicly guaranteed in donor countries. Source of chart: "The Geographical Distribution of Financial Flows to Less-Developed Countries," *OECD Observer*, February 1967, pp. 28-29.

⁶ Willard L. Thorp, "Development Assistance Efforts and Policies of the Members of

¹ See, Gwendolyn M. Carter and John H. Herz, *Major Foreign Powers*, fifth edition (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1967), pp. 329-335.

A. FRENCH BILATERAL AID

By far the greatest proportion of French foreign assistance, or approximately 97 to 98 percent, is extended on a bilateral basis. The most significant trends in French aid-giving during the past few years have been the endeavor to broaden the geographic distribution of aid, to augment expenditures for technical programs, and to increase loans as opposed to grants.

In 1963, no less than 94 percent of bilateral disbursements of French assistance went to franc-area countries.⁷ This allocation of the greater part of aid to franc-area countries was the result of long-standing economic, monetary, cultural, and other ties between France and these countries. Moreover, the remaining 6 percent included some countries with which France had had at some time a special relationship; for example, the countries of the former Indochina.

By 1964, however, France was beginning to expand its foreign aid program to other countries. During that year President de Gaulle took two tours of Latin America, to Mexico in April and to 10 South American republics in the fall. Throughout his Latin American travels the French President emphasized Latin cultural unity, foreign aid without political strings, opposition to any hegemony, economic diversification and industrialization of developing countries, and the stabilization of prices for primary commodities. As a result of his tour and of overtures to other developing nations, the French in 1964 extended 26.9 percent of their public bilateral aid to countries outside the franc area. That percentage rose to 29.8 in 1965.⁸

This trend toward geographical diversity reflects De Gaulle's grand design in foreign policy—to extend French influence and prestige beyond the frontiers of the former empire to embrace all three underdeveloped continents. And according to one observer, this new policy represents also a reassurance against possible political disappointments in French Africa, and helps in diversifying French exports; the extension of credits to such underdeveloped countries, which have a greater capacity than French sub-Saharan Africa to absorb industrial imports, would provide a stimulus for French industrial production.⁹

the Development Assistance Committee, 1966 Review," (Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, September 1966), p. 148.

⁷ Franc Area countries include, in Europe, besides Metropolitan France, Corsica and Monaco; in Africa: Algeria, Cameroun, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoro Islands, Congo, Dahomey, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mauritius, Niger, Reunion Island, Senegal, Togo, Upper Volta; in America: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, St. Pierre and Miquelon; in Asia and Oceania: French Polynesia, New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Mali, Morocco and Tunisia have special arrangements with the Franc Area.

⁸ Ambassade de France, "French Economic and Financial Aid to the Developing Countries," *French Affairs*, No. 197, September 1966, p. 3.

⁹ W. W. Kulski, *De Gaulle and the World: The Foreign Policy of the Fifth Republic* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1966), p. 356.

Another recent trend in French aid-giving is the significant increase in the proportion of aid devoted to technical assistance. For example, technical co-operation as a percentage of official bilateral net contributions has increased from about 21 percent in 1961, to 36.3 percent in 1963, to 47.2 percent in 1965.¹⁰ This trend toward increasing technical aid apparently reflects the view that training and cultural investments may often prove more important than financial assistance. As Maurice Couve de Murville, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, stated on April 28, 1964:

Training of men is the true, the only means of putting the underdeveloped countries in a position to carry out the main body of the task themselves, as is indispensable, since everything in the final analysis depends for each of these countries on the individual effort that it will be able to make. . . . I personally think that, in accord with our spirit and within our means, it is above all the training of men that should be stressed. . . . This means a much greater increase in our technical aid.¹¹

As an illustration of the size of the technical assistance effort, in 1965 over 43,529 Frenchmen were serving abroad in the technical assistance program. Of these, 29,235 were teachers, 10,016 were operational personnel, 3,939 were advisers, and 339 were volunteers. During that year the French also awarded 12,429 fellowships to foreign students and trainees, either for training in their own countries or to enter research centers, institutions of technology, industrial plants, or businesses in France.¹²

Another trend in French bilateral aid efforts is an increase in the number of loans as opposed to grants; however, French grants still constitute the greatest proportion of assistance. In 1963, 85 percent of French official bilateral aid was in the form of grants, 15 percent in the form of loans. Total French loans increased from \$143 million in 1963 to \$214 million in 1964. Although grants fell from \$678 million in 1963 to \$645 million in 1964, they still accounted for approximately 80 percent of aid in 1965.¹³

The French quest for prestige through aid-giving efforts to the developing nations, strengthened by the end of the Algerian war, by the Fifth Republic's policy of pluralism within the East-West confrontation, and by its liberal attitude toward the internal regimes of the "third world," has scored successes. Alfred Grosser, a French analyst of French foreign policy, has written that:

Prestige may certainly be credited to the positive side of the balance sheet in that French diplomacy receives much greater consideration in the "third world" than it did in 1958.¹⁴

B. FRENCH MULTILATERAL AID

President de Gaulle proceeds from the fundamental belief that the world is composed of sovereign states, the prime actors

on the world scene. Consequent with his overriding belief in the ascendancy of the sovereign state are his distrust of and lack of strong support for such international organizations as the United Nations. Thus, although France participates in the multilateral aid programs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, its contributions have consistently been small, representing only a few percentage points of France's total aid effort; that is, about 2 percent in 1964. In 1965, French financial participation rose slightly as the result of the doubling of France's contribution to the International Development Association and of increased participation in United Nations technical assistance agencies.¹⁵

In addition to participating in the United Nations aid programs, France contributes to the European Development Fund, the instrument created for cooperation between the members of the European Economic Community and the dependencies of the member states. The dependencies that have gained independence since establishment of the EEC and its Fund in 1958 have chosen to become associated states of the EEC, thereby continuing to receive assistance from the Fund. During the first 5 years of the Fund—1958 to 1962—France contributed about \$200 million of the total \$581 million. On December 31, 1962, the Fund was renewed, and plans were made to disburse \$800 million for the next 5-year period. France is contributing 34.4 percent of the \$800 million.¹⁶

In addition to its work in the United Nations and the European Development Fund, France also cooperates in aid efforts within the framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Along with other OECD members France contributes to two consortia—one for aiding Turkey, to which France contributed \$34.6 million for 1963 and 1964; the other for helping India and Pakistan, for which France granted \$20 million for India and \$10 million for Pakistan in 1964.¹⁷

II. THE OUTER SPACE PROGRAM OF FRANCE

France has its own space launch facilities and vehicles together with an advanced satellite program. Her scientists and technicians have proved that French industry and science is capable of producing the components of the standard required for space exploration, and they have largely accomplished this without the aid of any other power. Thus, in the realm of outer space, France ranks as a power capable of applying advanced technology.¹⁸

ORGANIZATION OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

France's space program is a joint military and civilian effort. The main Government agency responsible for the

¹⁵ Ambassade de France, "French Economic and Financial Aid to the Developing Countries," *French Affairs*, No. 197, September 1966, p. 6.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁸ Although Britain, Canada, and Italy have, in addition to the United States and the Soviet Union, placed satellites in orbit, the rocket launchers have in all cases been American. *Keating's Contemporary Archives*, May 21-28, 1966, p. 21416.

¹⁰ Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

¹¹ Ambassade de France, *French Affairs*, No. 182, p. 2.

¹² Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 153, 155.

¹⁴ Alfred Grosser, *French Foreign Policy Under de Gaulle*, translated by Lois Ames Pattison (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965), p. 130. Italics are Grosser's.

French space program was created on March 1, 1962—the National Center for Space Studies—CNES. Under the Premier and directly responsible to the Minister Delegate in Charge of Scientific Research, Atomic, and Space Affairs, CNES is charged with three main tasks:

To develop and guide scientific and technical aerospace research; to prepare programs and insure their execution,

either in its own establishments or through research contracts; and to follow all questions of international cooperation in conjunction with the Foreign Affairs Ministry.¹⁹

Since its creation CNES has grown rapidly, its budget rising from an original \$8 million to over \$57 million in 1965, and its staff increasing from 15 in 1962, to 391 on December 31, 1964. It receives

its funds in the form of subsidies from the Ministry of Scientific Research, Atomic, and Space Affairs.²⁰

FRENCH SPACE EXPENDITURES, 1964-67

The following chart shows the amount of French expenditures for its outer space program, compared with the rest of the Western European countries:

Western European space expenditures²¹

[In millions of dollars]

	1964			1965			1966			1967		
	National	Esro	Eldo	National	Esro	Eldo	National	Esro	Eldo	National	Esro	Eldo
France.....	46.20	1.00	29.61	40.01	3.36	20.21	45.1	7.40	19.93	71.75	9.38	21.92
West Germany.....	13.80	1.16	27.63	17.50	3.91	18.64	18.00	8.71	18.39	35.0	11.05	22.34
United Kingdom.....	2.00	1.29	48.05	5.20	4.34	32.81	29.4	9.66	32.38	30.7	12.25	22.94
Italy.....		.58	12.1		1.94	8.28		4.32	8.19		5.46	10.18
Netherlands.....	.58	.22	3.35	.68	.74	2.24	.91	1.64	2.21	1.1	2.08	3.81
Belgium.....	.51	.23	3.5	.59	.76	2.42	.75	1.71	2.39	.8	2.17	3.81
Sweden.....	.39	.27		.58	.9		.56	2.0		.8	2.54	
Switzerland.....	.01	.17		.01	.59		.07	1.33		.1	1.68	
Denmark.....	.09	.11		.26	.38		.33	.85		.5	1.09	
Spain.....	.61	.14		1.4	.46		1.8	1.03		1.9	1.31	
Norway.....	.29			.31			.35			.42		

FRANCE'S SPACE SATELLITES AND LAUNCHERS

In its quest to explore outer space, France has launched five satellites, four of which were launched with French launchers. The first French satellite, the A-1, was successfully launched from the Hammaguir firing grounds in the Sahara on November 26, 1965, thereby demonstrating that French engineers and technicians were capable of constructing a satellite launching system. The particular rocket booster tested in this first launch was the French-constructed Diamant launch vehicle. The 88-pound experimental satellite carried onboard radio and radar transmitters. Its mission was to test the 3-stage Diamant launch vehicle, the French network of tracking and telemetry stations, and the French-manufactured equipment on board.

France's second satellite, the FR-1A, was launched by the American-built Scout rocket from the Western Test Range near Vandenberg, Calif., on December 6, 1965. The FR-1A is a French-built scientific satellite developed by the CNES under an agreement with the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The FR-1A was designed to study the propagation of very low-frequency radio waves in various regions of the ionosphere and the earth's magnetosphere, as well as to measure electron densities.²² Among the scientific instruments carried on board were two telemetry transmitters, one continuous and one command, and a telemetry system for tracking. Although its planned lifetime was only 3 months, at the end of 1966, the satellite was still functioning

perfectly.²³ The major significance of the FR-1A was that it proved that French scientists and technicians were capable of designing and constructing a scientific satellite equal to American and Russian satellites.

In February 1966, barely 3 months after the onset of the French launchings into outer space, came the most significant French space achievement. At that time the French successfully launched the D-1A satellite, nicknamed the Diapason. The successful performance of this technological research satellite was a considerable achievement for President de Gaulle's largely independent national space policy. It represented the first all-French scientific satellite launching, and De Gaulle declared the event "a capital success for the whole of French science."

The Diapason carried two transmitters, a telemetry, and a telecommand system. Its function was to perfect a system for a satellite to measure its own course. It was thus followed not only by the classical method of analyzing its signals received by tracking stations but also by several other means—determination of radial velocity and alternations of it by measurements of the Doppler effect, and by observation of the stars. It was designed to test the French network of tracking, telemetry, and ground control stations as well as to check orbital calculation methods.²⁴

The D-1A was launched by a Diamant three-stage launcher from the base at Hammaguir, in the Sahara. The Diamant, France's first satellite launcher, is the final step in the "precious stones" experimental rocket series designed in 1960 as part of the national space program. Its first stage, Emeraude, is a liquid propellant rocket delivering 30 metric tons

of thrust for 93 seconds; the second stage, Topaz, is solid-fueled and delivers a thrust of 15 metric tons for 44 seconds. The first and second stages were tested individually several times in 1964 and 1965. Their combined form, known as Saphir, was successfully fired from Hammaguir in October 1965. The Diamant's solid-fueled third stage, Rubis, has a thrust increasing from 3.7 to 5.3 metric tons in 45 seconds. The entire three-stage rocket is 62 feet high, weighs 18.4 metric tons, and can carry a 175-pound payload.

The D-1A was to be the first in a series of four to test the French components of satellites and launchers. Its performance was so successful, however, that the French decided to bypass the D-1B, a slightly modified version of the D-1A, and to push ahead with D-1C and D-1D.

After these three spectacular successes, however, the French space program underwent a quieter period, during which performances were reviewed and Government circles were consulted on the future course of the program. After a few months of uncertainty, the French Government affirmed that space flight would occupy an important position in the French research effort. This was reflected in the increased budget of the Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales—CNES—in which the proportion designated for research work with rocket and balloon probes as well as credits for various technical research projects was almost doubled.²⁵

In February 1967, the D-1C—Diademe 1—and the D-1D—Diademe 2—were successfully launched, completing the end of the first phase of France's national space program. Diademe 1 carried 144 reflectors and was the first earth satellite to be used for long-distance geodetic surveying by means of lasers, which were beamed on to the satellite from stations in Provence, Algeria, and Greece. Le Monde commented that although the D-1C was a civil satellite, "its

¹⁹ Warren C. Wetmore, "Europe Irons Out Issues in Initial Space Programs," *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, March 6, 1967, p. 146. For an explanation of ESRO and ELDO, see below, pp. 21-23.

²⁰ Ambassador de France, "The French Space Program, Past, Present, and Future Projects," *French Affairs*, No. 191A, April 1966, p. 4; "France's A.I. and FR. 1A in Orbit," *Interavia*, January 1966, p. 68.

²¹ Ambassade de France, "The French Space Program, Past, Present, and Future Projects," *French Affairs*, No. 191A, April 1966, p. 3.

²² *Interavia*, February 1967, p. 154.

²³ "The French D-1A Satellite," *Interavia*, April 1966, p. 527.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ "French Aircraft and Missile Activities," *Interavia*, May 1967, p. 664.

geodetic experiments are of particular interest to military circles."²⁸

Many observers have speculated that the launches of the four Diademe satellites signaled the end of the operational use of the Diamant 1 booster. They believe that the next planned satellite, the D-2, will probably be too heavy for Diamant 1 and will require the use of the projected super Diamant launcher.²⁷ Like the D-1A, the last two in the Diademe series had "fairly ambitious" aims for such small satellites: First, Doppler effect experiment by studying the radio signals emitted by the satellites' transmitters, which are controlled in frequency by an ultrastable oscillator; second, Laser experiment measuring distance to the satellite from three ground stations; and third, photography experiment, in which the satellites are photographed against the star background of the night sky, thus permitting the experimenters to find the direction of the satellite.²⁸

EVACUATION OF THE HAMMAGUIR BASE IN THE SAHARA

The D-1C and the D-1D were the last satellites to be launched from the Hammaguir facility. That base must be evacuated by July 1, 1967, under the terms of the Evian peace agreement of 1962, which ended the Algerian war. The evacuation and subsequent move to the Kourou launching base in French Guiana could create a gap in French satellite-launching activity, for the Kourou facility will not become operational until late 1968 or early 1969. Thus, during a period of from 18 months to 2 years France will not possess an operational satellite-launching base; however, French scientists will continue with space research, not only in developing the second-generation satellites but also in pursuing numerous experiments with sounding rockets, balloons, and other terrestrial means.²⁹

FUTURE PLANS OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

Probably the first satellite that will be launched from the new base in French Guiana will be the D-2, to be the first satellite in the second-generation or program series of French outer space activities. The chief mission of the D-2 will be to study the distribution of atomic hydrogen around the earth, for the present knowledge of this distribution and of the temperature of hydrogen above 300 miles is very inexact. If successful, the projected 180- to 220-pound satellite will be a decisive step forward in French space technology because of its planned guidance system and because it will be an "intelligent" satellite in which tests can be conducted and controlled by means of telecommand.

The D-2 will have an onboard memory unit in the form of a magnetic recorder, and its means of communicating with the earth are expected to be much more sophisticated than those of the D-1

series.³⁰ The satellite will also be used to develop a system of navigation.

Another satellite planned by the French is the Eole, or FR-2, similar in conception to the NASA/ESSA/Ghost system. It is expected that the satellite will be launched by a Scout rocket from Wallops Island at the end of 1968 or in early 1969. The 187-pound satellite is designed to collect the atmospheric pressure, temperature, and wind velocity measurements made by 500 small balloons free drifting at ceilings of approximately 29,500 feet. The balloon-borne instrument packs will be solar-cell powered.³¹

Another projected activity in the French outer space program is in the field of telecommunications. France will begin the design of the \$30 million Saros stationary orbit communications satellite in 1967 with a \$1.7 million budget item. Saros will probably weigh approximately 440 pounds and will be stationed over the equator at the 15th meridian west of Greenwich. It could carry 1,000 telephone circuits and 18 radio circuits and would serve French possessions and ex-colonies in South America and Africa with one antenna and eastward as far as Moscow and westward to the U.S. east coast with the other two antennas. Launch is expected in 1971.³²

FRENCH INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATION

Beyond its strongly emphasized national space program, France has also engaged in international space projects, both on a bilateral and multilateral basis. France has cooperated bilaterally with several countries in scientific and technical space research, in joint experiments, and in sharing facilities and exchanging information. As previously mentioned, for example, the French concluded an agreement with NASA for launching the FR-1A satellite by a Scout rocket in 1965. France has also cooperated with the Federal Republic of Germany, Argentina, India, Pakistan, Brazil, Canada, Iceland, Spain, and Japan.³³

France also participates in international and regional space activities. She belongs to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the World Committee on Space Research—Cospar—and the international Telecommunications Union. France is also a signatory to the international agreement on the creation of an international telecommunications satellite consortium, signed by 45 nations in Washington, D.C., between April and August 1965. By these agreements the Communications Satellite Corp.—Comsat—was made manager of the international Telecommunications Satellite Consortium—Intelsat. France is represented on the Comsat committee which meets once

a month in Washington, and contributes 5.6 percent of the cost of the program.³⁴

In addition to its bilateral and international space activities, France cooperates with other European countries in the European Launcher Development Organization—ELDO—created in March 1962, and the European Space Research Organization—ESRO—created in June 1962.³⁵ ELDO is made up of Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Australia, who are cooperating in constructing a three-stage launcher for heavy satellites—Europa I.³⁶ The capability of launching heavy satellites would be extremely important for Europe, for it could then have its own telecommunications satellites.

The United Kingdom is building the first stage, Blue Streak, of Europa I, France the second, and West Germany the third; Italy is responsible for the experimental satellite, Belgium, for tracking stations, the Netherlands for long-range telemetry, and Australia for the launch site in Woomera. The total budget for the project was estimated at \$500 million in 1961, with each country contributing according to its resources. France's share comes to 24 percent, second to the United Kingdom's contribution of 37 percent.³⁷ France's second stage contribution of Europa I underwent its first successful static trial at the Vernon teststand in November 1965. Its flight test model of the second stage, named the Cora, is now being tested. France conducted two successful Cora launches from Hammaguir on November 27 and December 18, 1966.

Two suborbital ELDO shots are scheduled for 1967—F6/1 in June and F6/2 in October. Both will carry live French Coralie second stages and dummy German third stages. These two launches are expected to round out phase 2 of ELDO's initial program. Phase 3 will begin in 1968 with the full orbital firings of the Europa I with all stages live. Further orbital firings will ensue in 1969, completing the anticipated development program.³⁸

The convention creating ESRO was signed by 10 countries—Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom. ESRO is intended to stimulate research and provide services, not to rival the research establishments of the member countries. Its financial resources are provided by members on a scale gaged to national income, and France's contribution is approximately 19 percent. ESRO's budget has been fixed at \$300 million for the initial 8-year program. Among ESRO projects are the establishment of infrastructure and equipment; for example, tracking stations; and building satellites, such as ESRO I,

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

²⁹ See chart on West European Space Expenditures, p. 14.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 15; also see *The Baltimore Sun*, April 16, 1967.

³¹ Ambassade de France, "The French Space Program, Past, Present, and Future Projects," *op. cit.*, p. 15.

³² Warren C. Wetmore, "Europe Irons Out Issues in Outer Space," *Aviation World and Space Technology*, March 6, 1967, p. 147.

²⁸ *Keessing's Contemporary Archives*, March 25-April 1, 1967, p. 21944.

²⁷ See, for example, Warren C. Wetmore, "French Space Program Begins New Phase," *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, March 27, 1967, p. 50.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ "France Provides 2,000 Million Francs for Space," *Interavia*, May 1966, p. 701.

³⁰ Ambassade de France, "The French Space Program, Past, Present and Future Projects," *op. cit.*, p. 9.

³¹ Warren C. Wetmore, "Europe Irons Out Issues in Initial Space Programs," *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, March 6, 1967, p. 158.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 159.

³³ Ambassade de France, "The French Space Program, Past, Present, and Future Projects," *op. cit.*, p. 12.

a polar ionospheric satellite, being constructed by concerns in Great Britain and France.

France's contributions to ESRO and ELDO are drawn from the national budget. In 1966, for example, out of the national space budget, some \$28.3 million was earmarked for European space programs. Of the \$404.9 million provided for French space research in the French fifth plan—1966–70—\$91 million is earmarked for French participation in the two European organizations. This thus represents one-fourth of the national space budget.³⁹ France's contribution to the two agencies yields a sizable return to its own national space program in the form of technological development experience and actual hardware.

III. FRENCH MILITARY POLICY

French military policy today is personally guided by the President of the Republic and as such reflects De Gaulle's distinctive style and lofty ambitions to place France in the ranks of the great powers. French military policy also reflects the continuing search for security through less military and political dependence upon others. In addition there is strong French concern for the revitalization of French armed forces and their equipment with the most modern weapons, which means first and foremost nuclear weapons. Behind present military policy is the "desire to heal the wounds of the recent and more distant past, to reconcile the army and the nation, and to restore unity and pride to the armed services. Viewed from this angle, an independent military stance and opposition to integration in the Atlantic alliance become conditions not only of political independence but also of national renewal and of healthy and stable civil-military relations."⁴⁰

THE FRENCH NUCLEAR DETERRENT

President de Gaulle did not await the end of the Algerian war to establish the guidelines of the military policy under the Fifth Republic. As early as 1958, he made clear his displeasure with the structure of the Atlantic alliance and with patterns of consultation among the Western countries. During the following year, steps in the reorganization of the military establishment were taken, perhaps the most striking move of which was the acceleration of the French effort to produce nuclear weapons.

President de Gaulle believes that the nuclear deterrent is absolutely essential to France's independence and status as a great power. He has stressed that France can have no political independence without military independence, and that such military independence must include nuclear weapons. He has repeatedly declared that American nuclear power would not necessarily come to the rescue of Europe if, at the same time, the United States were threatened with destruction. As De Gaulle declared in April 1961:

It is both the right and the duty of the continental European powers to have their

own national defense. It is intolerable for a great state to have its destiny subject to decisions and acts of another state, no matter how friendly it may be.⁴¹

And Michel Debré, Prime Minister of France from 1959 to 1962, has written that possession of nuclear weapons helps France "in not falling down to the level of those nations who would not be asked for their opinion regarding world problems or even regarding European problems."⁴²

In the French view, the acquisition of nuclear weapons reflects the possession of a scientific, technological, and industrial potential which a powerless and weak nation does not have. And, the nuclear deterrent provides France with international prestige and independence, a possible trigger for the American nuclear arsenal, increased influence over American strategic policy, and a concrete basis for the assertion of primacy among her European partners.

Although the French nuclear program has been given great momentum under President de Gaulle it is actually a continuance of policy of the Fourth Republic.⁴³ France had even pioneered in nuclear research prior to World War II. During postwar reconstruction France concentrated on facilities for the industrial use of atomic energy. In 1951 M. Félix Gaillard became the Minister responsible for atomic energy, and by 1952, he had succeeded in developing the activities of the French Atomic Energy Commission and placing them on an industrial basis.

The French Parliament voted the credits necessary for a 5-year nuclear plan in 1952. A year later M. René Pleven, at that time the French Minister of Defense, asked the Government to study the possibility of manufacturing nuclear weapons. In presenting his budget to the National Assembly he became the major supporter of modernization of the French military machine. Some months later, Mr. Mendès-France, the new Prime Minister, turned his attention to atomic energy.

On December 26, 1954, it was decided to prepare a government policy statement aimed at the production of the atomic bomb and a nuclear-powered submarine. Although the fall of the Government put an end to these projects, the next Government made the decision to build the nuclear-powered submarine, and in 1955, M. Guy Mollet gave the order to build the bomb.⁴⁴

In 1956 the French Government authorized the Minister of War to study the technical and financial means required to equip France with thermonuclear weapons. In July of that year the Mollet administration officially revealed that the French were involved in military atomic studies. Also in 1956, the Techni-

³⁹ Cited in Duroselle, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

⁴⁰ Michael Debré, *Au Service de la Nation* (Paris, Stock, 1963), p. 152.

⁴¹ For details on the nuclear program of the Fourth Republic, see Lawrence Scheinman, *Atomic Energy Policy in France under the Fourth Republic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965).

⁴² "France's Force de Frappe," *Interavia*, June 1964, p. 797.

cal and Industrial Directorate of the Government received instructions to examine the operation requirements for a supersonic bomber to be built around the French atomic bomb. And in that same year the French Government laid the foundations for considerable research and development programs devoted entirely to nuclear weapons. In approving the 1957 defense budget, the French Parliament endorsed almost all the Government's statements on the priority for nuclear development and called for establishment of a system of defense based on France's possession of nuclear weapons.⁴⁵

The accession of Charles de Gaulle to the leadership of France brought greater emphasis upon the twin military and political roles of the atom and speeded up the work in progress. Since 1959, France has been advocating a new military and political doctrine. On November 3, 1959, in an address to the Centres des Hautes Études de Défense Nationale, De Gaulle outlined his nuclear plans:

The defense of France must be French. . . . If a country like France is involved in a war, it must be her own war. . . . France's defense would, of course, be coordinated with that of other countries. . . . But it is essential that we have our own means of defense, that France should defend herself, fending for herself and in her own way. . . . As a consequence, we must of course be able to provide ourselves in the course of the next few years with a force capable of being used on our behalf, which it has been decided to designate a force de frappe, capable of being deployed anywhere at any time. It goes without saying that this force will be founded on nuclear weapons which, whether we build them or buy them, must belong to us. And since France could be destroyed from any point in the world, our force must be so constructed as to be able to strike anywhere on Earth."⁴⁶

The De Gaulle government began to implement its military plans for France in 1960. The first loi-programme—program law—presented in that year gave an indication of the new directions to be followed and the new priorities accorded the branches of the armed forces and types of military equipment. It provided \$3.7 billion—nearly 40 percent—of the program for the next 4 years, 1960 to 1964, for special studies for producing nuclear weapons and for the first developmental stages of thermonuclear weapons; a missile program for developing and testing nuclear-weapon launching vehicles and for France's share in European manufacture under American license of Hawk surface-to-air missiles; and conventional weapons to develop such equipment as the AMX armored vehicles for the army, Mirage III and IV supersonic aircraft for the air force, and guided missile frigates and various aircraft for the navy.⁴⁷

It thus made it possible for France to start building a strategic nuclear force and to equip convention forces with new materiel. The second program law—1965 to 1970—provided for continuation of

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 798.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 798.

⁴⁷ Ambassade de France, *France and Its Armed Forces* (New York: Ambassade de France, Service de Presse et d'Information, December 1964), p. 22.

³⁹ Ambassade de France, "The French Space Program, Past, Present, and Future Projects," *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁴⁰ Elizabeth Stabler, "French Military Policy," *Current History* v. 50, April 1966, p. 233.

development of the strategic nuclear force—completion of the strategic nuclear air force, whose weapon is the nuclear bomb and whose vehicle is the Mirage IV jet bomber; development of strategic surface-to-surface ballistic missiles; and preparations for the delivery in 1970 of the first nuclear submarine, armed with strategic sea-to-surface ballistic missiles with thermonuclear warheads, plus the beginning of work on two other nuclear submarines.⁴⁸

France thus envisions three stages in the development of its strategic nuclear force. The first stage, and the only one now operational—since 1964—consists of Mirage jet planes carrying 60- to 80-kiloton bombs.⁴⁹ France is now believed to have 50 to 60 of a planned force of 62 Mirage jets, which are equipped for aerial fueling from American-purchased KC-135 tankers. The jet force is scheduled to be phased out in 1968, to be superseded in late 1968 or 1969 by a transitional, or second stage of strategic surface-to-surface ballistic missiles set up in scattered hardened sites. These are to be solid-fuel, 2,000-mile-range missiles, which will carry nuclear warheads of from 100 to 200 kilotons.

The third stage of the strategic nuclear force is a force of nuclear missile-launching submarines, expected to become operational between 1970 and 1973. France took a great step toward realization of this goal on March 29, 1967, when the first French nuclear-powered submarine was launched. The submarine was entirely French-designed and French-built and, unlike the British *Dreadnought*, did not benefit in any way from American assistance. Named the *Redoutable*, the nuclear submarine will undertake its first sea trials in late 1968 and is expected to become operational in 1969 or 1970. It is 422 feet long, with a maximum width of 35 feet. At a maximum speed of 20 knots, it will have a cruising range without refueling of about 200,000 miles, and will carry a crew of 135 men.⁵⁰

When operational, the *Redoutable* will carry 16 sea-to-air ballistic missiles. Its first missiles will have fission warheads of 500 kiloton strength only, for the projected more powerful thermo-

nuclear or fusion warheads are not expected to be ready at that time. The French hope to test their first thermonuclear or fusion device in 1968 at the South Pacific test range from which they ultimately hope to produce warheads in a 1 megaton range, or equivalent to about 1 million tons of TNT.⁵¹

The second in the series of nuclear submarines, the *Terrible*, is already being placed on the stocks⁵² and is expected to enter service in 1972.⁵³ A third submarine is scheduled to follow in 1974 or 1975. Although original plans apparently only called for three nuclear submarines, the French Defense Minister, Pierre Messmer, recently stated that others could follow the third submarine at 2-year intervals.⁵⁴

A recent report on France's plans for its strategic nuclear force indicated an expansion of original goals. It was reported in the press in April 1967 that the French Government now hopes to build 75 land-based strategic missiles, rather than the previously forecast 40 to 50 missiles. It also reportedly wishes to expand the number of submarines to five rather than three. The French are also developing their first very small battlefield atomic weapons. Reportedly, the first small tactical nuclear weapon will be the so-called Pluton rocket with a range of approximately 70 miles and a warhead of less than 20 kilotons; that is, about the force of the American bomb dropped on Hiroshima, Japan. The French hope to have this weapon, and a similar one in a bomb casing for aerial delivery, ready by 1972. Plans now are reported to call for eight Pluton rocket launchers for each army division.⁵⁵

Although it presently represents only 1 percent of the West's total nuclear forces, the French nuclear force is significant. French scientists and technicians have proved that they can overcome the technical and material difficulties involved in building a striking force. They have overcome many initial problems, and their ambitious plans for the future show new confidence that remaining problems can and will be overcome. Perhaps, more important, the French achievements in their nuclear program have been won almost entirely on their own, without significant outside aid.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES OF THE FRENCH

French military policy also aims at development of a strong, modern, and well-equipped conventional force. Although the reduction in numbers of the French forces since the end of the Algerian war is striking—from over 1 million men in 1962 to approximately 522,500 in 1966⁵⁶—the French have striven to pro-

duce a more streamlined and better equipped conventional force.

In 1966, the total strength of the French Army was 338,000. Five divisions were stationed in Europe, including one mechanized and one armored division in Germany; one brigade in West Berlin; and one mechanized, one armored, and one air-transportable division in France. The mechanized and armored divisions have been equipped with M-47 and AMX-13 tanks. Divisions in Germany have Honest John and Hawk launchers. The air-transportable division combines parachute troops with an amphibious group and supporting arms, and composes the permanent element of a strategic reserve.⁵⁷

Combat troops stationed overseas number approximately 15,000, including three regiments in Algeria, three regiments in other African states, three battalions in French Somaliland, and two battalions in the Pacific territories. In addition 3,000 French officers and NCO's serve either on secondment or on contract with the armed forces of independent African countries. Remaining troops are stationed in France for local defense. Their peacetime strength is six brigades. Mobilization would add one Alpine and seven territorial brigades, 100 infantry regiments, and supporting units.

Total strength of the navy is 84,000. It includes three aircraft carriers, one helicopter carrier, two antiaircraft cruisers, 19 destroyers—five of which have guided missiles—31 frigates and other escort ships, 21 submarines of which 17 are oceangoing, 15 patrol vessels, 50 fleet and coastal minesweepers, nine landing ships, 10 landing craft, 142 other ships, and a Marine commando of 800 men. The naval air force consists of 12,000 men and about 275 aircraft.

The total strength of the air force is approximately 113,000 with about 850 aircraft. This includes the Strategic Air Command, equipped with Mirage IV's and KC-135F tankers; the Air Defense Command with 140 aircraft; the First Tactical Air Force with 23,000 men and 250 aircraft; the Second Tactical Air Force with 150 aircraft; and the Transport Command, also with 150 aircraft.

In addition to regular French forces, up to 400,000 reservists may be called upon in time of emergency, plus the Gendarmerie and the CRS—Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité—who total 75,000.⁵⁸

ENLISTING PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN THE WAR AGAINST URBAN POVERTY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Studies, 1966), as reprinted in *Aerospace International*, January/February 1967, p. 36.

⁵⁷ Institute for Strategic Studies, loc. cit.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 39.

⁴⁸ Ambassade de France, *France and Its Armed Forces* (New York: Ambassade de France, Service de Presse et d'Information, December 1964), p. 22.

⁴⁹ *New York Times*, October 10, 1963; *New York Times*, March 29, 1967.

⁵⁰ By comparison, the United States Polaris submarines range from 381 feet to 425 feet long, weigh from 5,900 to 8,250 tons, have an average crew of 112 and cost from \$110 to \$115 million each. The United States attack submarines range from 252 feet to 447 feet long, weigh from 2,830 to 5,900 tons, carry a crew of about 95 and cost from \$49 million to \$57 million each. Although their speed is classified information, it is reported to be approximately 30 knots. The United States has 106 nuclear submarines programmed with 40 Polaris and 26 attack subs in service and the remainder in various preliminary stages. Only the United States and the Soviet Union have nuclear powered submarines in operation at present. Britain is building four with American aid. "French Launch 1st Atomic Sub," *Baltimore Sun*, March 30, 1967, p. 1.

⁵¹ American Minuteman and Polaris missiles carry warheads about that size. William Beecher, "Small Atomic Arms Being Developed by France," *New York Times*, April 14, 1967, p. 10.

⁵² *London Times*, March 30, 1967.

⁵³ *Washington Post*, March 30, 1967, p. H-1.

⁵⁴ *Baltimore Sun*, March 30, 1967, p. 1.

⁵⁵ William Beecher, "Small Atomic Arms Being Developed in France," *New York Times*, April 14, 1967, p. 10.

⁵⁶ Stabler, op cit., p. 235; Institute for Strategic Studies, *The Military Balance 1966-1967* (London: Institute for Strategic

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today two bills designed to encourage private enterprise, principally through a system of tax incentives, to invest in urban poverty areas—to create industry, jobs, and housing. These bills, originally introduced by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, of New York, have received bipartisan support in the Senate and I am hopeful they will receive a similar reception in this body.

Our Nation is in the midst of unprecedented prosperity. We have the highest standard of living known to man, a strong and growing economy, high wages, and record employment. Since 1935 our gross national product has risen 843 percent. Per capita disposable income is up 125 percent. Unemployment has been reduced by seven times. Corporate profits reached a record level of \$48.2 billion last year, an increase of 1,612 percent since 1935.

Americans are better educated and better employed. Just 27 years ago, the median education level in this country was between the eighth and ninth grades. Today it is close to a full high school education. In 1930, only 14.2 percent of our work force was employed in professional and managerial capacities and 19.8 percent were unskilled laborers. By 1965, our unskilled labor force was down to 11.3 percent and nearly 40 percent of the work force was represented by professional and managerial people.

For more than 30 years we have made great strides in educating our young people, curing the ill, providing greater security for the aged, creating more jobs, and improving job skills. Yet, the problems of poverty, especially in our urban areas, continue to mar that record. The costs of urban poverty are horrendous, not only in the ever-mounting bills we pay for social welfare programs, but in the broken lives, in the hopelessness and frustration of the men, women and children who have been unable to break out of poverty's vicious cycle.

Slum conditions and the services they demand eat up a far disproportionate amount of our taxes. In the city of Yonkers, N.Y., the fourth largest city in New York State and the largest in Westchester County, the most depressed areas of the city, measured by concentration of substandard housing and accounting for 30 percent of the city's population, also account for: 35 percent of the major crimes, 51 percent of the major fires, 53 percent of the juvenile delinquency cases, 59 percent of the tuberculosis cases, 77 percent of the city's venereal disease, 81 percent of the people on welfare, and 85 percent of the city's illegitimate births.

I am sure these figures will hold true for other urban areas.

Sixteen million poor people live in our metropolitan areas. Another 26 million are living on incomes above what has been defined as the minimum poverty level, but below an adequate level to live decently, especially at this time of rising prices and increasing tax burdens. The problems these people represent are massive and complex. It is obvious that the traditional tools are inadequate to meet

this challenge, and while the bills I am introducing today are by no means a final answer, they represent an approach which I believe will prove both feasible and effective.

Summaries of the provisions of the urban housing investment legislation and the industrial development legislation follow:

PROVISIONS OF URBAN HOUSING INVESTMENT BILL

1. Before applying to HUD for certification under this program, a prospective builder must obtain approval for his housing project from the municipality. (The municipality is thus in the position to seek out and encourage businessmen and other builders to construct these projects.) A partnership between private enterprise, local government, and the Federal government is thus achieved.

2. In order to qualify for benefits under this program, a builder with approval from a municipality must still seek certification from HUD. (This program will be administered through a new Low-Income Housing Division within HUD, which can devote all its attention to producing low cost housing.)

3. The builder-owner of the project must agree to (a) build or rehabilitate at least 100 dwelling units; (b) construct at least as many units as he destroys; (c) provide an initial equity investment of at least 20% of the project's cost; (d) agree to accept only a 3% direct return on his initial equity investment.

4. Mortgage money for a certified project will be made available in the same way it is made available under section 221(d) (3) of the National Housing Act. Once the project is certified by HUD, a 50 year mortgage bearing an interest rate of 2% can be obtained from a private bank. Since it will be FHA insured, the mortgage can then be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association. The mortgage on each project will run to 80% of cost depending upon the amount of equity supplied by the owner. The money for purchasing such mortgages will constitute a fund of \$3 billion. The Secretary of the Treasury will be instructed to borrow this money over the next 6 years. Because Treasury will have to borrow it at about 4% and then lend it at 2%, it will have to subsidize the difference. The subsidy cost will be approximately \$35 million a year for 50 years, quite low for the number of potential units.

5. The bill provides that local real estate taxes on these projects must be reduced from the normal 20 to 25% of total rents to 5%. A tax abatement fund is established with an initial appropriation of \$30 million. The Federal government automatically reimburses the municipality for 50% of the required tax abatement. On the remaining 50%, it matches the state contribution dollar for dollar.

6. Any family which is dislocated will be given a priority in obtaining the new housing units created under this bill.

7. The bill provides project insurance so that an owner will not experience any cash losses on the housing he has provided. An initial Federal fund of \$10 million is established; small premiums are then paid by the owners for the insurance they receive.

8. The bill establishes a Home Management Assistance Fund within HUD. Five million dollars is provided as an initial appropriation for this fund. At the time that the owner's project is certified, he will be required to consult with a representative from the fund. Arrangements will be made between the owner, the fund and the municipality to train the residents of the project to participate in managing and handling the day-to-day operations of the project.

9. No person or family shall be permitted to move into the project if the yearly sum for rent constitutes less than 18% of his or

its gross income (unless the Secretary of HUD waives the requirement for the project because of problems of maintaining full occupancy). If the tenant's income rises once he enters the project, he faces no increased payment until the rent constitutes less than 15% of gross income. Once it is less than 15%, the tenant shall be required to pay 18% of his income for his housing unit. The additional payment shall go into the tax abatement fund and serve to help lower Federal appropriations.

10. In return for building these projects the owner receives the following tax benefits:

A. a tax credit, which increases proportionately to the amount invested, equal to a specified percentage of the cost of the project, which builds upon existing investment credit provisions in Sections 46 through 48 of the Internal Revenue Code;

B. a shorter useful life for depreciation purposes, which builds upon the 5-year period for the amortization of emergency defense facilities and grain storage facilities;

C. the right to treat demolition and site improvement costs (often amounting to 10 to 15% of the entire cost of the project) as part of the cost for the building and therefore as part of the depreciable base;

D. a reduction, or in certain cases a postponement, of a capital gains tax upon a sale of the project after a minimum period of time.

11. It is estimated that a \$15,000 unit will rent for about \$99 a month, a \$12,500 unit will rent for \$86; and a \$10,000 unit will rent for \$73. With the cooperation of municipalities in lowering of land costs and the expertise of large private corporations, it is expected that housing costs could be reduced and rentals established below even these low levels.

12. Computations have also been made on the profits that owners will receive for building and continuing to own these projects. As the owner's equity investment goes up, his after-taxes profits will also go up. Profits for a large corporation will run over 10%. These benefits should induce large corporations to begin the job of rebuilding urban ghettos.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BILL

1. The bill calls for tax incentives to promote the industrial development of urban ghetto areas. The objective sought is the creation of new jobs to be filled by residents of these poverty areas.

2. The program is limited to poverty areas. These are defined as:

a. 193 urban areas already located on OEO maps for Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas of 250,000 people or more.

b. Comparable poverty areas to be located on maps for other areas classified as urban by Census Bureau (2500 persons or more).

c. Indian reservations specified by the Secretary of the Interior.

3. The bill utilizes a system of tax credits, increased deductions for wages paid, and rapid depreciation, which business leaders indicate will produce significant results in procuring badly needed industrial investments.

Before the program can begin in any city, the city must inform the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that it wishes to participate and will cooperate in locating companies to go into the poverty areas. (The city then controls the speed of the program and works at attracting the companies. This has been done in Puerto Rico under its Industrial Incentive Act.)

4. Any participating company must obtain a certificate from the local agency designated in the municipality to deal with this program. Then application is made to HUD which will certify that:

a. The business is locating in one of the above areas at a site approved by the municipality, and will establish a reasonable ratio

between capital investment and jobs created.

b. If it is engaged in industrial production (manufacturing, producing, processing, assembling), a staff of at least 50 full-time workers will be employed at the ghetto plant. At least 66% of the original working force will be residents of the ghetto at the time they were hired and will have lived there for at least 6 months prior to the time of hiring or be certified as unemployed, low-income people by the municipality. The required staff is reduced to 25 employees for municipalities under 50,000 persons and for Indian reservations.

c. To continue to qualify for benefits, the employer must maintain the same minimum working force unless economic circumstances beyond his control prevent him from doing so. Even if he is forced to reduce his staff, he must maintain the same percentage of low-income persons.

d. People who qualify and are hired do not have to continue to live in the urban poverty area.

e. The only other qualifying businesses would be those engaged in wholesale operations or the construction of buildings in an urban poverty area. (Same employee criteria.)

5. In return for agreeing to these conditions, the business gets the following tax benefits:

a. An increase in the normal 7% investment credit on machinery to 10%.

b. An extension of the 7% investment credit on machinery to the cost of the building in which the business is located. (If the business is a lessee, it would have the credit otherwise available to the lessor as to its premises. There is precedent for this in the original Investment Credit Act.)

c. A rapid depreciation—two-thirds of normal life—for the total cost of the building or portion of the building which it occupies.

d. A useful life or a class life for machinery and equipment of two-thirds the normal life under existing Treasury guidelines (Rev. Proc. 62-21).

e. For a period of 10 years, a deduction of 125% of the salaries it pays to the low-income employees it has hired.

f. All credits and deductions could be carried forward or backward or, if the business is a corporate subsidiary, utilized against other outside income of the parent corporation. Likewise a purchaser of the business could use the carryovers otherwise available to the seller if the purchaser continues the business. (The carryback or carryover provisions would be increased over the ones applicable to the present Investment Credit Act because of potential increased difficulties faced by the company locating in an urban poverty area.)

These benefits run for 10 years from the time the business goes into operation.

6. Run-away corporations do not qualify under the program. The bill uses an exclusion provision similar to the one included in the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. (The jobs created will be new ones.)

7. Resettlement provisions are included in the legislation for those who lose their residences or businesses because federally inspired industry takes over their homes or shops.

a. Allowances for relocation of families and individuals are more generous than under urban renewal.

b. Help on rent (up to \$1000) for 24 months for elderly, handicapped, and low-income families where 20% of their income will not obtain decent facilities and no public housing or State or local low-income housing is available.

c. Moving expense payments for business; added payment of \$2500 if business is small and earning less than \$10,000 a year.

8. The bill provides a recapture provision in case a corporation willfully violates the established hiring requirements, or simply

takes its benefits and ceases operations without economic justification. The recapture provisions are severe enough to serve as an effective deterrent.

9. The bill also provides for job training assistance to those industries moving into ghetto areas. The route taken is to bring the program under MDTA and add \$20 million for the first year with an open authorization. (The actual training under our plan should be handled in the following way. When the industry agrees to come in and has taken the necessary steps to qualify, it could enter into an agreement with the Department of Labor. The industry would stipulate the date by which it wants the manpower trained (probably the time it plans to start operations) and the number and type of workers it wants. If the industry wants to train the people itself, then the Department of Labor will contract with it. If the business does not want to do the training, then the Department of Labor should be given the power to contract either with a private manpower training firm or with the usual local public training organization.)

10. The only direct appropriation is \$20 million for manpower training in the first year and additional amounts needed for such training in future years.

Anticipated revenue losses to the Treasury through tax change will be slight over a period of a few years. An extra deduction for wages paid costs nothing because it is more than made up by the decrease in welfare payments for workers and the taxes paid on new salaries. Rapid depreciation on machinery and buildings cost very little. All it normally does is provide the investor with a more rapid return, and not a larger return. New credits under this bill will equal 10% on expenses for buildings and machinery in an urban poverty area facility. If we get industry to invest a billion dollars over the next few years—which would create many new jobs—we get a total cost of \$100 million. But an investment credit may in fact cost very little. Former Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon testified in 1963 that the Investment Tax Credit had returned within the first year at least one-half of the revenue costs through increased tax payments (and that was before the full impact of the Act on the economy was felt). In short, credits, depreciation, and deductions will be compensated for by reduced welfare payments, new taxes on wages paid, and increased industrial productivity.

A ROLE FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today privileged to cosponsor two bills which I feel contain revolutionary ideas and methods toward the success of our Nation's war on poverty. These bills encourage the active participation of the American private enterprise system to invest in the urban poverty areas by creating new industry, jobs, and housing.

The first of these bills, H.R. 11500, to be cited as the Urban Employment Opportunities Development Act of 1967, was originally introduced in the Senate on July 12, 1967, by the junior Senator from my State of New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. It would, if enacted, "provide incentives for the creation by private industry of

additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas." I believe this legislation would be a tremendous step toward the eventual success of the war on poverty in this country.

I am very pleased to add my support to this particular legislation, which is aimed at creating a new partnership against poverty. The bill would bring the resources and talent of our American private enterprise to bear on what I consider one of our most serious domestic challenges. The exact purpose is to stimulate investment—the creation of new jobs and income—in poverty areas. As the junior Senator from New York explained when he introduced this legislation in the Senate, the "bill seeks to remedy the greatest failure in our existing poverty efforts: the failure to involve and rely on the private enterprise system which is the basic strength of the Nation." The program will be carried out, not by Government agencies, but by private enterprise. According to the plan, the Federal Government would provide only a system of tax incentives designed to enable private enterprise to make its investments and carry out its operations in the urban poverty areas.

I intend to have more to say on this bill at some future date. However, I would like to state that it is my conviction that this bill will help to reduce welfare and dependency—and their costs—by providing real job opportunities for welfare recipients. I believe it is the welfare system itself, combined with the lack of decent job opportunities, which produces the welfare families who are asserted to be permanent dependents of the Government. This bill will not solve all the problems of poverty, but it is a step in the right direction and in the American tradition.

The second bill which I am happy to cosponsor today, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 11499, "to engage the resources, talents, and energies of American private enterprise in the physical reconstruction and rehabilitation of housing in urban poverty areas."

This bill was introduced on July 13, 1967, in the Senate by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and is aimed at creating a mechanism by which private enterprise can and will build and rehabilitate large numbers of low-cost housing units in urban poverty areas. This bill, as well as H.R. 11500, is part of the expanding effort to encourage private enterprise to play a role in the area of greatest need: the rehabilitation of the slums, which are a blot to our cities, and degrading, to say the least, to those who reside in them.

The bill, though complex in detail, is simple in purpose and method, and is designed to produce the needed new housing at the lowest possible cost to the Government. At the same time, it is designed to encourage a partnership of private enterprise and Government, in the production of low-cost housing.

Briefly, H.R. 11499 would push toward this goal by two means. First, it attempts to lower costs by providing an extended interest rate subsidy similar to that existing in some current housing programs and by payments to municipalities in lieu

of real estate taxes on this housing. Second, it aims to attract large-scale private enterprise investment through a system of tax incentives, designed to make such investment possible at competitive rates of return.

Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored and supported legislation in the past to help alleviate poverty. There are many laws on the statute books aimed at this objective. I trust that the Congress will enact this legislation which I have sponsored today. However, the success of these programs can only be achieved with full cooperation between Government, private enterprise, public officials, and the persons involved.

WHO DAMNS THE ELECTRIC POWER RELIABILITY ACT?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, after a long period of planning, the Federal Power Commission has submitted to the Congress its proposals for legislation to safeguard the Nation's electric power systems against cascading blackouts. Several Members of this House, including the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have sponsored the measure (H.R. 10727), which has the support of the administration and has been widely praised in the press as a constructive and sensible proposal. Predictably, the power industry's trade magazine has refused to see any merit in the bill. Electrical World magazine, in its June 19 issue, printed an editorial combining unintelligent opposition to the Electric Power Reliability Act with statements regarding the June 5 power failure on the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland interconnection which can only be described as totally misleading.

After characterizing the precipitating cause of the blackout as a "temporarily expedient circuit arrangement," the editorial remarks:

This situation, however understandable, is not apt to build confidence in Congress or elsewhere in the skill or good judgment behind today's power system operations.

That is one of the few statements in the editorial with which I can agree. It is followed by a series of "observations," which "need to be made." In my opinion, they also need to be substantially qualified.

First. The writer declares that—

Ties to adjoining regional interconnection groups, such as CANUSE and ISG, successfully supplied emergency power flows.

If this were true, there would have been no blackout. The ties to CANUSE, running from Pennsylvania to New York, were not able to carry all the load placed on them as a result of the breakdown in Pennsylvania. They supplied some emergency power, but not enough. To say that they "successfully" supplied emer-

gency flows, in view of the blackout that ensued, is nonsense.

The editorial's next point is that "unavoidable delays" in the completion of the 500-kilovolt Keystone transmission project meant that internal ties in the P-J-M interconnection were not strong enough. This may be true enough, but however unavoidable these delays may have been they do not excuse the failure of the systems concerned to strengthen the ties to New York—which had failed once before, in the great Northeast blackout of November 1965.

Third. It is proudly announced that "relay and protective systems operated according to plan." Great battles have been fought "according to plan" and lost because the plan was inadequate or mistaken. However smoothly the relays may have functioned on June 5, they could do no more than they were programmed to do. What the public needs to know is not whether the plan was carried out, but whether it was properly conceived in the first place. Electrical World—perhaps wisely—is silent on that point.

Fourth. The editorial rejoices that damage to equipment was "relatively light" and promptly repairable, and that restoration of service was "orderly and prompt under the circumstances." That is a very poor sort of triumph. Restoration of service in parts of New Jersey took all afternoon, up to 13 hours in all. It may have been "prompt under the circumstances," but if it was, I believe we ought to bend every effort to eliminate the circumstances. Certainly the consuming public will eventually cease to be impressed by brilliant recoveries after multimillion-dollar blackouts.

I should not, perhaps, fault the editors of Electrical World if their only object were to put the best face possible on a failure of their industry's performance—though even that activity ought to stop short of outright misleading statements. But the entire thrust of the editorial is to condemn, without analysis or discussion, the Federal Power Commission's legislative proposal. There is the customary lament about "centralization of authority over planning and operation" and "intervention of an outside agency." But there is not a scrap of reasoned argument tending to show that the Electric Power Reliability Act would not work a vast improvement in the planning and operation of electric systems. The editors tell us that the bill "can impede the industry's own efforts to increase reliability through careful coordination of regional power systems," but they do not tell us why or how.

There may be weaknesses in the FPC's proposal, as there are in most new bills. The Congress should study it carefully, and make whatever improvements are necessary. I expect some amendments are in order. I deplore, however, sterile, automatic opposition of the type represented by this editorial. It leaves us no wiser than before, except for the impression that the authors have, in reality, no case at all. I cannot believe that this editorial represents the level at which all electric utility managers will approach the FPC bill. Many of them have indicated by the

way in which they manage their systems, that they are willing to face problems with forethought and imagination. These progressive managements, in large part, have really applied the "valuable lessons" of past failures, rather than indulging in pious talk about "learning from mistakes." I hope that they, and not the last-ditchers of Electrical World, will set the tone for the utility industry's participation in our consideration of the Electric Power Reliability Act. Certainly one need not be a supporter of the bill to be able to discuss it in a rational way. The editors of the Wall Street Journal, for instance, are generally opposed to government regulation of business, yet their comments on this issue demonstrate a realization that it is sometimes necessary.

I place the editorial referred to at this point in the RECORD together with the facts concerning the PJM power failure as set forth in the Federal Power Commission Releases Nos. 14979 and 14982 and the rather different editorial by the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Electrical World, June 19, 1967]

THE AFTERMATH OF THE BLACKOUT

The blackout of June 5 carries the gravest implications for the utility industry.

It came at a time when the Federal Power Commission was shaping legislative proposals intended to confer upon itself vastly increased authority over power system planning, coordination, and operation. As we see it, such centralization of authority over planning and operation of local and regional power systems and interconnections is no guarantee against further interruptions. In fact it can impede the industry's own efforts to increase reliability through careful coordination of regional power systems.

The origin of the June 5 blackout was apparently the outcome of temporarily expedient circuit arrangement to bolster reserve generation on the PJM Interconnection against hot-weather loads. This situation, however understandable, is not apt to build confidence in Congress or elsewhere in the skill or good judgment behind today's power system operations. We do not propose here to excuse or defend what took place. But we do seriously question whether FPC surveillance could have prevented what happened.

Be that as it may, several observations need to be made in the wake of the June 5 blackout regarding the behavior of the PJM Interconnection under traumatic system conditions:

Ties to adjoining regional interconnection groups, such as CANUSE and ISG, successfully supplied emergency power flows;

Due to unavoidable delays in completion of 500-kv Keystone lines, however, internal PJM ties were not strong enough to maintain stable conditions during transient redistribution of power following initial trip-out;

Nevertheless, relay and protective systems operated according to plan;

Damage to power system facilities was relatively light and amenable to prompt repair;

Restoration of system facilities and resumption of service was orderly and prompt under the circumstances.

From this most recent blackout, as from the Northeast Power System Interruption of 1965, power system people can wring valuable lessons. These should be applied promptly and effectively for the perfection of interconnected system operation. For, as we see it, blackouts notwithstanding, properly coordinated regional interconnections offer the closest practicable approach to reliability

that present power system technology has to offer.

So far as the intervention of an outside agency, such as the FPC is concerned, there is grave question in our mind whether such activity would expedite the application of lessons arising from these blackouts.

[Federal Power Commission Press Release No. 14979]

FPC CHAIRMAN WHITE CALLS MEETING FOR THURSDAY ON FOUR-STATE POWER FAILURE

Federal Power Commission Chairman Lee C. White announced this morning that the FPC is calling a meeting Thursday in Washington, D.C., of representatives of the utilities involved in Monday's four-state eastern area power failure, with representatives of the four-state Governors and State Commissions, and Federal officials invited to attend.

Chairman White also announced the establishment of an Ad Hoc panel of industry and Government experts to study in depth the problem of bulk power supply reliability in the four-state-area affected by Monday's blackout.

Meanwhile, Chairman White said the FPC is pressing its investigation of the failure which cascaded across the 15,000 square-mile eastern area yesterday morning with the 10 million kilowatt loss affecting about 13 million people in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware.

The failure lasted up to 10 hours in some areas. Power had been completely restored by about 7:55 p.m. last night.

Chairman White said that while it is important to determine the initiating cause of the failure, that the blackout clearly indicates the need for strong interconnection and better coordination to prevent further cascading-type failures. One of the principal tasks of the new panel will be to make recommendations to minimize the possibility of a recurrence.

Chairman White conferred with the White House and with Congressional leaders yesterday. He was scheduled to make an oral report this morning to the Senate Commerce Committee at the request of Chairman Warren G. Magnuson. The Senate Commerce Committee is holding hearings on legislation affecting the Federal Power Act.

FPC staff members were dispatched to Philadelphia yesterday shortly after the failure occurred. The FPC experts are examining the sequence of events with officials of the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland (PJM) Interconnection, and are studying records of the timing and loss of generating plants and opening of transmission lines. The FPC investigation is under the direction of F. Stewart Brown, Chief of the Commission's Bureau of Power. Staff members on the scene are Paul H. Shore, the FPC's New York Regional Engineer, and Cleve R. Jacobsen, an engineer from the Washington Office.

The four eastern states involved in the outage are saved by the PJM interconnection. The power failure started at 10:18 a.m., Monday. Service was lost in the entire state of New Jersey, in eastern and southeastern Pennsylvania and in a part of the Delaware-Maryland peninsula.

The principal cities in which power was completely interrupted included Newark, Jersey City, Elizabeth, Patterson and Camden, all in New Jersey; Philadelphia, Reading, Chester, Upper Darby, Bethlehem, Allentown, all in Pennsylvania; and Wilmington, Delaware.

The power failure resulted in widespread separation of transmission lines around the perimeter of the affected area and the early loss of such major generating sources as the Brunner Island (700,000 kilowatts) steam plant of Pennsylvania Power & Light Company; and the Yards Creek (440,000 kilowatts) and Muddy Run pumped storage projects (480,000 kilowatts) of Public Service

Electric and Gas Company and Philadelphia Electric Company, respectively.

As the result of separation of systems and imbalance of generation and load, other systems went down under deteriorating system conditions.

Transmission ties from the affected four-state area to surrounding systems, including systems in New York, Maryland and western Pennsylvania, opened and power service in the surrounding systems continued unaffected.

The power systems which lost total power supply included: Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Jersey Central Power & Light Company, New Jersey Power & Light Company, Metropolitan Edison Company, and Philadelphia Electric Company. Other systems substantially affected included Delaware Power & Light Company, which lost about 80 percent of its load, and Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, which suffered an internal separation of its network, causing the eastern portion to lose power.

Service to the center of Philadelphia was restored by 11:10 a.m. yesterday and all of Philadelphia Electric's system was restored by 2:30 p.m. Power was restored on the Metropolitan Edison Company system at 11:45 a.m. Power was restored temporarily on the system of Pennsylvania Power & Light at 12:15 p.m., but system conditions became unstable and service to the eastern section was again lost. Service was essentially restored on the system by 2:00 p.m. except in the Northwest part of the system in the Sunbury-Williamsport area which was completely restored by 6:20 p.m.

Nearly all power on Jersey Central and New Jersey Power & Light Company was restored at 2:30 p.m. Delmarva Power & Light Company service was completely restored by 1:00 p.m. At 5:00 p.m. practically the entire area was back in normal service with the exception of the area served by the Public Service Electric & Gas, which at that time had picked up about 70 percent of its normal load. Loads on this system was fully restored about 7:55 p.m. last night.

Although Atlantic City Electric Company is a part of the interconnection and was initially affected by the disturbance, it separated from the network. Although significant heavy industrial loads were dropped, the system continued its operation. The PJM interconnection is equipped with only a limited amount of automatic load shedding and was unable to reduce loads quickly enough to prevent collapse of system generation.

Jersey Central, which is equipped to drop 30 percent of its load automatically, is the only one of the twelve members of the PJM Interconnection that is so equipped at present. Two other systems, the General Public Utilities and Pennsylvania Power & Light Company, plan to install automatic load-shedding relays. A 5 percent reduction in voltage was ordered by the dispatching headquarters of the PJM Interconnection as frequency began to decline, but was not done quickly enough to be effective.

On the basis of information that has been assembled to date, the trouble is believed to have started with a fault on a 230-kilovolt line of the Philadelphia Electric Company extending from Nottingham to Plymouth Meeting, Pa. Cause of the fault on the line has not been determined. The line is back in service and is being patrolled to detect any abnormal conditions.

The opening of this line resulted in tripping off the new Muddy Run pumped storage project on the Susquehanna River which was generating 440 megawatts. The control system for Muddy Run is so arranged that its generation is automatically tripped if one of the 230 kilowatt lines from Nottingham to Plymouth Meeting has opened. This is a temporary arrangement pending the placing of a new 500 kilovolt line in service later

this summer between these two general points. The sequence in the loss of generation of other plants in the vicinity, including Brunner Island and Conowingo has not yet been determined. This will require careful matching of oscillograph records of the disturbance, which is now in process.

The wide shutdown of generation over the area resulted in some damage to a number of generating units. Much of the initially observed damage has been found to be minor and repairs and tests are under way which will place these units back in service today or within a few days. Damage to a number of others may take longer periods. Altogether a total of 12 units was affected in some manner but it is now expected that all but one of these units, which has a capacity of only 80,000 kilowatts, will be operating by the end of this week. Most are already back in service.

The FPC will issue further reports on the power failure as its investigation progresses. A more detailed report will follow completion of the FPC's analysis.

[Federal Power Commission Press Release No. 14982]

CAUSE OF FOUR-STATE POWER FAILURE PIN-POINTED TO SHORT CIRCUIT IN HIGH VOLTAGE LINE WHICH SAGGED TOO CLOSE TO DISTRIBUTION LINE CROSSING UNDER IT

Federal Power Commission Chairman Lee C. White said this morning that Philadelphia Electric Company reported that the power failure which cascaded across four eastern states Monday was touched off by a short circuit when a high voltage transmission line sagged because of a heavy electric load, bringing it too close to a low voltage distribution line crossing under it.

The lines cross at a point midway on Philadelphia Electric Company's 50-mile Nottingham-Plymouth Meeting 230-kilovolt line in southeastern Pennsylvania.

The load on the high voltage line Monday reached 600,000 kilowatts, which was more than it previously had carried. This raised the line's temperature, causing it to sag physically toward the low voltage distribution line, and the resulting "flash-over" shorted out the 230-kilovolt line and the distribution line.

The important question which remains to be answered, Chairman White said, is why the loss of this one line brought about the service interruption throughout the four-state area.

Two additional generating units were placed in service last week at Philadelphia Electric's new Muddy Run pumped storage plant on the lower Susquehanna River, bringing about the increased load. Loss of the Nottingham-Plymouth Meeting line resulted in tripping off the Muddy Run project. The control system for Muddy Run is so arranged that its generation is automatically tripped if the 230-kilovolt line from Nottingham to Plymouth Meeting has opened. This is a temporary arrangement pending the placing in service, probably within another week of a new 500-kilovolt line generally between these two points.

The sequence in the loss of generation of other plants in the vicinity, including Public Service Electric and Gas Company's Yards Creek pumped storage station and Pennsylvania Power & Light Company's Brunner Island steam plant is still under investigation. Oscillograph records of the disturbance are being studied.

Information which had been assembled as of yesterday morning first indicated that the failure started with a fault on the 230-kilovolt Nottingham-Plymouth Meeting line. Near the beginning of the power failure a fuse was blown on the 4-kilovolt distribution circuit which passes underneath the 230-kilovolt line, and this led to a close examination of the transmission facilities in

this area. As a result, inspection crews determined that a "flash-over" had occurred but that damage to the line was not serious. The line is now back in service.

The failure cascaded across a 15,000 square mile area Monday morning with a 10-million kilowatt loss affecting about 13 million people in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware. The failure, which started at 10:18 a.m., lasted nearly ten hours in some areas. Power was completely restored by about 8 p.m. Monday night.

A meeting has been called by the FPC for tomorrow morning in Washington, D. C. of representatives of the Governors and state regulatory commissions of the four affected states and of all the utilities involved in the power failure. The Commission also has established a panel of industry and government experts to study the problem of bulk power supply reliability in this four-state area.

Tomorrow's meeting at the FPC which will be a working session limited to official participants, will consider all aspects of the power failure, including the reasons for delays in restoring service in some of the affected areas.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 12, 1967]

AT THE MERCY OF SQUIRRELS

Even if the electric power failure which last week left some 13 million people in the Middle Atlantic area without electricity—some for as long as 10 hours—had been the first since the Great Blackout of 1965 in New York and the Northeast, it would have been one too many. But since 1965 the nation has had 17 lesser service interruptions known as "cascading power failures."

Once upon a time a major breakdown in an electric utility affected that utility's customers only, since each company operated in a sort of geographical island. The cascading, or domino, effects of a failure now are due in part to the close interconnections, established in recent years, of electric companies serving a particular region.

So when somewhere on a line in eastern Pennsylvania a short circuit occurred the other morning, it resulted in tripped switches across a 15,000-square-mile area served by five companies linked to what is called the "PMJ interconnection" in Pennsylvania, Maryland and New Jersey and part of Delaware.

Acknowledging that it is not known yet why a short circuit on one line resulted in a wholesale failure, Federal Power Commission Chairman White observes that even something seemingly so trivial as a squirrel getting trapped in a high tension circuit could trigger a massive power failure.

And two of the New Jersey utilities involved admit that there is no assurance a massive failure could not happen again. In Washington, the Administration is pressing for quick action on legislation to give the Government additional authority through the FPC, to bring about more reliable operation of the nation's electric systems.

Although the industry contends that the evident dangers of an intertie system do not outweigh its advantages, in terms of safety and operating economies, the public is beginning to wonder whether it is not true that the bigger they are, the harder they fall.

Plainly a close look at the whole intertie theory is needed. Present agitation for protection against failures ought not to be used as an excuse for new strictures in an industry heavily regulated already. But if the industry can't find answers on its own, the public well may figure that tighter Federal control is worth a try.

A large group of investor-owned companies for years has been conducting an advertising campaign assuring consumers that there is an abundance of electricity and always will be. To the consumers told by the FPC that their electric supply is at the mercy of squirrels, that scarcely is assurance enough.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I mourn the passing of my dear friend, J. Arthur Younger, of California, on the 20th of June of this year. He was a fine man and a conscientious and hard-working Member of this House.

Born in Albany, Oreg., he moved with his family to Kirkland, Wash., when he was an 11-year-old boy. There he attended public schools and later was graduated from the University of Washington at Seattle in 1915. He remained at the university as graduate manager of athletics until he answered his country's call in 1917.

He served in France with the 48th Coast Artillery Corps and was promoted to the rank of captain before his release from active duty in 1919. Until 1930 he was vice president, director, and manager of the mortgage loan department of the Seattle Title Trust Co. At that time he became president of the Seattle Mortgage Loan Co. and served until 1934. He then came to the District of Columbia where from 1935 to 1937 he was assistant appraisal adviser and chief of the savings and loan division of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Moving to the San Francisco Bay area in 1937, he became vice president of the Citizens' Federal Savings & Loan Association of San Francisco. He was the friend of thousands in San Mateo where he made his home. He devoted his time and energies to the San Francisco Boys' Club as one of its directors; and he was chairman of the international relations section of the Commonwealth Club of California.

His career in real estate finance extended to positions of leadership in both State and national realty organizations. He was vice chairman of the operations committee of the National Savings & Loan League and a member of the executive council of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

He was elected to the House of Representatives in the 83d Congress and eventually became the second-ranking Republican on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. At the time of his death, he was the ranking Republican on the Commerce Subcommittee concerned with communications. He was a dedicated worker in committee. Banker though he was, banker's hours were utterly unfamiliar to him.

A bill which he introduced as a very junior Member is regarded as having been the origin of the idea from whence came eventually the Department of Housing and Urban Development. His bill called for a Cabinet-level Department of Urbiculture, as he termed it, to which were to be assigned many of the problems concerning the well-being of citydwellers.

At the time he introduced his bill, he said:

The rapidly changing social scene makes this department necessary, and what if anything is done about it will probably depend on how much backbone urban people show in demanding more voice and more help in the solution of their problems.

He had plenty of backbone himself and his disappointment was apparent when he detected a lack of it in others. Here in this House which he served so well and with such distinction we shall miss his calmness under pressure, his amiably firm convictions, his absolute integrity, and his selfless friendship.

PRIDE RATHER THAN PROFIT IN TELEVISION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as you and many of my distinguished colleagues in the House know one of my most important projects in my congressional career has been and continues to be the creation of educational broadcasting, and presently I have a bill H.R. 6845 before this Congress.

The airwaves of this Nation are a tremendous resource, and should be used to their maximum potential. Television's failure to even approach excellence—the excellence we feel we have a right to expect and enjoy—in programming has taught a lesson to those who value human interests. We must establish television for an audience of people who function more than merely as buyers or sellers.

The airwaves of our Nation can be used as conveyors of America's great cultural heritage and can stimulate the future cultural flowering of our great American Nation is going to have.

We must use television and radio to create a better informed, culturally enriched public, who will be able to carry on with the American ideals of excellence and greatness.

Mr. Speaker, for the edification of my colleagues and anyone who may read this RECORD, I insert the testimony I gave before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, whose members are doing a thorough and excellent study of this great benefit to future generations of Americans:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you very much for the privilege of being here today, and also for the gracious privilege you accorded me to be here yesterday. I regretted that, on account of an important meeting of the Rules Committee, I was not able to be here at that time.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the able chairman of this committee for his unusual farsightedness, and also for introducing H.R. 6736, the bill on

this subject, and also for realizing the need for hearings on this matter of such great consequence to the American people, and for the fine and comprehensive manner in which you are studying this subject. This is characteristic of the high quality of excellence on the part of the distinguished chairman and this committee.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have long been active, as many of you have been, in trying to give educational television a foothold in our great Nation. I always feel that I would be remiss in the performance of a duty if I did not publicly express my gratitude, and I believe the gratitude of the Congress and the country, to a great, gracious, and gallant lady, Mrs. Freda Henneck. She was a member of the Federal Communications Commission many years ago and she gallantly, valiantly and finally, after many obstacles, successfully established through the policy of the Federal Communications Commission the educational television facility that we enjoy, the channels that have been set apart for educational television in our country today.

I have also been active in my county in the establishment and support of educational television, which has one of the finest educational television stations in Florida. We like to think it compares favorably with any in the Nation.

We have five educational television channels, facilities, in our State today and we are very proud of them. A little while ago I met in Jacksonville a representative of this industry and taped a 30-minute recording which was played over these five stations of ours. We are very proud of them in Florida.

We have had an opportunity to sense the potential of educational television. That is one of the reasons I am here today, to support the distinguished chairman's bill. I introduced one that is a companion bill to it. I would like to do everything I can to progress the great cause of educational television.

Some of us were saying a moment ago, before the hearing began, "Why couldn't the school children be taught Caesar's campaigns on television rather than reading them out of a book?" I said, "Why couldn't the travels of Marco Polo be engagingly and intriguingly presented not only to the school children but also to the adult population? Why isn't the seizure of Troy just as exciting as Bonanza, the Lone Ranger or a lot of other things that have their place, perhaps, but not regarded, I think, as the classics of our civilization?"

We all realize that individual broadcasting stations are not enough.

By the way, I think of educational television as, in one sense, having the capacity to bring the great libraries and the great museums of our country, for example, into the classroom and into the home. You have to go down to the library, you have to go to the museum, to see a lot of the things that you should be able to see by just turning a dial on your television station. The school children could see them in their school rooms by having it brought to them.

Toward this end, in order to support the distinguished chairman's bill, I have introduced a companion bill, H.R. 6945. I was the first witness to appear at the hearings held by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and was pleased to introduce the legislation, the purpose of which is to carry out the great program recommended by the President and so strongly supported by the chairman and this committee, to continue and sustain educational television and radio programs.

I also adamantly supported the Senate amendments which put safeguards into the bill, mainly by ordering the creation of a private corporation "to facilitate the development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford

maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control."

The swift speed with which the Senate approved the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 gives weight to my long-held theory that quality television and radio is not an impossible ideal. In fact, the only recent critics of the public television bill are those who hold unfounded fears of propaganda takeover.

I inserted an article by Lester Markel, the Associate Editor of The New York Times, in the Congressional Record of June 19, 1967. In this article, Mr. Markel states that, "... Congress must be educated to the importance of public television and to the vital need of assuring its independence." He continues by saying that the basic fear of a Government-supported medium being used for propaganda purposes is canceled out by the well established example of the BBC.

I share Mr. Markel's views and sincerely believe that the corporation established for public broadcasting can and will act independently of strong Government interference. In fact, the hearings held before the Senate on this bill revealed the necessity of keeping news programs free of public funds. This idea has been readily accepted and proves to the critics that independence in public television will be encouraged and will be preserved.

It has long been believed that the air waves are a valuable public property and that, therefore, the Government has the right to enforce certain terms or conditions. This would require the broadcasters to perform a sufficient amount of public service or present shows of artistic taste. Anyone who has watched a sampling of television recently can give witness to the fact that no quality guide now exists; that is, one not high enough, I think most of us feel, to meet the criteria that Americans should require and expect.

On the contrary, television has become such a big business that the profit-making motive involved in a television show far outweighs the quality motive.

Television's failure to even approach excellence—the excellence we feel we have a right to expect and enjoy—in programming has taught a lesson to those who value human interests. We must establish television for an audience of people who function more than merely as buyers or sellers.

It has been said that "the marketplace is a necessary and desirable way of regulating a great deal of our economic activity. But that does not mean the marketplace should regulate everything." I believe that some of the most important things in life—education, artistic creation, friendship, religion, for example—cannot and must not have a price.

It seems the only way to guarantee that these important things in life can preserve and flourish is to make certain that they will not be wholly controlled by the profit makers. We have tried to achieve this liberation by keeping the schools and universities, scientific and artistic institutes, churches, libraries, museums, and parks apart from the world of business and the marketplace.

And to those who still argue that this cannot be done, I would like to quote a famous American author who said, "There are all the churches and schools and libraries in Christianity to testify to the absurdity of such an idea."

But let us approach this problem of public broadcasting from a different tack. I have recently been in contact with the Educational Television Stations Division of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters. They have furnished me with a report which reviews the Carnegie Commission's report, "Public Television, A Program for Action," and also makes suggestions for further action in increasing the scope and range of educational television.

The heart of educational television broadcasting is the individual station license. Strengthening of local stations should include operations and occur as a result of local

needs. Every effort must be made to increase the number of educational stations.

The main thesis of their report is that "Public television funds should be insulated, independent, and as far as possible, diversified."

Educational television has a tremendous potential in this country if it is allowed to grow and mature. Mr. Chairman, I am sure you and I share the same conviction: that our support of an expanded program of educational television and radio is not in any sense of the word intended to disparage or to discount or in any way to minimize or to reduce, or impair, the splendid private television and radio system that we have in this country.

It is, rather, to supplement it with programs where the principal emphasis is the public satisfaction, the public education and the public need which might not perhaps sustain a profitable operation in the rendition of that particular kind of service.

But if it is left entirely, this great educational radio and television potential, this marvel of the age, if it is left entirely in the hands of the profit makers, it will be squashed like a bug underfoot.

Incentive and profit are the great driving forces behind American life—and they must be protected and supported—but they should not be allowed to be the main stimuli to our cultural flowering and dissemination.

It is with all this in mind that I cannot but urge your support of the Public Broadcasting Act, for in doing so, you will be laying the groundwork for a more informed, culturally enriched American population.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to gather a broader based support for this legislation, I have been keeping the various educators and businessmen of my State advised as to the progress of this legislation. When advising them of the hearings, I suggested that they may want to make a comment to your honorable committee on the need for this legislation, and would like now to submit for the committee's information their replies for insertion into the official record of these hearings.

The first of those is from the very able State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Florida, the Honorable Floyd T. Christian, by letter, dated July 6, 1967.

Another one is by an outstanding businessman in Tampa, Florida, Mr. William P. Wallace, who has taken for a long period of time a very strong interest in the development of educational TV.

There are two additional statements by the very able director of the Division of Educational Resources of the University of South Florida, at Tampa, Mr. G. C. Eichholz.

I would like to have these included in your record.

I commend you again, Mr. Chairman, and I want to help in every way I can in the great work you are doing in support of this bill.

THE CHAIRMAN. I want to commend you for your fine statement, Mr. Pepper. I want to say that I have always found you to be on the side of those things which help to build America into a stronger and better nation. I thank you again.

MR. PEPPER. I am glad to work with the distinguished chairman and your fine committee in this effort.

THE CHAIRMAN. Thank you for giving us your time this morning.

WE SHALL OVERCOME

MR. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, let it not be whispered that the Democratic Party is dying in Florida. Although temporarily its specter may haunt certain hallowed public offices, soon it will be reincarnated.

I have had some recent correspondence from a registered Democrat of my district who was offered the wonderful chance of becoming a national sustaining member of the Republican Party, and although this is an excellent organization he voiced some disdain at their efforts.

I am reminded of the story "Snow White" in which the wicked witch asked her mirror—"Mirror, mirror on the wall, who's the fairest of them all?" and she was answered, "You are no longer the fairest one of all." Well, colleagues, for us the mirror is our constituency, and so I say, Republicans take heed.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this correspondence of my constituent and my reply at this point in the RECORD:

MIAMI, FLA.,
July 5, 1967.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLAUDE: Enclosed please find a copy of my answer along with a letter I received from the G.O.P. this morning.

I shall always find time to do all I can in any way I can to support You or any other candidate for office that has proven that he is a true representative of the people.

I need not tell you how much you are respected and admired here in your Home district. You have earned the respect and admiration of your constituents by your Honesty and Integrity and Statesmanship.

I don't know if you can make any use of this letter but if you can you are welcome to it.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD H. RAABE,
Vice President, Lodge 801 B.R.T.

JULY 12, 1967.

Mr. EDWARD H. RAABE,
Vice President, Lodge 801 B.R.T.,
Miami, Fla.

DEAR EDWARD: Your letter of July 5 was one of the most heartwarming I have received and I thank you very, very much for the kind sentiments you express concerning my public service.

And I have noted with great pleasure your reply to the letter from Chairman Clay of the National Sustaining Program for the Republican Party Headquarters. Your answer is inspired and I am proud of your writing as you did and I know the Democratic Party would be equally proud of the fine spirit you have shown. I am glad you gave me permission to make use of the letter and will save it for an appropriate spot where it will do the most good.

Every good wish to you, and
Believe me,

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—I am putting your letter in the Congressional Record and will send you a copy.
C. P.

NATIONAL SUSTAINING PROGRAM FOR
REPUBLICAN PARTY HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: "We can't afford to miff the opportunity of 1968." That's the

sentiment expressed over and over again by Republicans here in Washington . . . and it's probably the view of your GOP friends, too.

That's why I've put this letter to you high on my list of priority projects. I would be remiss if I didn't invite you to become a Sustaining Member of Republican Headquarters—for just \$10—in this important pre-election year.

Your support can help the GOP recapture the reins of our nation's destiny . . . move the country another giant step toward re-establishing two party government . . . and get the government back on some sensible system of financing and spending.

The Democrat budget calls for expenditures of \$370 million every day in the year . . . \$15.4 million every hour! Spending at this rate staggers the imagination. But it's even worse when you consider what it means in terms of your annual tax bite.

If you are like most Americans, your biggest expense every year is the federal income tax. Yet your payment slips through the government's fingers in a twinkling of an eye. And taxes will go even higher if we don't bring a halt to this fiscal extravagance.

The only hope is for Republicans to join forces, to strengthen the Party from top to bottom and push forward from the success already attained. The Sustaining Fund is vital to laying the foundation for victory—in your own state and across the country. It is our most effective financial resource for building solid, election-winning programs . . . and by joining now, you contribute mightily toward the drive for Republican success in 1968.

May we count on your support at this critical time? Please take just a moment to sign and return the enclosed form along with your check for \$10.

Sincerely,

LUCIUS D. CLAY.

P.S.—As a Sustaining Member, you'll be kept in close touch with Party news through your monthly issues of the Republican. Also, we'll send you your official membership card, registering you as a concerned and active member of the Party.

Mr. LUCIUS D. CLAY,
National Sustaining Program, Republican
Party Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you so much for your undated letter, and the honor you wish to bestow upon me, as you probably know we now have a Republican Governor, and Two Republican Senators in our State. And that is Three too many.

I am a working man and am proud to pay my share of Tax to pay for the operation of my government, and as long as a Democratic party remains in office I will be able to Pay My share. You see I am old enough to remember Herbert Hoover, and I won't allow a Hoover Vacuum Cleaner in my home.

It is my opinion that this country is getting along just fine under the Democratic Party, and as you point out the budget calls for the expenditure of \$370 Million each day, I say Thank God we've got it. Under the Republicans we wouldn't have it to spend.

There has never been a time in history that there hasn't been an increase in unemployment when the grasping old party was in office.

Thank you again for your offer, but even though I disagree with President Johnson, I would rather have him, Adam Clayton Powell, or even a member of the Mafia running this country than to have another Republican in office.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD H. RAABE,
A registered Democrat.

THE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. KIRWAN—AN OUTSTANDING STATESMAN

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I am prompted in part by a recent article in Reader's Digest which, in typical fashion, scathingly attacked the integrity of the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, our distinguished colleague from the great State of Ohio, and my own admiration and friendship for this outstanding statesman, to let it be known in the strongest possible terms that I consider this irresponsible smear to be completely indigestible to me and others in possession of the facts.

During my years of service as a Member of the Congress, I have come to know MIKE KIRWAN as a great and honorable man in all respects. No one with a grain of commonsense can deny the distinguished service he has rendered to his constituents, to the great State of Ohio and to our Nation as a whole. No single Member of the Congress has done more for the Commonwealth of Kentucky than has MIKE KIRWAN. The close association I have had with him over a period of years will always remain with me as one of my treasured experiences in public life. He has earned and will always have my respect and esteem.

FIGHTING AT LESS THAN MAXIMUM CAPACITY

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, amidst talk of an escalation of American fighting in Vietnam, of sending additional American troops to that embattled land, there are disturbing and repeated reports that the Army of South Vietnam, although fighting harder than many Americans realize, is nevertheless fighting at less than maximum capability.

The South Vietnamese Army must be revitalized as part of any plan to send additional U.S. troops to Vietnam. We cannot and should not take over the unlimited defense of a land that is not making the greatest possible contribution to its own self-preservation.

One of our Government's justifications for its worldwide military aid program is the contribution the foreign officer training program makes to internal stability, but it is this very program which has been such a failure in Vietnam.

When the U.S. military effort in Vietnam was stepped up in mid-1966, the participation of the South Vietnamese

military in combat declined. As U.S. casualties increased, those of South Vietnam decreased. A significant, but undisclosed, percentage of South Vietnam's 700,000-man Armed Forces has been reported to be stationed in urban garrisons, rear areas, or regions of light enemy opposition.

Under the 1967 campaign plan for Vietnam, the United States has primary responsibility for operations against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Army regular forces. The South Vietnamese Army was charged with securing areas which American forces have searched and cleared. They have fallen short of our hopes and expectations in this job as well.

The South Vietnamese Army has not been trained in the tactics needed to provide village security against guerrilla attacks. Their officers are mainly city dwellers, without knowledge of the terrain required for effective action against night attacks by the Vietcong. The average soldier is discouraged by poor pay, lack of motivation and emotional identification with his government, few opportunities for advancement, war weariness, and inadequate artillery and air support. He is stationed far from home, and is often utterly unconcerned with the welfare of the peasants he is there to protect.

There is not sufficient American forces to hold and secure the areas which our soldiers have searched and cleared. Unless the South Vietnamese Army is geared up to play its part, the Vietnamese war efforts will be off balance, and the full impact of the American sacrifice will be blunted. Even if American search and destroy tactics succeed without South Vietnamese help, guerrilla warfare could continue for many years, and will demand more active South Vietnamese participation.

What can be done to improve this situation? These are some suggestions: A massive and concentrated retraining program for South Vietnamese officers must begin immediately, especially for field and combat officers. The United States must insist that the less competent be weeded out. Retraining must emphasize guerrilla and jungle warfare; there has been too much emphasis in the past on techniques for massive operations.

South Vietnamese soldiers with fighting ability must be promoted to officer rank. Educational requirements should not be so stiff that only the wealthy, and often incompetent, can qualify for stripes.

Further improvements should be made in the pay and living conditions of the South Vietnamese soldier. Special effort must be made to station troops closer to their homes so that they will have some attachment to what they are defending—if not to their Government, at least to their hamlet and family.

It is a distressing fact that a number of South Vietnam's elite battalions are stationed in the area around Saigon to protect present rulers from dangers of a coup, rather than out in the thick of battle to protect the nation from Communists. These "coup divisions" must be

moved into the field, where they can fight. Their desertion rate now is high because they are serving so far from home.

A start should be made at integrating Vietnamese units with American units. This may help pick up their fighting spirit, and give them training in what effective operations involve.

Revitalization of the South Vietnamese Army is not the only improvement that should be made in Vietnam, but it is by no means an insignificant one. Without it, prospects for an early reduction in the American involvement in Vietnam must remain dim.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE MERCHANT MARINE SUBCOMMITTEE, JULY 12, 1967, IN SUPPORT OF AN INDEPENDENT MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to testify before the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in favor of my bill, H.R. 931, on July 12, 1967.

This is most important legislation. If we are to again have a thriving merchant marine in this country—if we are to continue the tradition of the sea which helped make this country great—we must have an independent maritime administration.

The following is my testimony to that effect before the Merchant Marine Subcommittee:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee and give you my views.

I thank you and your fellow committee members for the opportunity to testify today on H.R. 159 and companion bills to create an independent Maritime Administration.

As one of the more than 100 Members who have sponsored companion bills to H.R. 159, I welcome this opportunity to set forth my views in support of an independent Maritime Administration. My bill is H.R. 931.

Any struggle for independence is difficult, and the maritime industry's struggle is no exception.

A few days ago the American people celebrated the anniversary of this nation's declaration of independence from foreign domination. In many respects parallels can be drawn between that struggle of long ago and the current battle facing the maritime industry of this country.

In 1776 the American patriots realized that this country was too big and too important to be governed as merely part of a whole which eventually became the British Empire. The needs of America and its people were being neglected and ignored. The needs of Americans were being subjugated to the needs of England.

Mr. Chairman, as you will recognize, the American maritime industry faces a similar situation now. Today, in 1967, the needs of American shipbuilders, American ship operators, and American seamen are being neglected and ignored.

Today the American maritime industry, which extends the influence of the United States across the seas and carries this nation's flag to the far corners of the earth is being governed as part of a whole.

The maritime industry of the United States is too big and too important to be submerged within the Department of Commerce or any other Government department. Maritime needs an agency of its own, with its own budget.

The problems of this industry are too complex and diverse to be handled on a part-time basis—they need full-time consideration.

Let us consider for a moment the multifaceted importance of the maritime industry to our country.

Ships carry the products of American factories to foreign markets and return to this country with the raw materials and foreign goods which make possible the American standard of living. Ships comprise an integral link in the supply and distribution phase of our economic life.

Obviously, it is not feasible to carry a thousand tons of ore, a million barrels of petroleum, or a million bushels of wheat by airplane. We must have ships to do these jobs efficiently.

In wartime, ships form an integral part of our national defense. Ships carry the soldiers and material to fight wars in foreign lands. Ships carry the food and raw material needed by our allies and by our own industry and people.

In wartime, without merchant ships, this nation would face defeat. We are big, and we are powerful, but we are not self-sufficient. In today's highly industrialized world, no country is.

The production of ships—like any heavy industry—forms a vital part of our economic balance. Every one of the 50 States produces at least one item, and some produce 25 or more, all of which are needed to build a merchant ship.

For every man employed in American shipyards, a job is created for another man in industries supplying materials for shipbuilding.

The more ships we build here at home, the more jobs we create throughout our economy, the more consumer incomes we create, and the more tax dollars we generate.

Like ripples spreading on the surface of a pond, the importance of maritime pervades our entire economic complex.

The man in a West Virginia coal mine may not realize it, but maritime touches him.

Maritime touches the Kansas wheat farmer, too, and the Detroit auto worker, and the California electrician.

Maritime touches all of us, whether in the imported shoes we wear, the special services we provide, or the newspaper we read.

Mr. Chairman, this is the reason maritime is too big and too important not to be given its own agency, its own voice, its own freedom.

Today the maritime industry's voice is lost in the clamor of the Department of Commerce; its cries of need are not heard.

Certainly maritime is a vital part of the nation's commerce, but it is more than just that.

Certain maritime is a vital part of the nation's transportation network, but it is more than just that.

Maritime is commerce, industry, transportation, and national defense all rolled into one, and the problems posed by these diverse roles can only be properly dealt with by a separate and independent agency for maritime and maritime alone.

I urge this committee to resist pressures

to give maritime anything less than it deserves—complete independent status.

In 1936 Congress in its wisdom gave maritime independent status. In the pressure of demands following World War II, the wisdom of that action was forgotten, and maritime lost its independence.

The members of this committee are friends of the maritime industry, and these hearings on independent maritime status are the products of wise and far-seeing action.

I, too, am a friend of the maritime industry, and I pledge my support to the passage of H.R. 159 before this session of the 90th Congress adjourns.

May I indicate that Chairman Celler, whom you have just heard, is not only the dean of the House, as already indicated, and the dean of the New York State delegation, but is also Chairman of the Steering Committee of the Congressional delegation from the State of New York, made up of the 41 Members of Congress from the State of New York, and when he talked here today, as already indicated by Mr. Grover, he is talking I believe for the 41 Members of both Parties from New York State.

There is no point in my reiterating some of the points he has already made. May I make this further statement:

There has always been an effort by departments which are Cabinet departments to absorb or to keep within their jurisdiction other departments which well could be independent agencies.

I have in mind the Small Business Administration. At one time a Small Business agency was part of the Department of Commerce, and the fight all through the years was to keep Small Business problems within the Department of Commerce, despite the fact that there, they too, were treated as step children.

As you all know, for many years now the Small Business Administration has been set up by the Congress by legislation as an independent agency. Nevertheless, Commerce all through those years has sought to absorb that agency back into Commerce.

There has not been a Secretary of Commerce in all the years I have been here, which goes back to 1947, members of both Parties, that did not attempt to make the Small Business Administration a part of Commerce again, and to destroy its independence.

We have had to resist that, just as now you must again try to reinstate the independence of the Merchant Marine as an independent agency of Government.

Commerce will again oppose that. I think one of the reasons that they can probably get the ear of the President more readily than others is because they sit in Cabinet meetings with the President. I do believe, as has already been indicated, that when the President sees that the will of the Congress is that this be an independent agency, because it is the best thing for the country, for the best interests of all of the country, he, too, will go along with this bill, which I trust this committee will bring to the floor of the House very shortly, to restore to this agency its independence. It can go forward then as an independent agency to do the full job that must be done for our merchant marine.

LET OEO GO ON

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the Cleveland Plain Dealer in calling attention to the thoughtful and timely presentation by my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, CHARLES VANIK, before the House Committee on Education and Labor recently.

Congressman VANIK is a distinguished Member of the House and brings to his work an insight and determination which every one of his colleagues admires. We have come to expect of him the incisiveness and concern he recently displayed before the Education and Labor Committee. Speaking out against those who would retreat on the war on poverty by disbanding the Office of Economic Opportunity, he said:

It is no longer feasible or rational to demand the disbanding and destruction of an important agency which serves to coordinate and to assist on a unifying basis those thousands in my district and millions throughout the country submerged in the mire of poverty and despair.

Congressman VANIK called particular attention to the special needs of the large numbers of poor in urban areas:

Those of us Members of Congress representing urban areas with high levels of need cannot countenance any further dilution of the vital programs being carried on through the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, Representative CHARLES VANIK is not only a compelling advocate for the poor among his constituents, he is also a man who sees clearly how well the national interest will be served when those who are poor in America are finally helped to self-sufficiency.

I know my colleagues will be interested to read the following article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

LET OEO GO ON, VANIK PLEADS AT HOUSE HEARING

(By Robert J. Havel)

WASHINGTON.—Efforts to destroy the command post of the poverty war are not rational, Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D-21, said yesterday.

Vanik testified before the House Education and Labor Committee, which is considering amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Republicans and some Democrats favor transferring the antipoverty programs from Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity to other departments, thus abolishing OEO.

"It is no longer feasible or rational," Vanik said, "to demand the disbanding and destruction of an important agency which serves to coordinate and to assist on a unifying basis those thousands in my district and millions throughout the country submerged in the mire of poverty and despair." Vanik's congressional district includes the Hough area.

"Those of us members of Congress representing urban areas with high levels of need cannot countenance any further dilution of the vital programs being carried on through the Office of Economic Opportunity," he said.

Vanik then endorsed two proposals new to the OEO effort.

One would provide funds for on-the-job training for out-of-school youths in private industry.

"Private employers must be brought more closely in touch with the national effort to develop employability among our inner-city

and rural disadvantaged youth," Vanik said. "Such employment efforts should not be left to the public sector alone."

The second proposal would increase the maximum allowable income of those eligible for inclusion in antipoverty programs. The current limit is \$3,200 a year to a family.

"Five thousand dollars per annum in my community of Cleveland is a poverty level for a family of four," Vanik said.

"Yet the children from those families are in another world unable to benefit from these vital employment efforts, like Neighborhood Youth Corps, and are as well unable to benefit from any other means of gainful employment."

"These young people are left out with no recourse but to deal with the problem of having too much time on their hands."

In Hough and similar poverty areas, Vanik said, more than 50% of the youths are in the "terrible bind" of being from families \$200, \$300 or \$400 over the maximum income level.

More than 500 youths were rejected this year in Cleveland by Neighborhood Youth Corps solely because their families were a few hundred dollars over the maximum-income limit, Vanik said.

About 11,000 persons are participating in the major OEO education and training programs in Cleveland. Of the approximately \$60 million allocated to Ohio by OEO, more than a third goes to Cleveland's 20th and 21st Congressional Districts.

JOB CORPS WOMEN GET INVOLVED

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a heroic deed performed by two young ladies from my district in Brooklyn, N.Y., who are making a better future for themselves at the Cleveland, Ohio, Job Corps Center for Women.

Carol Vincent of 426 Baltic Street and Wanda Martinez of 91 Luquer Street in Brooklyn, went to the rescue of a woman who was being attacked by three men and were instrumental in the capture of the men. Too often I think we hear stories of misbehavior by Job Corpsmen being given wide publicity, and it is heartening to hear of acts by corpsmembers to actually prevent crime. We are all very concerned about the rising crime rate in the Nation and here we have an example of two young women—private citizens—who took an active part in crime prevention. I include the following article about their efforts which appeared in the Corpsman newspaper of June 15:

CORPSWOMEN RESCUE VICTIM OF NIGHT STREET ATTACK

In the past few years there have been many incidents all over the country in which people have stood by and watched while a crime took place. These people did not help the victim or call the police, and an innocent person usually suffered.

One night recently in Cleveland, Ohio, three teen-age hoods attacked a woman on a dark street. It was their bad luck to be spotted by Wanda Martinez and Carol Vin-

cent. These two Cleveland (Ohio) Corpswomen rushed in, saved the woman, sent two of the thugs running and held the other one until the police came. The two that got away were soon caught, and, thanks to the quick thinking and courage of the two young Corpswomen, a crime was prevented.

Both Wanda and Carol are from Brooklyn, New York. Wanda, who is 18, is studying to be a reproduction clerk, and 20-year-old Carol plans to become a psychiatric nurse.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith, for the information of

Members and others interested, current tabulations showing in summary form the status of the appropriations business of the session.

HOUSE ACTIONS

Including the new transportation appropriation bill as reported from committee, budget requests for appropriations of some \$128.6 billion at this session in 12 bills have been reduced in the House by \$3,227,448,998.

Upwards of \$20 billion—roughly—of additional appropriation requests are yet to be reported in appropriation bills dealing with public works, military construction, foreign assistance, and the closing supplemental bill.

The public works appropriation bill has been awaiting clearance of the annual authorizing bill for the Atomic Energy Commission, just recently enacted, and is now scheduled to be reported to the House later this week. The other appropriation bills hinge almost

entirely on annual authorization legislation not yet reported or enacted.

SENATE ACTIONS

The Senate has considered six appropriation bills during the session, involving budget requests for appropriations of some \$28.9 billion and in summary, has gone above the appropriation budget requests by \$1,565,765,814. This is brought about by the fact that the Senate added slightly over \$2 billion to the House amounts in the agriculture appropriation bill. That bill is pending in conference.

FINAL ACTIONS

Four appropriation bills have cleared Congress this session—two supplementals for fiscal 1967 and two regular annual bills for fiscal 1968. They appropriate \$23,322,940,767, a sum \$283,899,885 below the corresponding budget requests.

Mr. Speaker, I include two tables—a summarization of the totals and a listing by individual bills:

Summary of action on budget estimates of "appropriations" in appropriation bills, 90th Cong., 1st sess., as of July 17, 1967

[Does not include any "back door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations ¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

All figures are rounded amounts			
	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered.....	\$14,411,000,000	²² \$114,196,000,000	\$128,607,000,000
2. Amounts in 12 bills passed by House.....	14,238,000,000	²² 111,141,000,000	125,379,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests.....	-173,000,000	-3,055,000,000	-3,228,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered.....	14,533,000,000	14,371,000,000	28,904,000,000
2. Amounts in 6 bills passed by Senate.....	14,457,000,000	16,013,000,000	30,470,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests.....	-76,000,000	+1,642,000,000	+1,566,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 6 bills.....	+219,000,000	+2,150,000,000	+2,369,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered.....	14,533,000,000	9,074,000,000	23,607,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 4 bills enacted.....	14,394,000,000	8,929,000,000	23,323,000,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests.....	-139,000,000	-145,000,000	-284,000,000

¹ Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968.

² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget,

\$980,000,000; House, \$925,000,000). Also includes transportation bill as reported from committee.

³ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Total authorizations requested in budget, \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$700,000,000.

Summary of action on budget estimates of "appropriations" in appropriation bills, 90th Cong., 1st sess., as of July 17, 1967

[Does not include any "back door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations ¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates considered by House	Passed House	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	(+) or (-), latest action compared to budget
Bills for fiscal 1968:						
Treasury-Post Office.....	\$7,613,787,000	\$7,499,230,000	\$7,615,148,000	\$7,555,167,000	\$7,545,641,000	-\$69,507,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal payments.....	63,499,000	59,499,000				-4,000,000
Federal loan appropriation.....	49,600,000	48,100,000				-1,500,000
Interior.....	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550	1,382,848,350	-75,369,650
Loan and contract authorizations.....	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(16,200,000)	-(14,500,000)
Independent Offices-HUD.....	²² 10,804,642,700	²² 10,013,178,782				-791,463,918
Contract authorization.....	(40,000,000)					-(40,000,000)
Labor-HEW.....	²³ 13,322,603,000	²³ 13,137,488,000				-185,115,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	²⁴ 2,342,942,000	²⁴ 2,194,026,500				-148,915,500
Legislative.....	231,311,132	228,089,952	276,005,210	275,885,804		-119,406
Agriculture.....	²⁵ 5,021,097,400	²⁵ 4,770,580,950	²⁵ 5,021,097,400	²⁵ 6,782,529,789		+1,761,432,389
Loan authorization.....	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(909,000,000)		-(49,400,000)
Defense.....	71,584,000,000	70,295,200,000				-1,288,800,000
Transportation.....	1,718,618,772	²⁶ 1,530,198,372				-188,420,400
Public works.....	²⁷ (4,867,813,000)					
Military construction.....	²⁸ (2,937,000,000)					
Foreign assistance.....	²⁹ (3,818,736,000)					
Supplemental (NASA, poverty, other deferred items; usual supplementals).....	(*)					
Subtotal, 1968 bills.....	114,195,894,004	111,140,901,706	14,370,468,610	16,012,942,143	8,928,489,350	-991,778,485
Supplementals for fiscal 1967:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam).....	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,196,520,000	-79,350,000
2d supplemental.....	2,134,932,833	2,041,826,133	2,257,604,652	2,260,246,933	2,197,931,417	-59,673,235
Subtotal, 1967 bills.....	14,410,802,833	14,238,346,133	14,533,474,652	14,456,766,933	14,394,451,417	-139,023,235

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of action on budget estimates of "appropriations" in appropriation bills, 90th Cong., 1st sess., as of July 17, 1967—Continued

[Does not include any "back door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates considered by House	Passed House	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	(+) or (-), latest action compared to budget
Cumulative "appropriation" totals for the session:						
House (12 bills)	128,606,696,837	125,379,247,839	28,903,943,262	30,469,709,076		-3,227,448,998
Senate (6 bills)			23,606,840,652			+1,565,765,814
Enacted (4 bills)					23,322,940,767	-283,899,885

¹ Permanent "appropriations" were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968. (All forms of permanent "new obligatory authority" for 1968 were tentatively estimated in the January budget at \$17,452,899,000).

² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget \$980,000,000; House bill, \$925,000,000).

³ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Independent Offices-HUD, \$3,235,000,000 in budget estimates and \$881,000,000 in House bill; Labor-HEW, \$115,000,000 in budget estimates

and House bill; State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, \$150,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill; Agriculture, \$800,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill, \$700,000,000 in Senate bill. Total authorizations requested in budget, \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$700,000,000.

⁴ As reported from committee.

⁵ These are the amounts presently pending consideration in the committee.

⁶ Several billion.

DIPLOMACY FOR GUNBOATS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1903, American naval vessels appeared off the harbor at Colon to facilitate a revolution against the Government of Colombia. The American interest was not in the grievances of the revolutionaries, but in the possibility of securing control of the area in which the proposed Panama Canal was to be built.

The Colombian intervention was symbolic of a period in which the United States intervened freely and frequently in Latin American affairs.

But the era of gunboat diplomacy has been over for many years. Today, the Alliance for Progress, not the big stick, is the rule in relations between the United States and our neighbors to the south.

The newly negotiated treaties between the United States and Panama concerning the future of the Panama Canal are as indicative of the new day in relations with Latin America as gunboats were of the old.

A recent editorial in the Detroit Free Press points, quite correctly, I believe, to the responsibility of American conduct in renegotiating our agreements with the Panamanians. The editorial notes that a cooperative attitude concerning the canal is in the best interest of both the United States and Panama.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the editorial to the attention of our colleagues and include it at this point in the Record:

DIPLOMACY FOR GUNBOATS

An agreement on new treaties governing control of the Panama Canal and a possible new sea-level canal has been announced jointly by President Johnson and President Marco A. Robles of Panama.

The basic lines of the agreement are designed to insure that the canal will be open at all times to ships of all nations while defusing some of the anti-American feelings which led to the 1964 riots. The U.S. recognizes that the canal is on "Panamanian soil." The canal would be operated by a joint U.S.-Panama authority. The agreement seeks an orderly political, social and economic integration of the Canal Zone and the rest of Panama.

These proposed changes are concessions by the U.S. The present 64-year-old treaty gives our country sovereignty over the 10-mile-wide zone "in perpetuity." But the present treaty is a vestigial pact drawn in the era of gunboat diplomacy.

Our nation's interest in the canal—that it be open to our ships and that it not be controlled by any future enemies—can no longer be secured by an antiquated treaty, by policing a barbed wire corridor through another nation, by sustaining a double standard of American prosperity against a backdrop of Panamanian poverty or by continuing to impose our will on a smaller neighbor.

The new treaties seek to replace these conditions with a cooperative arrangement which will protect U.S. interests while at the same time increasing Panama's share in control and profits of the canal. These protections are vital.

In the world's other hemisphere, we have seen how Egypt seized control of the Suez Canal and, by closing the canal to Israeli ships, turned its control of one of the world's essential waterways into a weapon of its foreign policy.

The long-term solution must involve agreements worked out through the United Nations to internationalize the world's essential tradeways. But until that goal is achieved, the U.S. will be wise to build its interests in the Panama Canal, not on hostility, but on a sense of fairness which recognizes that gunboat agreements should be changed.

S.S. "HOPE"

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the article "Seven Years of Hope" in the Saturday Review of July 15, 1967. Sponsored by the People-to-People Health Foundation, the hospital ship *Hope* is currently on her seventh and most successful year as American ambassador of understanding and good will among our less fortunate neighbors. Since 1960 Project Hope has trained over 3,450 doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel and has treated over a million people on three continents. Her efforts have done much to prove the sincerity and compassion of individual Americans as well as promote a spirit of friendship and rapport between the recipient countries and

their American well-wishers. As citizens of America we are truly proud of the good ship *Hope*.

With unanimous consent, I insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SEVEN YEARS OF "HOPE"

She costs \$5,000,000 a year to operate—less than the price of one jet bomber. More than 8,450 major operations have been performed aboard her and some 100,000 persons treated. When she goes to a port she stays in the harbor for ten months, a symbol of America's concern for suffering. She is manned by men in white, not khaki, and perhaps her greatest accomplishment is the training of 3,450 local doctors and nurses in the latest techniques—sometimes fifty years in advance of theirs. Her name is the S.S. *Hope*, and in the seven years she has been to sea she has visited seven nations on three continents and become the most welcome ship in the world.

Three years ago on this page we reported to our readers the amazing early successes of the famed white hospital ship which set sail in 1960 for Indonesia and South Vietnam. She was then in South America and, at the end of year when she sailed out of a Peruvian harbor, 40,000 Peruvians lined the shore and cast flowers upon the water, most of the populace tearful and some of them having walked barefoot for thirty miles to give thanks to their Yankee benefactors. In seven years the S.S. *Hope* has become a leading international health organization which has captured the imagination of people abroad and at home with its inexhaustible supply of warm, human accomplishment and goodwill. There are many who think that the S.S. *Hope* should be one of a fleet and, in fact, the ship is so popular within the medical profession that it has a waiting list of doctors (they serve in two-month shifts—for free). It goes without saying that she has a waiting list of sufferers in every continent.

When the great white ship arrived off Nicaragua last year, the North Americans were not greeted with enthusiasm. On the contrary, there was considerable distrust, condescension, and skepticism until five Nicaraguan doctors and ailing natives discovered that the visitors had not come to show off but to teach. *Hope* doctors immediately found local assets not being utilized. A building near the Leon hospital had stood in disuse for years. Working closely with Nicaraguan counterparts, *Hope* teams turned it into a bright new maternity ward, the country's first. When the good ship left late last year, the President of Nicaragua made a personal visit and his aides told *Hope's* medical staff that "with your departure the people of Nicaragua are losing their best friend, the best messenger of goodwill any country ever sent us."

One story out of Nicaragua told of a woman who had left her home south of Managua before dawn in order to be on time for an afternoon medical appointment for her seven-year-old daughter. She had carried the

girl, who was suffering paralytic effects from polio, all the long weary miles. She also carried food for the day's journey. On this, her final visit, she had still another burden: a large, heavy bunch of bananas for those aboard the *S.S. Hope*.

As one happy Nicaraguan doctor put it: "You can still see American flags flying in Corinto, flags put up to welcome the *Hope* into Nicaragua last January. . . . Little children in the streets like to run up and lightly touch the Americans (their heroes) and the people of Corinto have learned to say 'hi' and 'goodbye' in English." So popular was the *S.S. Hope* in Nicaragua that an interpreters' committee made up of local volunteers took turns making a four-hour round trip from Managua to the ship each day with translators.

The Reverend Randolph Hellwig from Penfield, New York, chaplain aboard the *S.S. Hope*, believes that, because the ship had been at Nicaragua for the better part of a year, any feeling that Americans are only selfish and grasping has been totally destroyed. Dr. John T. Logue, from Columbia, Missouri, who recently served aboard the *Hope* in Corinto, said: "It is more effective to take a shipload of knowledge to foreign countries than it is to bring students to the United States for study." Dr. Walter C. Rogers, chief of staff of the *S.S. Hope*, told a recent interviewer:

"Actually, if the ship were simply a service ship it would not be worth sending to any country, because the countries to which we go have such enormous problems of health that a 130-bed hospital (which is our size) couldn't possibly, in ten months, begin to dent the problems. Our only hope is to train people in all sorts of medical and paramedical fields to go back and train other people in their own country to do better work, to take more interest in their problems, and so on. The doctors we train, the hospital sanitary workers we train, the dieticians, the technicians, the nurses, are all capable of going back into their own community and training other people, and in this way you have the typical stone-in-pond-ripple effect of constantly improving the health situation in the country to which we go."

The *S.S. Hope* is now in the midst of what may well be her most successful mission to date. One month after she tied up at Cartagena, Colombia, 2,619 patients had been treated aboard and in shore clinics, *Hope* surgeons had conducted 160 operations aboard and sixty-five more ashore, and Colombian children had been given 12,300 immunizations against polio, diphtheria, tetanus, and smallpox. By the end of this year at Cartagena, the *S.S. Hope*, already a No. 1 tourist attraction, is sure to break humanitarian records set by her on previous visits to six other ports.

In an insane world of idiotic spending for fratricidal wars and "defense," the comparatively small expenditures for *S.S. Hope* have lighted a tiny, inexpensive candle in the darkness. Imagine America's image, to say nothing of the world's health, if a thousand ships of *Hope* moved upon the waters of the earth for the alleviation of the ills of mankind. The possibilities for peace in a healthy world stagger the imagination.

R. L. T.

MEAT INSPECTION AMENDMENTS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], has been holding hearings relative to proposed amendments to the Federal Meat Inspection Act. This is a subject matter that should concern every American.

An article by Nick Kotz in the Des Moines Sunday Register this week, which shows that the writer has done considerable research and work on the subject matter, should be of interest to everyone who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have requested unanimous consent to insert this newspaper article in the RECORD and commend this reading to all my colleagues. It reads as follows:

ASK TIGHTER LAW ON MEAT INSPECTIONS FOR PRODUCTS SOLD WITHIN STATES

(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The vast majority of American meat products are federally inspected to insure wholesomeness, but a confidential nation-wide investigation has revealed shocking abuses in some segments of the non-regulated meat industry.

The investigation was made five years ago by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), to find out conditions in non-federally regulated plants which slaughter 20 million cattle and processes 8.7 billion pounds of meat.

This amounts to about 15 per cent of all cattle slaughtered in the United States and about 25 per cent of all the meat processed in the nation.

The investigation convinced USDA officials and a few congressmen, including Representative Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.) that the 1906 meat inspection law badly needs overhauling.

TRIED BEFORE

The Johnson administration and Smith tried two years ago for enactment of a strong law which would have required states to meet federal inspection standards or else have the federal government expand its inspection to cover intra-state slaughtering and processing.

The bill was buried in committee because of opposition from most of the meat industry and the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (N.A.S.D.A.).

This year the administration and Smith have obtained a house subcommittee hearing for two much weaker bills which they regard as at least a start toward more comprehensive meat inspection.

Details of the USDA investigation, the only data collected on the condition of federally uninspected meat plants in the nation, are coming to light for the first time now that congressional action appears possible.

Iowa adopted a mandatory inspection law in 1965 and is among only 25 states providing inspection of both slaughtering and processing. A total of 147,000 animals were slaughtered in 1966 without federal inspection. All of this meat must be sold within Iowa.

IOWA AUCTION

Smith says he became interested in the meat inspection issue after noticing at Iowa cattle auctions "that whenever they would sell a cancer-eye cow or diseased hog" the purchaser inevitably was a packer who is not covered by federal inspection.

One packer who Smith has observed buying diseased animals for Iowa use was also described by federal investigators as the operator of an unsanitary plant in Nebraska.

UPTON SINCLAIR

Only meat sold in inter-state commerce is covered by the 1906 federal inspection law—a law virtually unchanged since Upton Sinclair provoked it with his shocking book about the meat industry.

Most USDA experts believe conditions have not changed substantially since a federal meat inspector five years ago reported these conditions in a Minnesota meat packing plant:

"Both the saw and the inspection truck were sterilized with a hot water hose with the result that pus from abscesses and other disease carrying media was splashed on nearby carcasses."

RACKS NOT CLEAN

At another uninspected plant in Minnesota, the federal inspector reported:

"Hooks and racks in the cooler were not clean. I feel that they had at least a week's accumulation of tissue and meat juice."

At yet another Minnesota plant exempt from federal inspection, the investigator reported:

"In checking a meat grinder, it was determined that—although the piece of equipment had been used this day, there was an accumulation of tissue which had been from some previous days operation."

CARCASS WASHING

At still another Minnesota plant, an inspector reported watching a carcass being washed with a high pressure hose which "resulted in manure and urine being washed on the opened brisket and neck."

At a South Dakota plant exempt from federal inspection, an investigator reported:

"The carcass splitting saw was dirty, with accumulated grease, fat and oil. The general sanitation of the plant was such that it was inexcusably dirty."

"All walls and doors were splattered with blood, fat, and grease. I noticed sausages on trees that were dragging through puddles of water on the floor, which is gross contamination."

NEBRASKA PLANT

At a Nebraska processing plant the owner also operates in Iowa the federal investigator reported:

"In the beef boning room, one's attention was first called to the odor of putrid meat product. A good many flies were observed in the sausage manufacture room and, of course, crawl upon and contaminate meat products."

"The smoke house was coated with carbon, tars, etc. and this is being transferred to the product."

MOLDY SAUSAGE

"At another uninspected Nebraska plant, the investigator reported moldy sausage products were observed in the holding cooler."

At both Nebraska plants, the inspector reported that products labeled "all-meat" wieners actually contained 6 per cent filler products, a practice which would be forbidden under federal inspection.

Similar conditions were found through the nation in the USDA investigation.

The investigation showed many federally inspected plants or non-inspected plants were meeting federal standards, but it also revealed abuses at some plants in almost every state.

State and local inspection laws vary widely as does the quality of non-federal inspection.

OTHER STATES

Minnesota and South Dakota are among nine states which do not provide for state inspection of meat.

In 1966, a total of 206,000 Minnesota animals and 80,000 South Dakota animals were slaughtered without federal inspection.

Nebraska and North Dakota are among 13 other states which only provide for volun-

tary inspection of slaughtering. Neither state has any inspection of meat processing. In 1966, 162,000 Nebraska animals and 48,000 North Dakota animals were slaughtered without federal inspection.

The following list shows the total number of slaughtering and processing plants in Iowa and the upper midwest and the number undergoing federal inspection. The Nebraska figures show only slaughter plants.

	Total plants	Federally inspected
Iowa	847	41
Minnesota	887	46
Nebraska	345	51
South Dakota	232	9
North Dakota	98	9
Wisconsin	701	43

The vast majority of meat production in each of these states is conducted by the large national companies in the relatively few federally inspected plants.

COMPETITION

National firms, along with smaller companies, also operate plants not federally inspected in order to compete in local and state markets.

Consumers can identify processed meat products inspected by the federal government by a circle on the package with the wording "U.S. Department of Agriculture Approved for Wholesomeness" and raw meat by a purple stamp reading "USDA Approved."

The administration's proposed Wholesome Meat Act, sponsored by Smith, would:

Provide federal-state agreements under which the federal government would pay 50 per cent of the cost and supply technical assistance to states willing to establish and enforce federal inspection standards.

Provide tools of enforcement not presently authorized by the federal government to checkmate the distribution of unwholesome and adulterated meat products. Controls would be placed upon animal food manufactured and their distributors to guarantee that their products do not find their way into channels of human consumption.

Broaden the authority of federal coverage to include all meat "capable of" human consumption. At present federal control is limited to meat "intended for" human consumption, which has permitted unscrupulous operators in contaminated meat to escape federal inspection.

Provide the federal government with powers of detention, injunctions, and federal court actions to cope with contaminated meat discovered in transit or outside of federally-inspected establishments. At present, the USDA cannot detain such meat, except by getting assistance from other federal, state or local agencies.

In addition, Smith has introduced another bill which would broaden coverage of federal inspection to include large intrastate plants which are covered by provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, but not the meat inspection act.

Noting the inadequacy of state inspection, Rodney Leonard, deputy assistant secretary of agriculture, testified before the house subcommittee:

"Inspection under state programs is generally well below federal standards. Yet, these products are intermingled in many retail stores with federally inspected products for sale to the unknowing public.

LACK MONEY

"Administrators of state meat inspection programs generally admit they have neither the money nor manpower to conduct an intensive, continuous inspection service for both slaughtering and processing operations."

He added that variations between federal standards and those in many states permit use of "excessive water and extenders, chemicals that mask the true condition of prod-

ucts, and misleading or deceptive labeling."

Leonard stressed that modern technology—in addition to providing a wide variety of better products—has made it easier for unscrupulous operators to disguise the true condition of meat.

Thus, he said far more sophisticated methods of inspection and analysis are needed to protect the consumer.

"We are dealing with problems not conceived by those who drafted the original legislation 60 years ago," said Leonard.

"The act is becoming increasingly inadequate to deal with the problems of today's modern aggressive industry."

Calling for federal or state control over dealers in unwholesome meat products, he said:

"It is far too easy for dealers in dead animals, renderers, animal food handlers and others to divert unfit meat into human channels."

FEW ALLIES

Leonard and Smith stress that the main hope of the legislation is that states will accept federal assistance to improve or institute their own inspection programs.

The bill has a few strong allies including the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (A.F.L.-C.I.O.).

Arnold Mayer, legislative representative for the union, called for even stronger legislation and testified:

"Live cattle which obviously cannot pass inspection are sent to uninspected plants. This is done not only by the small number of get-rich-quick operators but also by some highly reputable firms.

"The very competitive situation in the industry currently leaves them no alternative. Only Congress can break this cycle by extending meat inspection and by providing the same rules for all."

Mayer also emphasized that even an expert often has a difficult time determining whether good or diseased meat has gone into ground hamburger or processed salami.

The National Farmers Organization and the National Livestock Feeders Association have testified for the bill. Companies who have their products federally inspected are quietly supporting the bill.

The bill also has numerous opponents. The National Farm Bureau Federation opposes it as a further intrusion of federal control into state affairs.

PROPOSE CHANGES

The National Meat Institute, representing the large national firms, and the Independent Meat Packers Association, representing smaller companies, both are professing neutrality, except for proposing changes which supporters feel would weaken the bill.

The National Association of State Agriculture Departments (N.A.S.D.A.) also proposes changes, which the USDA feels would eliminate the needed new authority to control operations to renderers and dog-cat food manufacturers.

After long years of seeking increased regulation, supporters are wary about what the N.A.S.D.A. and the Meat Association may be doing behind the scenes.

NOT "PORK BARREL"—CONCERN FOR NATIONAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I

would be disloyal to everything I value in my public life if I failed to join in this defense of my good friend MIKE KIRWAN, of the House itself, and on a broader scale, of our national resources policies.

Pork barrel has been a convenient shaft in the hands of sensation-seeking editors for a long time, but Reader's Digest, in using the term as the thrust in its latest attack, only proves how poorly it has judged the needs and temper of our people and the wisdom of the Congress. Pork barrel we may have, but the fact is that virtually every major conservation success in our country's history, from the National Park system to the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Soil Conservation Service, has deep roots in what has been commonly referred to as pork barrel politics.

Emphasis in conservation problems shifts with the changing economy and the changing environment, but the importance of these problems will be even greater in the future than it has been in the past. There are more of us in Congress working on natural resource programs than ever before, and there will be even greater numbers in the future, because awareness of the significance of resource development grows.

One of the great mainstays of resource development in this country has been our deep-rooted philosophy that natural resources must be developed in the interest of our economic well-being; that Government development or regulation ensures their use for the greatest interest of all the people; and that governmental action is needed not only for protection against monopolistic exploitation but for the wisest future use. The great conservationists of our history—Powell, Pinchot, Newlands, Norris, the two Roosevelts—have been more concerned with economic justice in the handling of resources than with the mere prevention of waste. Noble as their motives were, these great men were also practical men who recognized the value of politics. It is not coincidence that most major conservation achievements have been associated with political movements labeled progressive or liberal.

MIKE KIRWAN knows all this. It is this extensive knowledge, and 30 years' experience in the House, where he has demonstrated unfailingly his patriotism, the value of his business experience and his service in city government, his devotion to the good of the country regardless of area or politics, and his unwavering loyalty to his word, that have endeared MIKE KIRWAN personally and made him one of the most respected Members of this body.

Let Reader's Digest rant "pork barrel" if it wishes. The equivalent language has been directed against every major public works accomplishment, and every guiding hand behind those accomplishments, since Clinton built the Erie Canal. But the "sticks and stones" have not prevented the American people from being grateful to the people who have been responsible for our natural resource development, and they will not prevent the American people from being eternally grateful to MIKE KIRWAN.

FEDERAL VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, for many years, American industries have pleaded for more trained and skilled workers. Now, through the Job Corps, the Manpower Development and Training Act program and other similar Federal activities, industry is finally obtaining a pool of trained talent, a pool which it can help assimilate into an urbanized, technically specialized society which would otherwise reject it as "unqualified."

The May 1967 issue of *Fast Food* includes a careful analysis of "Federal Vocational Training," citing the valuable work done in these programs by training young men in the area of food services. Over 1,000 cooks and bakers have been placed in industry from Job Corps food service centers and another 700 are presently being trained.

The article importantly points out three basic areas in which the corpsmen and others must be retrained: "the job itself, basic education and the attempt to build a new attitude toward society, work, and his chances in life."

I have taken the floor in the past to point out the fine work which is done at the Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center in Edison, N.J.—this is just one more enlightening example. The article also points out the excellent job being done at the Gary Corps Center in San Marcos, Tex., in the district represented by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

The article follows:

FEDERAL VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Frances Roth of the Culinary Institute of America has told the food service industry: "For years industry spokesmen have decried both the shortage of trained workers and the massive spending programs of the Federal Government. Now you have a real opportunity in assisting in training thousands of young workers and at the same time have a direct voice in how the government spends your money. Should you not grasp this unique opportunity, your future criticisms may well lose much of their effectiveness."

Although she was speaking of the Job Corps in particular, the statement is equally true of the entire spectrum of Federal programs.

All Federal activities, including the more familiar Manpower Development and Training Act program (MDTA) and the Job Corps, give the industry a source for training help and trained manpower.

At the Job Corps centers, trained manpower is more than a management phrase; it is a constant effort to fit young people into a society that considers them unfit.

To prepare this person for a job, the Corps first takes him out of his environment to one of the 108 centers. Here, his re-training is divided into three basic areas: the job itself, basic education and the attempt to build a new attitude toward society, work and his chances in life.

In the food service field, Camp Kilmer, New Jersey, is one of the Jobs Corps' outstanding examples. The camp itself is con-

tracted to and run by Federal Electric Co. but the culinary program looks for advice and guidance from associations, companies and colleges with food service programs. Roger Lundy, director of the culinary program at Kilmer, had set up food service training programs for the Army before coming to the Corps. His two basic courses—for cooks and for bakers—have already graduated 178 people since July of 1966 and placed 116 of these in jobs as of Mid-March. A third course in short-order cooking is just getting under way.

The training all takes place in a converted Army mess hall. Instruction is simple and basic—learning the tools of the trade on the first day—but geared to actual practice of skills and actual work conditions. The Corpsmen, for example, set up, cook, serve and clean-up a cafeteria that serves the noon meal for the culinary and transportation schools. In the new short-order course, Corpsmen will learn by operating a counter-and-booth coffee shop at the camp.

From those who have profited from the foodservice programs in Job Corps Centers, nearly 1,000 are at work in the industry and another 700 are now at centers. For all of these, industry cooperation is needed through companies and associations.

Perhaps most notable is the Texas Restaurant Association for its work at the Gary Job Corps Center, San Marcos. Members of TRA helped to plan the program; and they meet to review and evaluate the program. These 2-3 day auditing conferences held at the training site have been the greatest single factor responsible for the high level of realism in the Culinary Arts program at Gary Job Corps Center. Further evidence of this strong cooperation lies in the fact that the Center is an associate member of the Texas Restaurant Association. The Center's staff and trainees enjoy a close link with the real world of foodservice work. Graduates from the training center are nearly all placed through the cooperative effort of the TRA.

Where Job Corps works on a direct contract from the Federal Government, Manpower Development and Training programs work through state agencies and local educational facilities. MDTA is administered jointly by the U.S. Department of Labor and the Office of Education.

The joint sponsorship of the program—Education and Labor—also allows for a variety of programs ranging from those that are strictly institutional to those that are primarily on-the-job. Sheraton Corp. was one of the first to utilize MDTA as a training aid, using an on-the-job approach. The Food Service Executive Assn., Madison, Wis., recently began a 40-week course that will prepare 25 people for jobs as short order cooks.

Programs such as these have been set up throughout the country, adding up to more than 670 projects. The length of the programs vary but average about 27 weeks. At a cost of more than \$19 million of Health, Education and Welfare funds, 626 projects exposed more than 22,000 people to the foodservice industry through on-the-job training and institutional programs.

One of the outstanding programs, and one of the first, is in Washington, D.C., at the Armstrong School. The building, formerly a public high school, is now used for adult education classes.

Each morning, the students gather in the school's cafeteria kitchen. Under the direction of Randall I. Ward, instructor of the cooking class, they go about their jobs, preparing lunch for themselves and cleaning as they go. In former times, the class prepared lunch for the rest of the school but the budget made this difficult at best and this practice was abandoned. The problems of menus, nutrition, tastes, availability of fresh foods and the chemistry of food are taken up in afternoon classes. In addition, students

study budgeting of food money, sanitation, methods of storing food and the mathematics of cookery.

"We don't turn out master chefs," comments Ward. "We don't expect to. But we are training good beginning cooks. When they leave here, they can do a job and do it well. That's a good start for anybody."

The opportunity, the finances, the trained personnel are there but they must be wooed. This is not a one-sided problem because every Federal program needs industry support and advice. As Dr. J. Graham Sullivan, deputy commissioner of education, explains: "The only means of assuring effective training is to involve industry people in the programs. It is important that your voice be heard. Federal money allocated to the States for vocational training is not earmarked for food service training. The industry must make its needs known."

LEGISLATION TO AMEND TITLE IV OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PROVIDE SCHOOL LUNCHES TO CHILDREN RECEIVING ASSISTANCE FROM THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would amend title IV of the Social Security Act to provide school lunches to children receiving assistance from the aid-to-dependent-children program and to provide food to families where the State agency has determined that unless food is furnished directly, the family will not receive any such food.

I am sure that many of my colleagues have received, as I have, numerous complaints from both concerned school officials and welfare directors on the number of children who are not receiving a proper school lunch or decent meals at home. Unfortunately, some of our welfare recipients are using their payments for other than the "necessaries of life" or for the welfare of their children.

This legislation provides that any child under the aid to families with dependent children program would receive a school lunch while attending a school, college, university, or a course in vocational technical training designed to qualify him for gainful employment. The cost of the lunch would be deducted from the total amount to be given the welfare recipient.

The second part of the bill would provide that in those cases where there are obvious abuses of the welfare payments, the State agency would be given authority to provide food directly to the affected families who would not otherwise receive a proper diet. The costs of the food would be deducted by the State agency from the recipient's check. This provision is directed only to those individuals that the State and local agencies have determined are misusing their Federal assistance. I think we can all agree that the general populace has magnified these abuses in order to support its op-

position to any form of aid to the disadvantaged. I am sure that all of my colleagues are aware State and local agencies cannot now under Federal law correct these abuses without cutting out all assistance. This proposed legislation would assist them in their efforts and at the same time continue to provide aid to the innocent children.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us who have supported these programs in the past are alarmed at the growing animosity towards all forms of assistance to those now on our welfare or relief rolls. I feel it is important to correct any loopholes or abuses that may occur but I feel it is equally important to assist those who are underage and who may be unfortunate victims. May I urge my distinguished colleagues to join with me in supporting this timely and much-needed legislation.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S RECORD

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the outstanding stewardship of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman during the more than 6 years in which he has administered the Nation's farm programs.

First of all I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], delivered last week in the House:

Mr. Freeman is the best Secretary we have had since most of our members came to this House, and he is the best who has been suggested, so let us help him be the kind of Secretary we want.

I can readily understand Secretary Freeman's feeling of anger at a recent statement that—

The Administration hopes the war in Viet Nam will bail it out of its farm difficulties.

No one really believes such an irresponsible charge.

No one, however partisan, can actually believe that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture hope for anything other than a speedy and honorable termination of hostilities in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, several ancient and long-discredited charges against the administration and the Secretary of Agriculture were voiced here on the floor of the House last week.

I believe these charges deserve repudiation once and for all.

The Secretary was charged with "advocating off-shore purchases for Vietnam," when the record clearly shows that off-shore purchases of meat by the Department of Defense this year amounted to less than 1 percent of total DOD purchases.

The charge was made of "curtailment" of DOD pork purchases, and the record,

again, shows that DOD pork purchases in 1966 were 14 million pounds above 1965 and this year will be 50 million pounds higher than last year.

The charge of "grain dumping" was repeated and, again, not borne out by the facts: The price of corn rose from \$1.02 a bushel up to \$1.29 during the time the so-called dumping was supposed to have occurred.

The charge was made that dairy imports have been permitted to flood the American markets. The fact is that the President, acting on Secretary Freeman's recommendation, has ordered a 75-percent reduction in the amount of dairy imports which threatened domestic producers.

The charge also was made that the administration is encouraging the elimination of the family farm. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our farm programs now are operating under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, which was enacted following passage by this House. It is designed to encourage the family farm system of agriculture, which has produced the greatest miracle of production the world has ever seen.

Instead of indulging in carping criticism not based on the facts, let us look at the record.

In January, 1961, when Orville Freeman became Secretary of Agriculture, after 8 years of Republican administration, rural America was in real trouble. There was a mountain of wheat in surplus—1.4 billion bushels. The feed grain surplus was equally as bad—85 million tons. Farm income had dropped steadily for 8 years to a low of less than \$12 billion. Farm prices had dropped 17 percent between 1952 and 1960. Farmers were confronted with \$1 corn and \$2 soybeans. Cattle were selling for \$20, hogs for \$15, and manufacturing milk for \$3.25.

The record shows that this trend has been reversed since Orville Freeman became Secretary of Agriculture.

Commodities in surplus are now fast disappearing. Commodity Credit Corporation investments have been sharply reduced. Exports of farm products are constantly increasing. Of most importance to farmers, realized net farm income has substantially increased.

Last year net farm income climbed to \$16.3 billion, the second highest in history, while total gross income by farmers was setting an alltime record. Net farm income was 40 percent greater than it was in 1960 and 15 percent higher than in 1965. Realized net income per farm was setting an alltime record at an average \$5,024—19 percent higher than the previous year and 70 percent greater than 1960.

Of course, we all recognize there remain farm commodity fields in which farmers are not sharing in this increase—in fact, which remain in serious trouble. But this is not due to lack of attention and concern on the part of Secretary Freeman, and, under his direction, the Department is searching for and is taking where possible, effective steps to bring about income improvement. Some of these inequities exist among farmers in the district I represent, and I want to

take this occasion to thank the Secretary and the Department for their continuing concern and assistance.

The enormous surpluses which were all too familiar during the 1950's—before Secretary Freeman took office—are gone. By January 31, 1967, the investments of CCC in farm commodities were down to \$4.35 billion, a reduction of \$2.45 billion from the previous year and \$4 billion less than the peak years of 1956 and 1959.

Of greatest importance, however, is the fact that surpluses have been reduced without depressing farm income. On the contrary, prices of commodities in surplus have moved steadily up as we disposed of commodities in storage.

This then is the record of solid achievement of Orville Freeman on the farm front. His administration of the Department of Agriculture has been wise, judicious, and progressive. He has been and is a diligent, conscientious, and effective Secretary of Agriculture.

HIGHWAY SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to acknowledge the quick and efficient work of the Department of Transportation and, in particular, the National Highway Safety Bureau in establishing meaningful standards for State highway safety programs. The standards, announced recently by Secretary Boyd, provide an excellent basis for improvement in 13 areas of highway safety. They also lay the groundwork for unprecedented State-Federal cooperation in protecting the traveling public from the dangers inherent in our mobile society.

I have often wondered at the lack of training and precautionary knowledge required of automobile operators. Perhaps, due to the rather gradual year-to-year evolution of the automobile, we have never fully realized the complex skills needed for efficient operation of the family car. Hours of study and training are required to receive a private pilot's license. Anyone who has been in the service knows of the myriad of licenses required before permission is granted to operate military equipment.

Yet our highways are the scene of 10,000 injuries every day and 1,000 deaths each week. So it is with an appropriate sense of urgency that the States begin to implement the new standards—an urgency that I am confident is felt in every State.

Secretary Boyd said in announcing the standards:

They are the opening strategy in an applied effort by the States and the Federal Government to significantly raise our level of driving safety.

Secretary Boyd realizes, as I am sure the States do, that this is not a one-shot effort, but rather a concerted drive that

will be carried on as long as vehicular traffic exists. It is to be expected that immediate problems may arise due to lack of funds, the need for planning and cost estimating, and the need for appropriate action by State legislatures.

But I do not believe any of these problems can long stand in the way of implementing a meaningful highway safety program in every State. The Department of Transportation in the next 6 months will be working closely and diligently with the States to determine cost estimates which can be presented to the Congress.

I am confident that this State-Federal cooperation, both in the early stages of the program and throughout its existence, can only lead to achievement of the goal everyone desires—a safer driving public.

In his message to Congress calling for establishment of the new Department, President Johnson said:

No function of the new Department—no responsibility of its Secretary—will be more important than safety. We must insure the safety of our citizens as they travel on land, in our skies, and over our waters.

The new highway safety standards and vehicle safety standards, established in the first 3 months of the Department's operation, are outstanding examples of how the President's mission for the new Department has been undertaken. Secretary Boyd and his staff are to be commended.

The foundation for highway safety has been constructed; the challenge has been articulated. It is now up to the States and the people of this Nation to diminish the senseless highway death toll.

HON. ARMISTEAD SELDEN ADDRESSES PAST DEPARTMENT COMMANDERS BANQUET, AT THE 49TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the 49th Annual Convention of the Alabama Department of the American Legion was held in Mobile, Ala., this past weekend, July 14-16.

The featured speaker at the past department commanders banquet on July 15 was our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, the honorable ARMISTEAD SELDEN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. Congressman SELDEN spoke to the Alabama Legionnaires and their wives on the subject of patriotism and the dangers facing our Nation for the past century. He also discussed a recent report released by the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee concerning Communist activities in the Latin American area.

Because Congressman SELDEN has been a vigorous and outspoken foe of the in-

ternational Communist conspiracy, and because his remarks to the Alabama American Legion are particularly appropriate at this point in our Nation's history, I am inserting them in the RECORD so that Members of the House of Representatives can have the benefit of his sage advice concerning the future of our Nation:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN, PAST DEPARTMENT COMMANDERS BANQUET, AMERICAN LEGION STATE CONVENTION, MOBILE, ALA., JULY 15, 1967

As a Legionnaire and as a member of the United States House of Representatives, I am very much aware of the outstanding job that is being done by the American Legion in its many and varied undertakings, and I can assure you that it is a high privilege for me to address members of this organization.

I am certain I need not remind those of you here this evening that this is the 50th anniversary year of the entry of the United States into World War One. The first of this century's Great Wars is the historic landmark from which we measure our country's rise to world leadership. And that era is also, as we know, the revolutionary landmark from which our chief adversary in the world today, Communist Russia, measures its own history.

This has been a half century of tremendous achievement for our country and the world. It has also been one of the most turbulent periods in human history. And in terms of suffering, it has certainly been the most devastating.

For out of World War One, the "war to end all wars," were sowed the seeds of a second World War and the confrontation between the Communists and the Western World which has been our chief concern in the past quarter century—a confrontation that has led our country into two costly hot wars in which American blood has and is being spilled in foreign lands.

So it is that in this anniversary year we might well ask ourselves: What went wrong five decades ago when the Western democracies, having won the "war to end all wars," lost the peace? And again, what went wrong when these same democracies, having defeated totalitarian Nazism and Fascism twenty-five years ago, left themselves and the Free World open to the assault of an even more formidable kind of totalitarianism?

Obviously, these questions aren't simply academic. Our ability to learn from our mistakes in making the peace of 1918 and 1945 will determine whether succeeding generations of Americans, every twenty-five years, will have to shed blood in defense of our country's freedom.

Another overriding question—a closely related one, to be sure—is whether the very values for which we fought the great wars of this century—and for which Americans are dying in overseas combat this very moment—are actually in danger of being destroyed here at home.

It was because the 90th Congress recognizes the threat posed by home front attacks on basic American institutions and values that the House recently enacted legislation to outlaw the burning and defiling of our country's flag in public demonstrations. And as a co-sponsor of this legislation, I am hopeful that the Senate also will act favorably on this measure in the near future.

Indeed, it is a tragic commentary on the uses—or should I say the misuses—of freedom to think that there are Americans today who would destroy the very symbol for which 20th century Americans fought and died in the Argonne and at the Meuse—at Bastogne and at Iwo Jima—at Seoul and at DaNang.

Let me add, however, that I agree with the recent statement of the President that these flag burners and draft dodgers do not by any

means represent the overwhelming majority of this young generation of Americans. They emphatically do not. And they certainly have nothing in common with the thousands of young Alabamians in our armed services who are today doing their duty to God and country. Throughout the country today there are the many thousands of young men who, as their fathers and older brothers did in previous wars, are responding to their duty to maintain their country's freedom—and to keep the American flag flying as a symbol of that freedom throughout the world.

Yet the war that this generation has been called upon to fight is unlike any of the previous wars which were fought by Americans during this century. It is, in many respects, a more difficult war—and it is certainly a more frustrating war, as daily reports from the war zone tell us.

Tactically, this frustration stems from the difficulty of putting out the fires of a subversive, guerrilla movement in a foreign land, and in a war in which there are no front lines. But in a larger sense, it is a frustration reflected also in the indefinite and blurred goals of our national effort in South Vietnam.

To put it bluntly, our generations—the generations that fought in World Wars One and Two—had a clear objective to fight for: victory over a totalitarian enemy that threatened the freedom of the world and the security of our homeland.

But the men who fight in Vietnam are tragically denied such clarity of aims. They are being asked to fight what, in effect, is more a political than a military war. To be sure, they are asked to risk their lives—to die—and to watch their friends suffer and die. But they are given no clear answer as to the end result which these sacrifices might achieve.

I am familiar with those who argue that there are no clear simple answers to the challenges and problems facing our nation in a nuclear age. But it seems to me that at any time a country asks its fighting men to risk their all, some clear answer must be given as to what they will achieve by that risk.

For the American fighting man who is engaged in deadly combat with a Communist enemy in South Vietnam, this war has already been "escalated" to the limit. Our country has never before deliberately sent its fighting men into battle without giving them the fullest measure of support. And it should not—cannot—give them anything less in Vietnam.

What then can be done to clear the air of doubt and lack of definite purpose over our Vietnam policy—to give our fighting men there a full measure of political as well as material support?

Our first need, it would seem to me, is to recognize the true nature of the enemy we are fighting in that country. That enemy is not, actually, the Vietcong. For the Vietcong are simply being used as an instrument of the world Communist powers, as were the North Korean aggressors of sixteen years ago.

Our true enemy then remains the world Communist powers themselves, Red China and Communist Russia.

It is Communist Russia which, although talking of peace and coexistence, furnishes the deadly tools that keep the Vietcong's aggression alive in South Vietnam. And it is Red China that encourages and helps supply the North Vietnam war machine that is shipping troops and supplies to the south to kill Americans.

Theorists can talk all they want about the split in the Communist world. But from the practical point of view of the men who are fighting our battles in Vietnam, this theoretical split has no meaning. For regardless of their differences, we must recognize that all Communist nations—Russia, China, the countries of Eastern Europe and

the Soviet-leaning countries of the so-called "neutral" world—are united on one issue: the destruction of the United States as the leading capitalist nation and the prime defender of the Free World.

Considering this fact, it is little short of incredible that some of the theorists who influence our foreign policy in Washington do not recognize the danger of their so-called policy of "building bridges of understanding" to the Communist world, until such time as we see a *genuine* indication that the Red nations are willing to give up their aggressive designs on the Free World.

Needless to say, we should at all times—as indeed our country has always done throughout its history—keep the door open for a true discussion of differences with other nations of the world. But in keeping the door open, the better part of wisdom would require that we stay alert and prepared to defend ourselves against expanded Communist aggression.

In Vietnam, we have seen how the Communist nations hope to bleed the United States in a frustrating, bloody war. And we have also seen how many purported allies and friends of our country—so-called allies whom we have helped and even rescued in the past half century—have shown their gratitude by giving our enemies material aid through trade. Other allies of this country—or perhaps it is more correct to call them erstwhile allies—have all but deserted the camp of the Free World in an effort to placate and appease the Communist bloc.

With the harsh realities in mind—with our country practically carrying the defense of the Free World on its shoulders alone, and with little assistance—the temptation is great to pack up our gear and return home to American shores. After all, it is not boastful—it is, in fact, only reflecting the power realities of the world—to say that the United States can go it alone far better than can the other countries of the Free World.

President De Gaulle of France, for the best example, stands aloof and critical of our countries policy in Vietnam and other parts of the world. But he can afford to talk independently and without fear that the Communist world will overrun France—as did Germany twice before in this century—only because the United States assisted in the rebuilding of France and even today is supplying a nuclear shield for the non-Communist world.

If the United States were to weaken and fall—an end that President De Gaulle's policies often seem directed toward—then France and all of Western Europe, along with the self-styled "neutral" countries of the globe, would overnight disappear into the Communist orbit. And whether they fell into the Russian sphere of that orbit or the Chinese sphere would make little difference in terms of the freedom and independence in their countries.

So it is that we are tempted to withdraw to a Fortress America. But this is a dangerous temptation indeed—and that is the lesson above all that the history of World War One and World War Two has taught us.

The world today—even more than it was in 1945—is too small a place to stand isolated, even for a great nation—even for the greatest, most powerful nation in the world.

If we, out of our frustration in Vietnam and our dissatisfaction with the policies of other nations of the non-Communist world, were to back away from our worldwide responsibilities, then we would soon find ourselves fighting for our lives not in far-off lands, but in our own hemisphere.

This is not mere rhetoric. It is a well-documented projection for the future, if the United States should indeed disengage from its commitments overseas. The most recent documentation along this line came in hearings held by the House Subcommittee on

Inter-American Affairs, which I am privileged to serve as chairman.

The House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee has long been concerned over the possibility that the Communists would gain a subversive foothold in Latin America, as they have in Southeast Asia. If this occurred, then the tragedy we are seeing unfold in South Vietnam would be repeated many times over in our own hemisphere. The inevitable result would be that our front line of defense against the Communists would move from South Vietnam, across the Pacific, right to our home shores.

Recognizing the critical danger of such a threat, the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee keeps a constant watch over the status of the continuing Communist campaign to undermine and overthrow, by violence and subversion, the legitimate governments of Central and South America. That was the subject of our recent hearings. And out of those hearings, at which experts from the Defense and State Departments were questioned in detail, came some disquieting conclusions and recommendations for the nation's and hemisphere's security.

Our hearings verified the fact that far from diminishing, the Castro Communist drive to take over our southern neighbors' governments has been intensified. Communist weaponry and Castroite training is providing the cadre for what may become Vietnam-type guerrilla wars in several nations of Latin America. Venezuela is still high on the list of countries the Castro Communists hope to take over by a guerrilla terrorist revolution. Bolivia is extremely vulnerable to increased Red assault, as is Colombia. And there are several other countries in this area where the situation could become more serious as Communist subversive activities increase.

In view of this growing threat to the hemisphere's security, the Subcommittee made a number of recommendations. We hope that these recommendations will be heeded—for if these guerrilla movements are not nipped in the bud, a decade from now we may find the bleeding guerrilla war of Vietnam has spread like a contagion to our own hemisphere.

We recommended that United States military assistance and aid to Latin governments under Communist attack be geared to meet the specific needs of paramilitary and counterinsurgent warfare. As we have found in Vietnam, the military approach used in former wars of this century simply isn't applicable to jungle and hill-country guerrilla fighting. We recognize the need to strengthen the economic muscle of Latin American countries, but urge that these countries themselves move quickly to bolster their economies through sound fiscal policies.

We also urged that the Latin countries themselves take the initiative in improving the quality of their own anti-insurgent effort. For ultimately, it is the people of a country themselves who must carry the fight to the enemy if their homes and freedoms are to be safeguarded. No matter how rich and powerful the United States is, we cannot hope to guarantee and preserve the freedom of any people that do not themselves want to make the necessary sacrifices to stay free and independent.

In addition, our report points out that the Subcommittee supports the objectives of the current meeting of the Organization of American States which is examining Venezuela's complaint against Cuba and recommends that the OAS consider ways and means of strengthening existing measures. The report suggested that additional measures of defense—such as naval and border patrols—be considered in order to prevent Communist infiltration.

Our Subcommittee also urged our State Department to apply more forceful pressure against so-called friends and allies who con-

tinue to trade with and otherwise support the Castro Communist government.

Finally, the essence of our recommendations for United States policy in Latin America is that we recognize there—as we must come to recognize in Vietnam—the true nature of our enemy, the Communists, and their plans for world domination.

Failure to recognize an enemy—and to stop the growth of that enemy's power and aggression at an early stage of development—was the chief failure that led to loss of the peace fifty years ago, and again 25 years ago. And, this same foolish unwillingness to stand firm against aggression has cost us American lives and resources again and again during these critical post-war years.

Thus, unless we are to waste the sacrifices of all these years—and of the young men who are engaged today in a war as bloody and fearful as any our country has ever waged—we must wake up to the realities of the dangerous world in which we live. For, if we ignore or back away from the threat of totalitarian aggression, be it aggression of the Right or Left, we do so only at the risk of losing our own freedoms.

"The best of prophets of the future," as George Gordon Lord Byron once said, "is the past." This statement, unfortunately, has proven true too many times during these 50 years of war and peace. Every concession to aggressive forces in time of peace has in effect prophesied the next war. But can we afford to let this happen again? No, we cannot. Instead, we must learn and profit from the errors of the past and apply the many lessons of these five decades toward the end that 50 years from today, the flag of the United States—and all it stands for in terms of God and country, human freedom, and dignity—may continue to fly over a land of the free and the brave.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the week of July 17 has been designated as Captive Nations Week, in order to direct the attention of world opinion to the denial of the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the peoples of the eastern and central European nations.

For the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union, this past year is keynoted by increased mutual understanding and diminishing suspicions, by a growing curiosity about cultural and technological heritages, and by mounting concern over a common enemy. During no year since the end of the Second World War have the two nations seemingly resented each other less.

Our burgeoning sympathies of friendship and understanding have proven a force of no minor consequence in directing the run of world events. Compromise of ideologies, constructive joint action of the two great powers—these are still achievements of the future. But if the foundations of communication between the United States and the Soviet Union do not crumble, perhaps advances will be made, world tension will be reduced, and the peoples of the world can seek the pleasures of life. Such is the future ideal.

But let us examine for a moment what constitutes the present reality.

Today a great force is motivating those in our world who have not as yet been allowed to find political sovereignty and independence. It is a force which touches the daily life of the individual more acutely than the side effects from the knotting of lines between ourselves and the Soviet Union. It is a force which moves from within the human being, compelling him to act as his will dictates.

It has been called the equalitarian revolution, the revolution of rising expectation, and has been linked with the shrinking pains of the world and the equality of desire.

But no one of these terms describes this phenomenon sufficiently. Its consequences are too diverse, its manifestations too complicated to be categorized under a single phrase.

Yet this force does not defy understanding, for its appearance as the motivating force in action is frequent and recognizable. It appeared in 1953 when the East Berlin laborers rioted against their imposed government, and again in 1956 in Hungary and Poland. A people's desire for self-determination, a peoples reaction to the Communists' consoling opiate, "You never had it so good," with cries of "Our bodies are fed and clothed, but our minds are slaves and our hearts are empty."

More recently this force has been concretized by the independence of a Marshal Tito and the defiance of Comecon by Rumania's Ceausescu.

Our relationships with the Soviet Union have, in the near past, evolved a certain diplomatic openness. The leaders of the two countries have conferred together and space treaties have been signed. We would like to believe that such actions will lead to a future of expanded cooperation. We hold a popular hope for a friendly Soviet Union competing with us peacefully in a world market of independent nations. But we should not forget about the shots which can be heard nightly from behind the Berlin wall; about the imprisoned artists and writers of Eastern Europe; about the 26 divisions of Russian troops standing ready in Eastern Europe to repress the desires of non-Russians—people who have felt the winds of freedom, people who would ask only for the return of their inalienable rights.

Our friends in eastern and central Europe have spent still another year unwillingly fettered to Soviet Russia. Their desire to find release from this enslavement has intensified and they have begun to loosen the knots of their bindings. In defiance of Soviet demands, Rumania has conceded diplomatic recognition to her second leading commercial partner, West Germany. Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia and Poland have taken new roads into the fields of abstract art, experimental dance, and avant garde theater. And Yugoslavia has continued her independent directions of development.

Mr. Speaker, in our tentative groping for a detente with the Soviet Union, we must not allow the central and east European peoples to believe that we have forgotten them. We must reassure

them of our support for their experiments in independence. And to those who would ask our aid in achieving political-economic independence from the Soviet Union, we must lend the fruits of our great economic system. Let us stretch to grasp the hands of our friends in Eastern Europe, that they might find the strength to pursue their dreams.

WIRETAPPING AND ELECTRONIC EAVESDROPPING

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Clark's announcement forbidding wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by agents of the Justice Department without specific authorization by the Attorney General himself is a major, but only a partial step forward toward safeguarding the individual's right to privacy. I was gratified not by the fact that this memorandum is going to be a panacea of safeguards to the individual's privacy, but by the fact that it shows most dramatically the growing awareness of the threats posed by our burgeoning electronic snooper technology in our fishbowl society.

I introduced a bill on January 10, 1967, which would forbid any Government agency from using any wiretapping or electronic eavesdropping device unless the use had previously been approved by the head of the department or agency and only upon a determination that such use would be vital to the national security. My bill requires, in addition, that all such authorizations be reported to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate. Congressional participation in control is essential to the protection of the individual American citizen from the overzealous use of these devices by agencies of the Government. This safeguard is not new to a government based on checks and balances.

Justice Louis Brandeis, writing in the Harvard Law Review, long before his ascension to the High Court, said:

Solitude and privacy have become more essential to the individual; but modern invention and enterprise have, through invasions upon his privacy, subjected him to mental pain and distress far greater than could be inflicted by mere bodily injury.

It is no wonder that in his famous dissent in the landmark Olmstead case in 1928, he prophesied that the failure to understand the intrusions on personal liberty permitted by advancing technology presented "the greatest danger to liberty." The rapidly accelerating rate of technological achievement makes this statement frighteningly clear today.

Mr. Speaker, wiretapping and eavesdropping have long been problems and their threat recognized and fought against, but they have received little at-

tention from the general public. The advancements of science in the 20th century, however, have overridden the previously plodding advances of snoopers and those who would intercept the private conversations of others. Today it is possible to make transmitters smaller than a dime and, yet powerful enough to transmit conversations several city blocks. Special cameras and television apparatus, using infrared radiation, can show movements clearly from 40,000 feet or 400 feet with ease and clarity. Other equipment can penetrate great distances to pick up sounds and some sound wave equipment can detect sounds through a solid wall and from a distance of a city block. These devices are very easily attainable at a low cost. Wiretaps no longer need be directly placed on the phone, but telephonic conversation can be intercepted instead simply by placing certain types of coils near the telephone. In other words, modern electronics engineering is bringing to the eavesdropper greater efficiency and security in his snooping, while at the same time subjecting the object of the eavesdropper's attention to less security, to less chance of success in guarding his privacy, and even to less awareness of the invasion of his privacy. Most people now know all about this; appallingly enough, a great many people feel that it is a necessary part of life and are willing to accept it without regard to the effects on our liberty and freedom. And if this is not obvious to us, consider the consequences to our children.

There is little doubt that prosecutors—local, State, and Federal—would have an easier time if they could wiretap and eavesdrop without restriction, but we have a wide spectrum of prosecutors and their tactics ranging from Frank Hogan of New York to James Garrison in New Orleans. There is no doubt that there would be an increase in the number of convictions if this evidence were allowed in court. But there is also little doubt that an authoritarian state is much more efficient in suppressing crime and corruption than a democracy, and I do not hesitate to attribute that efficiency to the use of the very devices I am speaking of today. While suppressing crime and corruption, these devices just as certainly and surely suppress the liberties and freedoms of the individual which we in the United States have grown to hold supreme, or have we forgotten that this is what America is all about? The basic concept of the American legal system is that a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty by the jury finding him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The placing of a "bug" or wiretap on a person and on his movements and conversations also surrounds him with an aura of guilt and a veil of suspicion. He is, in effect, guilty until he proves himself innocent by his remarks and conversations. As Justice Brandeis said:

All invasions on the part of the government and its employees of the sanctities of a man's home and the privacies of life . . . (are) the invasion of his indefeasible right of personal security, personal liberty and private property, where that right has never been forfeited by his conviction of some public offense.

Mr. Speaker, there has been great fear expressed throughout the country at the increasing rate of crime in America. FBI statistics show an alarming increase in murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault that outstrips even our birth rate. But I submit that these are the very crimes that will not be stopped by the use of eavesdropping and wiretapping devices. These are the crimes that are best solved and prosecuted by conventional methods of evidence gathering and by eliminating the sociological reasons for these facts.

It is certainly indisputable that some crime is organized; probably some of it was organized well before the advent of the infamous "James" brothers. The history of gambling attests to that conclusion. But is the threat to our society from organized crime so great that in order to combat it, we must put a match to the Bill of Rights?

Similarly, is the need for statistics and statistical studies so great that we must put a continuous biography of every American citizen into a computer and call it a National Data Center, as some would propose, even if such a data center could easily become a Dossier Bank that would place our people in a position of fear and our Government in a position of peril? Can the flag of "efficiency and economy" justify the dehumanization of our society? I think not.

In the rapidly accelerating gap between technology and the law, we are faced with a new and critical problem in protecting the privacy of the individual, the enormity of which we cannot afford to ignore. Where do we draw the line between what might be helpful to one discipline but harmful to society as a whole? I sometimes think that had there been no "Mafia," modern bureaucracy might well have found the need to create one. The specter of a "Mafia" or the slogan of organized crime is no substitution for a real answer to the fundamental question of how far we should go in the destruction of our Bill of Rights in the pursuit of real or fictitious criminals. For as was illustrated in the "Hate Goldstein Hours" of George Orwell's "1984," it is always necessary to have a target to divert the attention while the rights of the people are taken away.

Perhaps one way of reducing the present gap between law and technology would be a real attempt at protecting the many rather than considering them expendable while advancing the interests of the few. We could make a step in the right direction by adopting a realistic wiretapping and eavesdropping bill and by clearly defining our terms in limiting their use to the protection of our national security in unequivocal and unmistakable terms.

The term "national security" as used in my bill is intended to embrace such crimes as treason, espionage and sabotage—those crimes which threaten to harm irreparably the national existence.

National security cases have almost unanimously been considered justification for the use of wiretapping and eavesdropping devices. Attorney General Brownell said in a 1954 law review article:

The essential thing is that we do not put off any longer authorizing the admissibility of wire tapped evidence obtained by government agents in those cases involving the national security or defense.

Mr. Speaker, we should clear up the obscurity and uncertainty that surround the use of wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping evidence. I am hopeful that this 90th Congress will act in this area by passing my bill which prohibits all wiretapping and eavesdropping by the Federal Government, except in those cases threatening the national security and then only with notification to the Congress. We will then protect the individual citizen from both internal and external threats. As it is, he now lives in the shadow of both.

The time is here when we can no longer procrastinate on a decision in this area, for to delay is in itself a decision. It is a decision to abandon all hope of coping with new problems that confront our civil liberties in this modern scientifically sophisticated world. The time has come not to put off these decisions—the time is overdue to meet these problems. Scientific and electronic achievement pose many new threats which have yet to surface in easily understood terms, but we must begin to think about their effects and to enact laws that are comprehensive enough to meet these modern challenges.

Let us write a law that is clear, and let us write laws that will begin to protect the individual in the "pursuit of happiness" as well as his life and liberty. I think a meaningful wiretapping and eavesdropping law would be at least a start in that direction.

I would like to insert at this point a recent article by Tom Wicker of the New York Times on the wiretapping issue and a recent editorial from the Times:

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1967]
IN THE NATION: IS WIRETAPPING WORTH IT?
(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Attorney General Ramsey Clark, by administrative action, has forbidden all wiretapping and virtually all bugging by Federal agents, except in national security cases. Clark does not believe these are effective tools of law enforcement, but some who do are scheduled to make their case in hearings before Senator McClellan's subcommittee this week.

Clark and President Johnson have proposed legislation that would outlaw all wiretapping and bugging by anybody except Federal agents in national security cases. Another bill, drafted by G. R. Blakey of the Notre Dame Law School and tomorrow's first witness, would set up procedures for authorized eavesdropping by Federal and state agents as a weapon against serious crime.

CURBS IN PROSPECT

No one seriously defends wiretapping or bugging by private parties or by unauthorized policemen, and it is likely that these practices, the divulging of anything learned by them, and the manufacture and distribution of the equipment that makes them possible, will be entirely prohibited.

The real question is the extent to which the police and Federal agents should be authorized to use either practice in criminal law enforcement. An answer requires a determination whether these practices are good law-enforcement tools, and whether they can be administered without abuse.

THE MOST VALUABLE WEAPON

District Attorney Frank Hogan of New York is convinced that they are and they can. He told the New York State Constitutional Convention on June 7 that wiretapping was his "single most valuable and effective weapon . . . particularly against organized crime." He denied, however, wholesale use of this weapon.

In New York County in 1966, Hogan said, about 65,000 criminal matters had arisen, but only 73 wiretap orders were obtained (and 36 renewals of such orders). As for effectiveness, he said that in the ten years before the Supreme Court ruled in 1968 that wiretap evidence was inadmissible, his office had legally made 733 wiretap installations, caused 465 arrests on the evidence obtained, and secured 364 convictions.

Most of these convictions were in the areas of organized crime and racketeering, and Hogan contended that the peculiar nature of these activities—highly organized, highly secret, highly efficient—made wiretap evidence the only effective weapon against them.

He also made the telling point that not even Ramsey Clark wants to outlaw wiretapping in national security cases; this, Hogan contended, was "tantamount to a concession that wire interception and eavesdropping are essential weapons of detection against elaborate, organized criminal conspiracies."

Hogan also said investigating committees had found no abuses of eavesdropping practices by his office and that the rights of individuals had never been invaded or abused.

Yet, only a week after this testimony, the Supreme Court found that what he had called New York's "model" eavesdropping law authorized "general" rather than specific search warrants, did not require the police to specify the crime being investigated, and did not require the "bug" to be removed once the evidence sought had been found.

The Court made it doubtful that bugging could ever square with its interpretation of the Fourth Amendment, which limits police searches; it apparently required, for instance, that the criminal to be bugged had to be notified of the auditory "search" of his premises.

UNLAWFUL BUGGING

As for wiretapping, whatever Hogan's experience, Federal agents have been accused of tapping and bugging without authorization, cases have been thrown out of court because of it, and not long ago J. Edgar Hoover and former Attorney General Robert Kennedy disputed publicly as to whether Hoover's G-men had eavesdropped without even Kennedy's knowledge.

Frank Hogan and others may be right that effective law enforcement needs authorized eavesdropping, Ramsey Clark to the contrary. But they have yet to show, in the McClellan hearings or elsewhere, that any set of controls can guarantee that eavesdropping will not be abused by zealous or careless law agencies; and that this practice is so essential to the public safety that the risk has to be taken anyway.

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1967]
PLUGGING THE ELECTRONIC EAR

Unless Federal police officials and the Office of Attorney General itself adhere strictly to the new regulations that forbid all wiretapping and control eavesdropping, the real intent of these commendable limitations may be honored in the breach. For the proscriptions must be respected in both legal and moral terms if safeguards against invasion of privacy are not to be overpowered by authorized trespass in the name of fighting organized crime.

Attorney General Clark's recent memorandum is strongly against wiretapping (intercepted telephone talks) and bugging (hidden microphones). In the past the Justice

Department has sanctioned wiretapping to obtain leads, so long as discovered information was not divulged; now the very act of wiretapping is prohibited. As to bugging, an "out" existed for some types of electronic surveillance where conversations could be picked up without technical trespass; now anticipating a Supreme Court decision next fall on this issue, the Attorney General has blocked this kind of interception.

The Attorney General reserves for himself a good deal of leeway in allowing eavesdropping of non-telephone conversations with mechanical or electronic equipment. If they follow certain strict procedures of notification, police investigative agencies will still be able to pursue this practice in the war against crime with the Attorney General's consent.

The entire matter of eavesdropping, wiretapping and privacy still demands Congressional action to insure uniform Federal and state police procedures, including control over private and industrial invasions. The constitutional protection of the Fourth Amendment against unreasonable searches and seizures requires spelling out in this era of sophisticated snooping.

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. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia), for 60 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. RIEGLE, for 60 minutes, on July 20, 1967.

Mr. QUILLEN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BATES (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia) to extend his remarks during general debate on Senate Joint Resolution 81, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia) to extend his remarks during debate on Senate Joint Resolution 81, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a letter.
Mr. HORTON and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WINN.

Mr. MCCLORY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. PURCELL.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. DORN.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 25. An act to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 14, 1967, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10918. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 18, 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:

920. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

921. A letter from the Director, Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a study of the parity income position of farmers, pursuant to the provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965; to the Committee on Agriculture.

922. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a-1, and pursuant to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

923. A letter from the Chairman, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission, transmitting the 10th Interim Report of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 84-372; to the Committee on House Administration.

924. A letter from the Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 279-B, *The Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes of Indians,*

residing upon the Blackfeet and Fort Belknap Reservations in the State of Montana, Petitioners, v. The United States of America, Defendant, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

925. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report of awards of the young American medals for bravery and service for 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Stat. 397-398; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

926. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 27, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Columbia River at Brewster, Wash., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted June 28 and July 31, 1957, no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvements are being accomplished by other interests; to the Committee on Public Works.

927. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 11, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Ouachita River and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana, Harding drain, Pine Bluff, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959, construction of the necessary rectification measures has been initiated under existing authorities, no additional authorization by Congress is recommended to provide a more comprehensive plan of improvement; to the Committee on Public Works.

928. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 15, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Sandy Bay, Mass., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 20, 1954, and March 30, 1955; to the Committee on Public Works.

929. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 17, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a survey of Hammonds Cove entrance to Locust Point Harbor, N.Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

930. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 17, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Lake Worth side channel, Florida, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 10, 1962; to the committee on Public Works.

931. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Education Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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. STAGGERS: Committee of conference. S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of

their employees (Rept. No. 485). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 472. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase certain land from Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex. (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 547. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., and to provide for the establishment of a plant materials center at a more suitable location to replace the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5037. A bill to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 488). 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. DORN:

H.R. 11479. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11480. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 11481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to returns and deposits of the excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11482. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 11483. A bill to provide for the control or elimination of the alewife and other such pests in the waters of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 11484. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 23, 1955 (ch. 375, 69 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11485. A bill to provide for the control of the alewife and other fish and aquatic animals in the waters of the Great Lakes which affect adversely the ecological balance of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 11486. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on honey and honey products and to impose import limitations on honey and honey products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 11487. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on irradiated fresh, chilled, or

frozen fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 11488. A bill protecting the members of the Armed Forces and their families from threatening and harassing communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 11489. A bill to amend title 38 to provide that service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be considered active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 11490. 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. CURTIS:

H.R. 11491. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by making it clear that the income, including subscription and advertising income, derived by an organization in carrying on any publication, such as a trade or professional journal, shall not be deemed to be unrelated business taxable income if the publication is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11492. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code by making it clear that the tax exemption of a civic league or organization exclusively for the promotion of social welfare shall not be affected because of income, including subscription and advertising income, derived from carrying on any publication, such as a journal, which is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 11493. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 11494. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 11495. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work, and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself, Mr.

RODINO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.R. 11496. A bill relating to the carryover of net operating losses of certain railroad corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 11497. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the transportation and shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of alligators and alligator hides taken in violation of Federal or State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 11498. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for the deferment of police officers from

training and service under such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. DULSKI):

H.R. 11499. A bill to encourage and assist private enterprise to provide adequate housing in urban poverty areas for low income and lower middle income persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. KUPFERMAN):

H.R. 11500. A bill to provide incentives for the creation by private industry of additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 11501. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11502. A bill to encourage and assist private enterprise to provide adequate housing in urban poverty areas for low income and lower middle income persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11503. A bill to provide incentives for the creation by private industry of additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11504. A bill to continue until the close of December 31, 1967, the existing suspension of duties on certain forms of nickel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 11505. A bill to permit retired personnel of the Armed Forces to receive benefits under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation of Federal employees for work injuries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 11506. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave for Government employees who are members of local public school boards to attend regularly scheduled meetings of such school boards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 11507. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11508. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the regulation of television network broadcasting of sports events to assure that such broadcasting is in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11509. A bill to establish a procedure whereby all candidates for elective Federal office may receive financial assistance from the Treasury to assist in defraying their election campaign expenses, and to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11510. A bill to encourage and assist private enterprise to provide adequate housing in urban poverty areas for low income and lower middle income persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11511. A bill to provide incentives for the creation by private industry of additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 11512. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to provide school lunches to children receiving aid to families with dependent children and to provide food to such families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:
H.R. 11513. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:
H.J. Res. 716. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOGGS:
H.J. Res. 717. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOW:
H.J. Res. 718. Joint resolution amending the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:
H.J. Res. 719. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDRUM:
H.J. Res. 720. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBISON:
H.J. Res. 721. Joint resolution to consent to and enter into the Mid-Atlantic States air pollution control compact, creating the Mid-Atlantic States Air Pollution Control Commission as an intergovernmental, Federal-State agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:
H.J. Res. 722. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate October 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:
H.J. Res. 723. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the

Congress to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:
H. Con. Res. 413. Concurrent resolution concerning a World Farm Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:
H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution to clarify the proper extent of the U.S. military commitment to the Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:
H. Con. Res. 415. Concurrent resolution calling for the restoration of freedom to the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:
H. Res. 744. Resolution providing for a thorough review of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCCLORY:
H. Res. 745. Resolution providing for thorough review of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

257. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Common Varieties Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:
H.R. 11514. A bill for the relief of Lillian

Marie Gederon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11515. A bill for the relief of Vincent C. Lombardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):
H.R. 11516. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cesar R. Estoye; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:
H.R. 11517. A bill for the relief of Wenefreda Miguel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H.R. 11518. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Farina Avenger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:
H.R. 11519. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Mohammed Hosain Amirgholi, M.D.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. QUILLEN:
H.R. 11520. A bill for the relief of Minobu Miki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

127. By the SPEAKER: Petition of southern Missouri legislators and governmental officials, Jefferson City, Mo., relative to the impact of Federal land acquisition on residents of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture.

128. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Index; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Results of 1967 Public Opinion Questionnaire in 12th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1967

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the interesting results of the 1967 public opinion poll which I recently conducted in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois.

In April 1967, I distributed approximately 140,000 questionnaire cards to the residents of the 12th Illinois District, an area comprising Lake County, McHenry County, and Barrington and Hanover Townships in Cook County. By May 31, 1967, a total of 15,854 properly marked cards were returned and tabulated. These represented about 12 percent of the distribution. Additional returns are continuing to arrive in my Washington office, even now.

This year I utilized a special IBM punchcard so that the questionnaire returns could be machine tabulated. Also, the use of automatic data processing equipment made possible a more

careful and accurate analysis of the questionnaire replies.

In addition to 10 questions on issues of significance to the Nation, the 12th District citizens were asked to identify themselves by age group, occupation, and party preference. This personal information made possible an interesting analysis of returns on the basis of the individual's age, political affiliation, and occupation.

One of the most interesting questions is that dealing with the United States' policy and presence in Vietnam. Altogether 87.8 percent of the 12th District citizens approved the present or even stronger American involvement in Vietnam: 62.9 percent favor using sufficient military power to clear South Vietnam of Communists; 9.7 percent favor greater use of air and sea power; 7 percent favor holding South Vietnam; and 8.2 percent favor continuing the present policy. Of special interest was the similar viewpoints of citizens of different ages, occupations and political preferences.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that the political party response to the questionnaire—which appears to be overwhelmingly Republican—is not indicative of the true Republican-Democratic proportions within the 12th Congressional District. The ratio of Republicans to Democrats in the 12th Illinois District is not 6 to 1 as the questionnaire returns suggest, but more like 2 to 1 or 3 to 1—at

this time—as recent election results show. If, for political reasons, some normally Democratic voters have declined to respond to the questionnaire which I circulated, this is—of course—regrettable. Very few of the great national issues are to be decided along strictly partisan lines. As Representative in the Congress of both Democrats and Republicans, I have been anxious to receive the views and to give appropriate recognition to the position of both Republicans and Democrats on the various issues. I am suspicious that many of those voters—24 percent of the total—who described themselves in the questionnaire as “independents” may, in elections, support various Democratic candidates. This would make the ratio of Republicans to Democrats more consistent with the ratio as revealed on election days.

In the face of a threatened tax increase, the questionnaire returns are most persuasive. Twelfth District citizens have voted better than 9 to 1 against the proposed 6-percent surcharge tax increase. Even a larger percentage prefers to have our economic problem resolved by reducing nondefense spending.

The response to the proposal to transfer some of our national holidays to Monday, in order to provide the benefit of 3-day holiday weekends, was most enlightening in view of the forthcoming hearings in both the House and the Sen-